



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"An Evaluation of the London Jewish Chronicle, 1870-1897,
As A Source for English-Jewish History, 1870-1897"

written by Stanley Kaplan
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: (☒)
cannot be considered for publication: ()
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (☒)
may not be loaned by the Library: ()

Ellis Rivkin
(signature of referee)

Ellis Rivkin

(referee)

February 23, 1954
(date)

Amic. 2/72

AN EVALUATION OF THE LONDON JEWISH CHRONICLE,
1870 - 1897, AS A SOURCE FOR ENGLISH-
JEWISH HISTORY, 1870 - 1897

by

Stanley Kaplan

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
the Master of Hebrew Letters
Degree and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
February, 1954

Referee:
Professor Ellis Rivkin

to my wife

Rena

and to my daughters

Judyth Shoshannah and Deborah Mariam

with gratefulness and love

Preface

It is necessary to express my gratitude to all my teachers, but especially to Professor Ellis Rivkin whose insights into history and human experience, whose profound understanding of human nature and science, and whose gentle guidance and encouragement have contributed greatly to my own self-expression.

Stanley Kaplan

Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion
February, 1954

AN EVALUATION OF THE LONDON JEWISH CHRONICLE, 1870 - 1897, AS A
SOURCE FOR ENGLISH-JEWISH HISTORY, 1870 - 1897

Digest

As an introduction to the thesis proper, there is an outline of the major relevant aspects of English and Anglo-Jewish history and of the structure of the Jewish community.

The London Jewish CHRONICLE was chosen as a source because at the time it was the only Anglo-Jewish newspaper in England, and because London was the center of Jewish life there. Its major limitation as a source is the subject of this thesis, which is developed by an examination of its attitudes.

ANGLIFICATION characterizes its attitudes; therefore it is the theme of this thesis. The first aspect of ANGLIFICATION is shown to be in the CHRONICLE's support of the authority structure of the Jewish community; the second aspect, in its support of the leaders of Anglo-Jewry in their desire to anglicize the East European Jewish immigrant poor. Then our thesis deals with "union," "charity," industrialization and education, all of which are exposed to have but little relationship to the needs of these foreign Jewish poor, but which have the purpose of anglicizing these immigrant poor. For the CHRONICLE and these leaders believed that ANGLIFICATION once attained would safeguard the position, the reputation and the vested interests of Anglo-Jewry and perpetuate its status quo.

This thesis then proceeds to show that, according to the CHRONICLE, the solution to the Jewish problem was conceived in ref-

erence to the needs of ANGLIFICATION. The Jewish Problem was anti-Semitism abroad and even to a minor extent at home. The CHRONICLE almost ignores the solution of a better government policy on the part of the nation persecuting the Jews and centers its attention on ridding the East European Jews of their "objectionable traits." Though the intolerance of governments is the initial cause of anti-Semitism as it is also of these "traits," the CHRONICLE believes that emancipation will only do away with attacks upon and discrimination against Jews. What will rid Jews of these "traits" is moral, spiritual and social improvement, mainly through education and participation in national life. The latter, as manifested in England in the form of ANGLIFICATION, is shown to assume in the CHRONICLE, as in the Jewish community, the extreme form of "out-Britishing the British."

The thesis proper concludes with demonstrating that it was because of the exigencies of ANGLIFICATION that the CHRONICLE and the leaders of Anglo-Jewry reject Herzl's solution to the Jewish problem. ANGLIFICATION will admit a Jewish State but not one which must be based on the concept of the Jews as a nation.

The final conclusion of this thesis, therefore, is that the major limitation of the CHRONICLE is its middle and upper class orientation. Objective history can be written only if the source is aware of and takes into consideration its own commitments and involvements. Understanding history in this manner is urgent because the attitudes and policies adopted from the general non-Jewish ruling classes by the Jewish ruling classes -- supported by such as the CHRONICLE -- often leads to supporting those policies which can lead

to using the Jews, to discrimination against them and even attacks upon them.

Table of Contents

	page
Preface	iv
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
Major Aspects of Nineteenth Century English History	1
Major Aspects of Nineteenth Century Anglo-Jewish History and the Structure of the Community	6
The CHRONICLE as a Source for Anglo-Jewish History From 1870-1897	16
CHAPTER TWO ANGLIFICATION: AUTHORITY AND STRUCTURE OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY	19
The Board of Deputies and the Berkeley Street Congregation	19
The "Ecclesiastical Authorities": The Chief Rabbi and the Beth Din	27
The United Synagogue: Its Relationship to the Federation of Synagogue and the Chevras	35
CHAPTER THREE THE PROBLEM OF THE FOREIGN JEWISH POOR: ANGLIFICATION	42
The Problem of the Jewish Poor and "Alien Immigrant"	42
The Relation of "Union" and ANGLIFICATION	43
Relation of Charity and Industrialization to ANGLIFICATION	53
Relation of Religion, Orthodoxy and Education to ANGLIFICATION	70

CHAPTER FOUR	SOLUTION TO "THE JEWISH PROBLEM": ANGLIFICATION	78
	What "The Jewish Problem" Was	78
	The Causes for Anti-Semitism	80
	The Solutions of "The Jewish Problem": In General	93
	Solutions of "The Jewish Problem": In England	98
	Solutions of "The Jewish Problem": ANGLIFICATION Par Excellence	100
	Solution of "The Jewish Problem": Zionism vs. Nationalism	119
CHAPTER FIVE	EPILOGUE	131
References		
Bibliography		

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Major Aspects of Nineteenth Century English History

From the middle of the nineteenth century to 1880, England gloried in an Economic Golden Age. Many developments had converged to make her an international trading concern organized on the basis of a global economy. She had become the industrial, the commercial and the banking center of the world. Throughout this period, profits from every sort of enterprise and from every part of the world poured into her coffers. The ever ascending spiral of prosperity constantly reached new and dizzy heights.

But after 1870, other major developments were beginning to become discernible. With the Franco-Prussian War, Germany had already begun its preparation of becoming the rival of Britain; and the United States after the Civil War was fast occupying the same position. Consequently, a leveling off of England's prosperity took place, given impetus by the depression of the late 1870's, because she no longer possessed a monopoly on modern industrialization; and her steel and coal production was beginning to decline. Her foreign trade advanced more slowly as the economic competition of Germany and the United States quickened. It was these two nations to whom England was gradually but surely throughout the last years of the century losing her economic control of the world. They, and not Britain, were becoming the leaders of world economy, Germany by application of chemistry to industry and the United States by mass

production. They were the nations who were gaining ascendancy by means of the benefits of the new phases of industrial capitalism, which were the appearance of the financier-capitalist and the consolidation into trusts and cartels.

England's foreign policy with regard to the Continent, ever since the end of the Crimean War in 1856, returned to a policy of "splendid isolation" until the latter part of the century — especially since she had no dreams of territorial conquests on the Continent. During this time, therefore, the major efforts of her foreign policy were, first of all, to continue to maintain a balance of power on continental Europe so that there would be no danger to herself. Consequently, she remained aloof from alliances with the powers of Europe, entering into them only if this balance was threatened. Secondly, the major efforts of her foreign policy were centered also on the protection of the route to India through the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal. Because the czars still longed for their "window" on the Mediterranean at Constantinople in order to command the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, Russia became the traditional enemy of Turkey. And England, to protect her Empire, became committed to the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. England's statesmen greatly feared that Russia at Constantinople might be the prelude to her advance upon India. Thus, even though the sister and granddaughter of the Queen were given in marriage to the czars, because of these conflicting imperialistic policies, England and Russia continued to be opposed to each other in the Balkan and Near East areas throughout the nineteenth century. Often England had to save Turkey from Russia when the czar's troops invaded the Balkan

area of the Ottoman Empire ostentatiously to liberate his "little Slav brothers" from the Turks.

With the Congress and Treaty of Berlin, in 1878, ending the Russo-Turkish War, both England and Russia lost interest in the Balkans and also in the Near East. Russia, having been effectively barred from the Mediterranean by the Congress, disappointingly turned to the Far East to find a "window" on the Pacific. But Russia continued to be a threat to England's Empire in India during our period because the czar sought desperately now to gain an inroad into India through Afghanistan. And on the other hand Britain's concern with the Balkan and Near East areas abated because the acquisition of Cyprus, Egypt, and the Suez Canal safeguarded her life-line to India.

However, the Balkan area remained a concern after 1878 to the Jewish community in England and even to some extent to the British Foreign Office because of the persecution of the Jews by Roumania. As a reward for joining Russia in order to go to war against her overlord and rid her land of the Turk, the Congress of Berlin had given Roumania national independence. And thus when Roumania ignored the provision of the Treaty granting full equality to her Jewish subjects, and again applied to them the old discriminatory laws, the Anglo-Jewish community prevailed upon England to intervene. The Foreign Office justified its action on the ground that Britain was one of the powers who, by her might and money, had rewarded Roumania with national independence.

After Russia and England had abandoned the Balkan peninsula as a prime concern of their imperialistic policy, it was Germany who began to implement dreams of an economic empire in Asia Minor. In

the period following 1878 she gained a strong hand in the affairs of Turkey, invested large amounts of capital and proceeded to build the Bagdad railroad. It was not long afterwards, beginning with 1890, that England was forced to leave her "splendid isolation" which she found by then not so splendid but very isolated. Not only the realization that she no longer occupied so exalted a position of control in international affairs, but also the renewed hostility of France because of rivalry in North Africa and the still constant threat of Russia to India began to force her out of her previous isolation. But the major factor in finally dislodging her was Germany. The economic competition of Germany in the Near East, thus endangering Britain's economic control there and even in India, her growing commercial and naval challenge, all with a resultant fear of Germany often bordering on panic, were the consequence of Germany's new policy of overseas imperialism. When Bismarck retired in 1890 the policy of not competing with England by remaining a land power confined to Europe retired with him. Moreover, this competition on the part of Germany not only led to England's diplomatic revolution, that is, to embarking on a renewed imperialistic policy with a dual aim of increasing her prosperity again and of protecting herself. It not only forced Britain in the early part of the twentieth century into an alliance with France and Russia, her long-time traditional enemies. It ultimately even led to the First World War.

After the Reform Bill of 1832 the middle class of England (the landed gentry and the industrial capitalists) began to rule and to take the place of the aristocrats. In order to effect this change what has been termed the "Victorian Compromise" was agreed upon. It was an unwritten, and largely unconscious, alliance between the middle

7

class and the aristocracy from this first Reform Bill until the second in 1867 so as to divide political power in England between them to the exclusion of the lower classes. The corollary of this compromise was that the welfare of these classes certainly was not to be avoided by a Christian nation and let them starve, but that a policy must be adopted of a moderate amount of "protection" for the pauper and the working classes. The ruling classes thought however that protection must be strictly limited or else laziness would be encouraged. The psychology here was that there was a causal connection between wickedness and poverty. The Victorian business man had found industriousness, frugality and temperance to be the virtues that lead to success. And therefore the absence of them was considered the greatest of the vices and the cause of poverty, but in the pursuit of them lay the salvation of the lower classes.

The rise of the laboring class to some political power became manifest in the period beginning with the late 1860's. This class won the Reform Bill of 1867 which enfranchised the better paid industrial workers in the towns. And it was social reforms and socialistic movements in England which gave the working class its program and its encouragement. There were social reform ideas in England even before Marxism first made its imprint there in the 1870's and 1880's. From this time onward, however, more and more workingmen became amenable to the new ideas especially because of the serious and prolonged economic slump in the late 70's from which industry and commerce recovered very slowly, but agriculture not at all, with the result that many working men were out of work. And their numbers were increased greatly by the farmers who tried to find a liveli-

hood in the cities and towns. It was up to Fabian socialism to have the greatest effect of all on such movements in England. Its policy was socialism by legislation, not by revolution. The Fabian Society was organized in 1883 and contributed immensely to the social reform movements which by the end of the century were improving the life of the working classes and at the same time were beginning to turn the tide against the Victorian Compromise and its laissez faire policy. And not too long after the period of our investigation, within the first five years of the new century, the Labor Party came into existence, culminating the first major step of the emergence of the political power of the laboring class which had been developing during the last thirty years of the nineteenth century.

Major Aspects of Nineteenth Century Anglo-Jewish History and the Structure of the Community

It was in this general context that this thesis intends to investigate the (London) JEWISH CHRONICLE of the years 1870-1897 as a source for the history of the Anglo-Jewish community from 1870 through 1897. These two years are important in its history, for they mark out a period which begins with the establishment of the United Synagogue and ends with the first Zionist Congress.

Concerning the composition of the community, by 1880, the majority of English Jews were of German, Austrian and Hungarian stock. They comprised the Ashkenazi community which had grown up along side of the older Sephardic community beginning in the early eighteenth century. By the end of that century about one-quarter of the Jews were Sephardic and these made up the more wealthy and anglicized

members of the community, while the majority, the Ashkenazi Jews, consisted of the poorer and less assimilated members. Even though the latter were constantly becoming more and more integrated into English life, the foreign character of the community was maintained throughout the years of 1760-1815 by almost continuous Ashkenazi immigration, due to much restlessness on the Continent.

And London was the principal area of settlement. Of the immigrants, the well-to-do entered commerce, brokerage and jobbing; the middle class immigrants, shopkeeping-and many were skilled smiths and watchmakers. Next, in social and economic standing came the artisans, and lastly the lower classes, who were mostly traders in old clothes and peddlars. And, in the same period of 1760-1815, many of these same traders in old clothes and peddlars seeking greater opportunity, together with wealthy Ashkenazi traders who became ships' agents at the larger sea-ports, spread out beyond London and founded the provincial Jewish settlements in England.

In 1768, because of persecutions in the Ukraine, waves of immigrants swept to the shores of England and settled in London. And largely because the Great Synagogue there refused aid to those whom it deemed to have left without good cause, a severe problem of poverty afflicted the Ashkenazi community. This soon led to a serious problem of crime. Therefore the Anglo-Jewish community took measures to reduce this flow of immigrants with the help of the government, but the decisive factor in ending these waves of immigrants was the French Revolution and the subsequent Napoleonic Wars.

These wars, moreover, not only brought relief from immigra-

tion to the Jewish community but also increased prosperity. For it was during this time that Jewish bankers became irreplaceable in England. The Goldsmid brothers, replacing the older Sephardic bankers, became central in government loans and finances and also in the improvement of England's tax system. Immediately after them came the Rothschilds. And with the end of the wars and the rise of the extremely wealthy Jewish banking families, a new era dawned for Anglo-Jewry. This new era, lasting from 1815 until 1881, witnessed an increase in the prosperity of the Jewish community along with the increase throughout the nation. At the same time, the Jewish community quickly assimilated its foreign elements so that after a while the majority of the Jews in England were native born and quite anglicized. And, furthermore, at the same time, because of these two interrelated causes of economic prosperity and increased assimilation of all elements into the national life, the Jewish community began to win its social emancipation, which was the prelude to attaining its political emancipation. Bound up with the improved social position also went a change in the attitude toward the Jews in England as expressed in the depiction of Jews in literature and "conversionists" circles. Whereas the Jews beforehand were maligned and attacked verbally, with their better status and economic prosperity they were treated more kindly and humanely.

And by 1871 the Jews had won complete political emancipation, with only the exception of being unable to distribute ecclesiastical patronage. This entire process was the result of the change in the position of the Jews of England which has

just been indicated. The series of events leading to emancipation began in 1826 when religious qualifications were removed as obstacles to non-Anglicans becoming naturalized. The English middle class kept on showing its impatience with religious disabilities so that by 1846 the Jews were placed on the same footing as all Dissenters. The only disability then remaining was not being able to take part in political life. The attempt to remove this was fought by the Jewish community from 1847 until 1858 at which time the House of Lords, tired of putting up a strong opposition, agreed to let Baron Lionel de Rothschild take his seat in Commons. And in 1855 the Jews won political emancipation in the municipalities. In 1860, the seating of Jewish members of Commons was made a right and no longer a privilege granted in special cases. In 1866 this situation was legalized in the Oaths Act which removed from the oath of office the words which the Jews elected to Parliament found objectionable. And the last step was taken in 1871 by Parliament when it repealed a section of the Relief Act of 1858 so that now the Jews were on the same footing as English Christians. Thereafter Jews held all positions in English government from Lord Mayor of London to Viceroy of India, and even several of their top leaders served as ministers of the Crown. In 1885 a member of the Rothschild family became a member of the House of Lords.

To this well established Anglo-Jewish community came a very large immigration of East European Jews, mainly from Russia and to a lesser extent from Roumania, beginning with the severe Russian persecutions of the Jews in 1881, and continuing throughout the rest of the century. Whereas by 1858 the immigration was

to a large extent of middle class, self-supporting families, and only a few from East Europe, those who flocked to England's shores during the last two decades of the nineteenth century were predominantly from the lower classes. They superimposed themselves upon the older, anglicised community, remaining in compact groups, retaining their own customs and ways of the ghetto. Whereas previously the Jews took part in all phases of the economic life of the nation, the newer group almost exclusively went into tailoring and allied trades. In 1858 there were fifty thousand Jews in England and in 1860 sixty thousand. The persecutions that began in 1681 continued in severe form until 1882, and in the beginning of the 1890's they again became so severe that during the first half of the 1880's and the 1890's there was a tremendous influx of refugees — and by 1905 the Jewish population grew to almost two hundred thousand. Even though after the early part of the 1890's alien immigration gradually subsided, even though many immigrants spread throughout the provinces, even though they effected a slight but important revolution in the clothing industry by making cheap but good clothes available to the working class, a strong movement to restrict immigration by legislation developed in the latter part of the 1890's, especially with the coming into power of the Conservative Party in 1895. The excuse was that there was a growing fear of the immigrants competing too much with native labor and thus endangering the workingman's standard of living. This movement culminated in the Anti-Alien Immigration Act of 1905.

During the period of 1870 through 1897, some of the major institutions of Anglo-Jewry had been founded; — the others under-

went various changes. Corresponding to the major problems, which the modern Anglo-Jewish community faced from its very inception, was the erection of its major institutions. The political authority of the community was vested in the Board of Deputies. Originally known as the London Committee of Deputies of British Jews, it was formed both from the "deputados" of the Sephardic community who were nominated to watch over political developments which might affect the community and to serve as intermediaries with the English government, and also from the representatives of the Ashkenazi community who acted in a similar capacity. In the beginning its functions were intermittent; but with the new era of Anglo-Jewry after 1815 the Board came into its own when in 1836 it was given statutory recognition by Parliament in its Marriage Act — and at the same time the Board was granting representation to provincial synagogues. The Marriage Act allowed marriages "according to Jewish usages" through a system of registration of synagogue secretaries certified to the Registrar General of England. These secretaries were certified by the Board of Deputies since it handled political relationships with the general community and with the government. And because the synagogue had to be a place of worship where marriages were performed "according to Jewish usages," the ultimate effect of the Act was to empower the Board with the authority to decide what is to be considered a "synagogue." And it called upon the Chief Rabbi to make this decision.

Also in the 1830's another important series of events in the community took place. In 1836 prominent members of the Sephardic community petitioned the ecclesiastical authorities for reforms

similar to those in Hamburg. This step was a culmination of the discontent among the wealthiest and most influential Jews with the established ecclesiastical order, dating back to the beginning of the century, and not quiesced by minor reforms. Public opinion encouraged the governing bodies not to give in; and thus in 1840 some of the most wealthy and prominent members of Devis Marks, the Sephardic synagogue, together with some of the most wealthy of the Ashkenasi community, resolved to establish a place of worship in West London that would be "British." In the face of an ecclesiastical ban, the West London Synagogue of British Jews — later also called the Berkeley Street Congregation — was established in 1842. It was not Reform to the extent that German and American congregations were Reform — as the CHRONICLE proudly boasts many times. Furthermore, the same conditions (that is, the new social and economic position of the Jews which has been indicated above) that gave rise to this new development of "Reform" also brought changes, along the same general lines, in the liturgy and organization of the other congregations who nevertheless remained within the orthodox tradition.

Having been banned, and having "dissented" from the orthodox community, the Berkeley Congregation was refused admission to the Board of Deputies. Its synagogue was not considered a "Jewish" place of worship and therefore its secretary was not certified to regular marriages. This posed a problem but the members of the synagogue succeeded in getting Parliament in 1856 to provide special legislation so that they were on the same standing as the orthodox congregations, but only by virtue of a separate enactment by Parliament. By 1870 however, both sides were willing to reconcile their

differences. The Berkeley Street Congregation still wanted representation on the Board of Deputies, and by now the Board was willing to alter its constitution so as to allow that Congregation to seat its deputies. This change took from 1872 until 1885 when all elements of the established Jewish community were willing to unite to mutually solve the problem of the immigrant poor. The major changes in the constitution adopted were these: any written application for certification of a secretary must be accompanied by a certificate from the ecclesiastical authorities stating that the congregation applying is a "Jewish" place of worship; these ecclesiastical authorities were defined as the Chief Rabbi and the Beth Din of the United Synagogue and the Haham of the Sephardic synagogue, Bevis Marks; and the Berkeley Synagogue does not have to submit itself to the control of these authorities. Thus the two elements became reconciled; for the division had been bitter and embarrassing to the community. The rapport was so great that after 1885 the Berkeley Synagogue cooperated with the United Synagogue in most every community venture, including the latter's East End Scheme to solve the problem of the Jewish poor.

As indicated above, the religious authority of the community was vested in the Chief Rabbi, together with the Beth Din of the Great Synagogue, and after 1870, of the United Synagogue. Just as the Board of Deputies was to solve the problem of centralizing and consolidating the community — besides its other functions as representative and intermediary — so the religious authority was similar in nature so far as it centralized and consolidated the community. To a great extent it was patterned after the ecclesiastical structure

of the Church of England from its very beginning at the end of the eighteenth century when the struggle for supremacy with the Hambro Synagogue resulted in the rabbi of the Great Synagogue becoming the first Chief Rabbi of England. During the period of our study there was a movement to render it more like "Church government" by having one such authority over the entire Jewish community of the Empire.

But the real basis of the religious authority of the community was the United Synagogue, for the Chief Rabbi and his Beth Din were to a large degree only special functions of it. During the period of great prosperity and advance of the Jewish community throughout the first seventy years of the century, there had been many attempts at uniting the London synagogues. One such attempt in the beginning of the century between the three Ashkenazi synagogues resulted in the establishment just of a spiritual head, the Chief Rabbi. Other later attempts had the purpose of sharing the burden of caring for the Jewish poor. The efforts of Lionel Cohen, an officer of the Great Synagogue and a communal leader, and the urging of the Chief Rabbi that all the metropolitan synagogues be united under his leadership, resulted in a series of conferences and then in the instituting of the United Synagogue by an act of Parliament in 1870. It was established to better and more effectively carry out concerted efforts to solve community problems, especially that of the Jewish poor.

The problem of the Jewish poor was by far the most serious difficulty that the community had to face during the period from 1870 through 1897. To deal with this problem there were instituted the Board of Guardians, the Federation of Synagogues and the East

End Scheme of the United Synagogue. The Board was formed in 1859 for the "Relief of the Jewish Poor" of London, although Liverpool had as early as 1845 established such a society. All the time that the immigration from East Europe brought in great numbers of paupers and unskilled labor the Board was the busiest agency of the Jewish community. The Federation of Synagogues, or Federation of Chevras, was a combination of these "minor synagogues" in 1887, with the purpose of bringing the East European Jews into closer contact with the established Jewish community and helping to improve their own condition in a more concerted fashion. And the East End Scheme was instituted by the United Synagogue to draw the East End Jews (the East End was the section where the Jewish poor and working classes lived) away from the Federation and to bring them instead under the influence of the United Synagogue and thereby to improve the moral, spiritual and social condition of these Jews.

The remaining major Anglo-Jewish institution was the Anglo-Jewish Association. The economic and imperialistic development of England during the nineteenth century was such that, to the extent that Anglo-Jewry was vital in this development, the Jewish community of England became very influential throughout the world and was looked upon to as the protector and defender of oppressed Jews everywhere. Moses Montefiore took active leadership in this field and personally intervened in several cases and saved several Jewish communities from further violence or discrimination, as he did, for example, in the Damascus Riots. And because the Anglo-Jewish community attained such a position with regard to other, foreign Jewish communities, it itself formed the Association, in 1871, although an

international organisation, the Alliance Israelite Universelle, was already performing the function of intervening on behalf of sorely oppressed Jews. The Association had, however, a larger sphere of activity in that it also aimed at the promotion of the social, moral and intellectual progress of Jews abroad, mainly in Asia, including Palestine, and in North Africa.

The CHRONICLE as a Source For Anglo-Jewish
History From 1870-1897

The choice of the (London) JEWISH CHRONICLE as a source for Anglo-Jewish history is a simple matter inasmuch as it was at the time the only Anglo-Jewish newspaper in existence in England. And what is more, since the London Jewish community by far was the most influential and comprised the greater majority of all English Jews and since London was the center of Jewish life in England as well as of the entire nation, to this extent can the CHRONICLE therefore be said to be a source for the entirety of Anglo-Jewish history of this period. This is true even though, when dealing with the provincial Jewish settlements and congregations, our source includes only matter-of-fact reports and only very little discussion of their problems, their attitudes and their institutions. The reason, of course, is that the CHRONICLE was solely for the London community, although synagogal statistical reports from provincial members of the United Synagogue and exceptional events anywhere in the provinces are regularly published in the pages of the CHRONICLE.

One aspect of our source, which is at the same time both an advantage and disadvantage is its style and syntax. There is an

overabundance of superfluous material, attention to details, laborious verbosity and complicated sentence structure. Yet the full supply of details and ideas allows the investigator a wider range of choosing material vital for his study, which the editors might have omitted. Certainly the editorials can be said to lack the conciseness and continuity of what is found today in outstanding newspapers.

The CHRONICLE never intends to deal with more than the immediate Jewish community except for national and international matters which affect it in some way. Thus, one might ask to what extent, in spite of this "limitation," but because the Jewish community of England was a vital and integral part of the larger ones, does our source reveal how Anglo-Jewry related itself to the political situations at home and abroad, and to the domestic and foreign policies of the nation, which we have outlined in the earlier part of this chapter. A good number of these our source does reveal, if only indirectly: antagonism towards Russia over the Near Eastern question; antagonism towards that nation and towards Roumania for their persecution of the Jews in their land; antagonism towards Germany, but not because of its economic or naval rivalry, but expressly because of its autocratic government, its Judenhetze and its Jewish community's Reform Judaism are all quite prevalent. But although there are indications of the economic slump of the late 70's, there is virtually nothing in the issues of the CHRONICLE of the period of our study pointing to the initial stages of England losing her economic and imperialistic grip on the world. On the other hand, what is more clearly brought out, and consciously so, is the Victorian

attitude toward the working and the poor classes, the desire to improve them socially, morally and spiritually, and the sternness in refusing to "coddle" them by too much "protection." Also boldly asserted is the attitude that the Jewish community, and Judaism too, is the champion of the laboring man in his search for means to improve his condition by social reforms. Equally made clear is the attitude toward the national economic policy of "Free Trade." Thus the fact that our source does reveal in some way at least what position the Jewish community took with regard to a good number of these issues is definitely an advantage that the CHRONICLE has as a source of history. But the fact that this is done in the case of other issues indirectly and seldom consciously enough, and with still others not at all, is a decided disadvantage.

Now, there is one limitation of the CHRONICLE of so great significance and extent that it must occupy the major portion of this thesis. To develop the remainder of this paper, to evaluate the CHRONICLE (of the years 1870-1897) as a source for Anglo-Jewish history from 1870 through 1897, only the attitudes expressed in our source will be dealt with, to the exclusion of a treatment of factual material with the purpose of demonstrating whether or not our source can be used to write Anglo-Jewish history of this period in its entirety. Thus our concern will be with those issues which are of prime importance to the CHRONICLE, such as the issues of unity, charity, industrialization, education and religion — both as attitudes expressed as ideas, and also as institutionalized and structuralized in the community.

Chapter Two

AMPLIFICATION: AUTHORITY AND STRUCTURE OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY

The Board of Deputies and the Berkeley Street Congregation

As we have indicated in the first chapter, from 1872 until 1885, the Board of Deputies and the Berkeley Street Congregation made various attempts, characterised in the beginning by rancor but later on by amicability, to seat the deputies of that synagogue on the Board. The settlement was delayed for many years because of the disagreement over the recognition of the "ecclesiastical authorities." The Board, deriving its powers from Parliament, had beforehand asked these authorities to guide it in all religious matters, especially in certifying Jewish marriages ever since the Marriage Act was passed in 1836. This relationship of the religious authorities to the Board was set down merely as one of its bye-laws. But when the question arose of seating the Berkeley deputies, the Board found an opportunity to elevate this relationship to the status of a law in the new constitution. Therefore the Berkeley Street Congregation then declined to send its delegates since in doing so it would force itself to recognize those authorities because of whom it had separated itself from the rest of the community. To remain completely aloof was most undesirable and uncomfortable for the members of the Berkeley Congregation, but to submit would be to forsake the very principles on which it was founded. Nor would the Congregation agree to allow such interference in its internal affairs by the orthodox religious authorities.¹ Thus, even though the Berkeley Street Congregation was not made to submit to the control of these

authorities as the price it would have to pay for admission to the Board, still it refused even to acknowledge their authority.²

Throughout this struggle, the CHRONICLE takes sides with the Board and with the "ecclesiastical authorities," and it upholds the validity of the Marriage Act and the authority of Parliament as they related themselves to the religious life of the Jewish community. It gives assent, both implied and expressed, to the whole structure of authoritarian relationships and sanctions between them and the Jewish community. To this extent the CHRONICLE supported and condoned the centralized and vertical authority structure of Anglo-Jewish life.

Now, because this struggle concerned the "ecclesiastical authorities" and the Board directly, and the Marriage Act and Parliament only indirectly, we would expect to find ample and articulate evidence supporting the first two while the evidence for the latter two would be predominantly implied rather than expressed. This is exactly what is found to be the case. With regard to the CHRONICLE condoning the source of the authority of the Board of Deputies and of the "ecclesiastical authorities" as being in the result of an act of the secular government, the evidence is not abundant but it is implied clearly enough. But nevertheless there are several places where our source is very explicit. An editorial states that "there cannot be two marriage laws in the community,"³ and that must be, of course, solely the civil marriage law. The CHRONICLE elsewhere⁴ includes in its definition of "progress" the following:

"If progress means ... that as the civil law is binding on us then it is an anachronism to continue certain phases of the Jewish marriage and divorce laws which are palpably illegal in this

country ... then we are on the side of progress with all our hearts."

Here it is clear also that our source upholds the civil marriage law, as it does when it concludes in another place that "unregistered marriages (which it terms) 'Stille Chasne' ... (are) ... objectionable proceedings."⁵ And when support was given to this civil marriage law of England, support was given also the authority structure which implemented the law.

Since the Board of Deputies was the sole political agency within the authority structure of the Jewish community, there can be found explicit evidence in the CHRONICLE supporting the two-fold aspect of the Board's power and authority, to implement the Marriage Act of 1836 and its position in the community as based on the sanction of Parliament. In its review of the year 1874,⁶ the CHRONICLE finally admits that the refusal of the Berkeley Street Congregation to seat its deputies is all for the best because the Board cannot be a political body only but also has to serve in a "quasi-ecclesiastical function" as well, mainly due to its connection with administering the Marriage Act, and consequently there would have been constant friction between the two sides. It is here, as in other articles, that our source demonstrates its approval of the authority of the Board both to empower congregational secretaries to certify religious marriages and to investing the religious authorities with the power to determine what is a "Jewish" place of worship. And by implication this review of 1874, as in the case of other instances, condones the special power of the Board, by which it implements the Act, and which is derived from the secular government. Thus there is evidence, even though meager, to show that our source gives its

support to the Board of Deputies in the position it occupies in the vertical authority structure as it extends from Parliament through the Board to the Jewish community of England. It is important to remember that evidence need not always be explicit and articulate to be admissible and valid. As in the present case — the CHRONICLE's opinions concerning the Marriage Act and the Board of Deputies — the evidence, though implied, is valid evidence. For none of it contradicts other more readily admissible evidence but rather is exactly what we would expect to find; and, moreover, it accounts for, supplements and corroborates what is definitely known and expressed.

On the other hand, however, there is ample evidence condoning the authoritative role of what the CHRONICLE terms the "Ecclesiastical Authorities," that is, the Chief Rabbi and the Haham of the Sephardic Synagogue. First of all, the very fact that the revised constitution of 1873 defines these authorities and stipulates that they are to guide the Board in all religious matters and problems, itself constitutes a full recognition and condonement of them.⁷

We expect a profusion of data here simply because, as stated above, our source admits that the struggle between the Berkeley Street Synagogue and the Board of Deputies is concerning the recognition of authority, both the religious and the political (as vested in the Board).⁸ Throughout the various stages of the struggle innumerable editorial articles further reveal this nature of the contest. It is lamented that in 1874, when both sides were in a conciliatory mood, Alfred Henriques failed to bring about a settlement because the Berkeley Street Congregation would not agree

to acknowledge the authority of the "Ecclesiastical Chiefs of the Orthodox Community."⁹ In the same review of the year 1874, cited above,¹⁰ the CHRONICLE clearly defines its position when it admits that it is best that the Berkeley Street Congregation has decided not to send its deputies to the Board, because in addition to the friction which would plague the community there would also be an unfortunate weakening of "Ecclesiastical Authority," something which it wanted to avoid at any cost. What is more is that, at the very beginning of the struggle while reviewing¹¹ the entire Marriage law as it applies to the Jewish community, our source appeals to what it thinks is the final authority on the matter, the Chief Rabbi himself, and quotes him as maintaining his own "Ecclesiastical Authority" on the ground that to remove it would be to remove the guarantee that marriages are according to Jewish usages, as the law requires. And what is significant is the fact that the CHRONICLE upholds the authority of the Chief Rabbi in connection with the implementation of the Marriage Act although it makes no provision for any Jewish "Ecclesiastical authority."

The sentiments of the leaders of the community also can be found in the CHRONICLE. According to a report¹² of a meeting of the Board, the deputies demonstrate their support of the religious authorities in opposition to all who would threaten them; and, what is more, they argue for the eventual strengthening of these authorities. Thus it is quite clear that the disagreement between the Berkeley Street Congregation on the one hand and the Board of Deputies and the CHRONICLE on the other, is concerning the strengthening and further centralizing of authority in the Jewish community. And

it is also apparent that the action of the Berkeley Congregation were a conscious reaction against this increased consolidation of power and domination which had for thirty years excluded them, and in which the CHRONICLE concurred.

Therefore, on the basis of the struggle between the Berkeley Street Synagogue and the Board of Deputies, we now understand the position which the CHRONICLE took in reference to the authority structure of the community, the support of which we have termed ANGLIFICATION, the paralleling of the structures of Jewish and English life in Britain. Furthermore, from this struggle there is something else of great import to be seen. This is a repeated, overpowering desire on the part of the CHRONICLE for communal "union." In fact, to a far greater extent the prime concern of our source is the ultimate effect of the obstinacy of the Berkeley Synagogue on the unity desired in the community. In fact, "union" becomes the watchword of the CHRONICLE and of the community throughout the period of our study. The zeal for "union" and "unity" comes up quite prominently when we examine the final settlement of the problem which faced the Berkeley Synagogue and the Board of Deputies.

The first constitutional revision in 1873, and the final one in 1885, did not require the Berkeley Street Congregation to submit to the "Ecclesiastical Authorities," but merely to acknowledge that it is the religious authority.¹³ This was the purpose of the constitutional revision in 1873 when the Board agreed to grant to the "Ecclesiastical Authorities," not the power to govern the community in all religious matters (which was the form of the original clause), but only permitted them the "guidance of the Board."¹⁴

This alteration is included in the final form of the constitution in 1885.¹⁵ It was even in the first revision that the most important contested clause, "that the Berkeley representatives shall be bound to recognize this authority,"¹⁶ was deleted. And, moreover, when the constitution was finally amended in 1885 it was with this addition: "but nothing in this clause (containing the role of the religious authorities in connection with the Marriage Act) contained shall abridge or affect the individual rights or action in regard to its own internal affairs of any congregation certified under the provisions of the Act 19 and 20, Vic., c. 119."¹⁷ The congregation referred to was specifically the Berkeley Synagogue. Obviously therefore in spite of the host of articles in the CHRONICLE praising, supporting and seeking to inculcate orthodoxy as the preferable way of religious life, and in spite of the support it gives to the "Ecclesiastical Authorities," conformity to this authority was not the ultimate or the final concern of either the CHRONICLE or the leaders of the community. For, if so, since the Berkeley Street Congregation would never submit to this authority on principle,¹⁸ there would never have been a settlement, nor would the sphere of control and power of the authorities be limited to any degree.

Therefore, if there is evidence that the CHRONICLE agrees with the final settlement, then we would be justified in concluding that submission to the "Ecclesiastical Authorities" is not its ultimate concern. This evidence is found, stated quite articulately, in an editorial, late in 1885,¹⁹ where, praising the Berkeley Synagogue for its cooperation and desire to be seated on the Board of Deputies, the Board itself is equally praised for changing its constitution

for this purpose. That the CHRONICLE supported the authority of the "Ecclesiastical Chiefs" has been shown; but that it now condones a settlement whereby their power and control is to be limited in scope is revealed in the editorial of 1885 just cited.

This final and more important concern of the CHRONICLE is found in the same editorial. Here, the spirit of compromise and conciliation on both sides is praised mainly because the whole settlement is welcomed as another step towards unity in the Jewish community. And the same editorial concludes that, because of this final settlement, loyalty to "union," unlike the past, is to be the watchword of the community. In fact, all during the years of the struggle between the Berkeley Synagogue and the Board of Deputies, the zeal of the CHRONICLE was centered above all in securing "unity" in the community. For example, in December of 1873, an editorial²⁰ explains why the Berkeley Congregation and the orthodox community can now heal its split and maintains that admission of the Berkeley Synagogue to the Board is a step towards this goal -- and it concludes, "the cry today is Klal Yisroel!" Then, in early March of 1874, still in the midst of the crucial period of this problem, another editorial²¹ attacks the Berkeley Congregation's decision not to seat their deputies on the Board and not to accept its revised constitution because it widens the breach in the solidarity of the community; and then it calls for "unity at any cost," even if the Berkeley Congregation is not represented on the Board! Then again later in the same month, still another editorial,²² expresses this attitude that unity is more important than representation of the Berkeley Synagogue.

Disregarding the inconsistency of the CHRONICLE's attitude here, in that at other times it wants that Synagogue represented on the grounds that this certainly will bring "unity," it is obvious that -- in connection with the problem between the Berkeley Congregation and the Board of Deputies -- "union," or "unity," is what the CHRONICLE really wants above all else for the Jewish community. The Board, too, wanted to see the Berkeley deputies seated for the sake of unity.²³ And not only the CHRONICLE and the Board, but also this was a major concern of the Berkeley Street Congregation itself.²⁴ Moreover, in many letters to the editor, the desire for "union" is predominant.

The fact that the CHRONICLE, together with the Board of Deputies, makes an exception in the case of the Berkeley Synagogue is, as we have seen, most significant. That the Synagogue would not have to submit, as the rest of the community had to do, to "Ecclesiastical Authority" as a condition of its representation on the Board of Deputies, was for our source permissible and even desirable because in this manner alone could "unity" be attained. But it could not be attained if the leaders of the community would have demanded obedience to the orthodox religious authorities. The significance of, and the reason behind, this overwhelming desire for union on the part of the CHRONICLE -- and also on the part of the leaders of Anglo-Jewry -- will be looked into further on.

The "Ecclesiastical Authorities":

The Chief Rabbi and the Beth Din

We have seen in the previous section that the CHRONICLE

gives its support to each element in the vertical authority structure of the Jewish community: to the position of Parliament and its Marriage Act as basic to the series of authorities which culminate in the Board of Deputies and the "Ecclesiastical Authorities." The struggle of the Berkeley Street Synagogue with this authority, as viewed in the CHRONICLE, really points out the desire of the orthodox community (the majority by far), with which our source readily and unmistakingly identifies itself, to be bound by the overall authority vested in the Board and in the religious leaders. Now, although "union" has been found to be a consideration of greater importance, nevertheless, support of the ecclesiastical structure itself is of great significance, both to the CHRONICLE and to the leaders of the Jewish community.

The support given to the "Ecclesiastical Authorities" was centered in support for the Chief Rabbi. An editorial article²⁵ — which draws heavily on The Marriage Law of England, by J. T. Hammick for its data — states that, before the constitution of the Board of Deputies was first revised in 1873 in an endeavor to seat the Berkeley deputies, what were to be determined as "Jewish usages" according to the Marriage Act of 1836 was left to Dr. H. M. Adler as the "referee" of the Board "because the Board deemed itself incompetent to deal with the ecclesiastical bearings of the matter." The revised constitution had defined "Ecclesiastical Authorities" so as to include also the Haham of the one and only Sephardic Synagogue, Bevis Marks. But the Haham never rose to the communal importance that the Chief Rabbi possessed, mainly because the Ashkenazi community over which the Chief Rabbi held sway became the larger and more influ-

ential portion of the Anglo-Jewish community. Therefore, the condoning of the "Ecclesiastical Authorities" on the part of the CHRONICLE and the top leaders of the Jewish community was directed preeminently toward the Chief Rabbi.

The struggle of the Berkeley Street Synagogue and the Board of Deputies showed that the CHRONICLE — together with the leaders of the Jewish community and the Chief Rabbi — wanted to maintain the control of its "ecclesiastical authorities" over the community, especially in relation to marriage certification and designation of Jewish places of worship. The Board of Deputies accomplished this by means of unequivocally defining²⁶ these "Ecclesiastical Authorities," and for all practical purposes this had the effect of consolidating the position of the Chief Rabbi. With all this the CHRONICLE agreed and aggressively espoused. But when, in 1890, the Chief Rabbi (N. M. Adler) died, there was an opportunity to bring about further changes in the Chief Rabbinate.

Voices in the community, however, cried for a reduction in his power and control. A letter to the editor early in 1890, signed by "A Member of the Council of the United Synagogue," whom we would expect to be quite conservative, argues that now is the time to curtail the power of the Chief Rabbi, something which was impossible while he was alive because his authority prevented any change.²⁷ A more complete idea of the degree of control possessed by the Chief Rabbi is gathered from a report of a speech, early in 1895, by the well-known Anglo-Jewish historian, A. Wolff.²⁸ In the speech, on the occasion of raising a call for a "progressive party" in England, Wolff attacks the Chief Rabbinate as an example of "the Oriental and

medieval principle of 'one man power' ... which has "ever stood in the way of progress." He continues and says that even the recent establishment in the United Synagogue of a Committee of Ministers (that is, a new Beth Din) to confer with the new Chief Rabbi (H. Adler, appointed in 1891) on religious and synagogue matters has not broken his autocratic power. For, he says, a report had leaked out from the Committee which indicated that it would be no more than consultative, in spite of the settlement in which it was supposed to have curtailed the domination of the Chief Rabbinate to some degree.

Even though Wolff's position here must be recognized as one which possibly would have the tendency to exaggerate the nature of this authority, still within the realm of religious matters there is enough evidence to show that the Chief Rabbi exercised a dominant role of semi-autocratic authority and power. He exercised such a role through the United Synagogue which represented the influential portion of the Jewish community in England. And Wolff's complaint would suggest that he exercised such domination even after 1890.

This being the nature of rabbinical authority, certainly before 1890, the CHRONICLE's attitude toward it must be examined more closely. In 1874, while reviewing the previous year,²⁹ the CHRONICLE decries the fact that communal "union" is lacking mostly in the absence of ecclesiastical discipline in the form of "church government," that the Chief Rabbi is a moral force only, and that there is no distinct privileged and empowered clerical body. Even if we have overestimated the extent of the CHRONICLE's power, still it is unambiguous here the extent to which the CHRONICLE advocates the strengthening of the "ecclesiastical authority" of the community at

this time.

Returning to the developments during 1890, with the death of N. M. Adler there was a community-wide agitation to weaken the authority of the Chief Rabbi, in which the CHRONICLE took part. At first we might be surprised that such a movement arose and that the CHRONICLE supported it. Our previous investigation would seem to indicate otherwise. But it will become evident shortly that the purpose of this movement was to reduce only the power of the Chief Rabbi in order to strengthen the power of the religious authority of the community as a whole. That is, the agitation sought to transfer the semi-autocratic control of the Chief Rabbinate to the Beth Din, or "ecclesiastical court," of the United Synagogue, of which the Chief Rabbi would be merely the head. The CHRONICLE and the leaders of the community all conducted themselves as if they really were crusading for the goal of strengthening the powers of the Chief Rabbi. But, as will be seen, there was little to this claim.

The proposal, most acceptable to the Council of the United Synagogue, effecting this change was the following, according to a report in the CHRONICLE:³⁰ that the Beth Din should continue to act as a Court of Arbitration in matters of divorce, chalitzah and schechitah; that it should now control the arrangement of visitation, that is, supervision, of provincial synagogues and schools, and the matter of conversion; that it should henceforth assist the Chief Rabbi in deciding all questions of synagogue ritual and practice, religious education and with relaxation of customs, and to henceforth assist the Chief Rabbi in all other religious questions

"heretofore decided by the Chief Rabbi by his sole unaided action." The last clause, referring to marriage certification and designation of "Jewish" places of worship, now places the Beth Din directly within the vertical authority structure of the Jewish community. The proposal then seeks to justify itself with the argument that such a change will not disturb the Chief Rabbi's function, that it will rather increase his dignity and authority, because, as Chief Rabbi in Council, he will have the help of an Ecclesiastical Board which will embody the "combined wisdom of the best Jews and highest religious authorities in the country." This refers to a measure in the proposal which would complement the foreign-born Orthodox rabbis, comprising the Beth din and imported expressly for the job, with native talent. The proposal asks for extra dayanim, those who would be close to the needs of the East End (foreign poor) Jews; and the other, preferably an "Englishman," who would be able to carry out the aims of the leaders of the United Synagogue in the provinces. With regard to the Chief Rabbi, the proposal (which has been paraphrased here) uses words which have the effect of obscuring the attempt to weaken the autocratic control which the previous Chief Rabbi had succeeded in attaining. The only "new" kind of authority he is given is merely as "chief among his brethern."

In an editorial³¹ soon after the proposal is made public, the CHRONICLE accepts this proposal in toto. It accepts its "moderation" in solving the problem of the rabbinate in England; it eagerly condones its disavowal of "one-man authority." even from the first century C.E. Jewish tradition rejected such authority and was characterized by a court of three. This same editorial praises the

chief feature of the proposal; that the Chief Rabbi will no longer be the "personal Chief Rabbi" as in the past but the "Chief Rabbi in Council." And the CHRONICLE welcomes the additional dayanin, the "English synagogue officials" who would be able to deal with and know synagogue and communal problems in the East End and in the provinces, far more capably than the rabbis previously imported. The latter knew halacha, yes, but they were always ignorant of Anglo-Jewish life and its problems.

Thus it should now be evident who it is that benefits from the reduction in the power and authority of the CHRONICLE: it is the leaders of the United Synagogue. Thus, though we were surprised to find at first that the CHRONICLE and communal leaders wanted to curtail his control, now we find that what was wanted was to increase the power of the "Ecclesiastical Authorities" which according to the proposed plan would not be just the Chief Rabbi alone but now would be a more amenable and controllable board of rabbis and English synagogue officials. Thus the whole purpose of the change seems to have been with a view on the part of the Jewish leaders to assure their own greater control of the Jewish community, by adding to the number of dayanin so as to include more of the total community, especially those elements which from the standpoint of these leaders need to be brought under more strict control (viz., the East End and the provinces). The result of all this, then, was to permanently give to the leaders of the United Synagogue a more concerted and greater extent of power and authority through its "Ecclesiastical Court," the Beth Din. This kind of arrangement would remove real control from the hands of a single individual who might prove intransigent

or stand on his religious principles, and place it just where it was now desired, into the hands of the rulers of the Jewish community. For the leaders of the United Synagogue were the same, or had the same interests, as those of the Board of Deputies and other lay groups which controlled the Jewish community. And the evidence is conclusive that the CHRONICLE supported these leaders every step of the way.

In conclusion, when we investigated the difficulty between the Board of Deputies and the Berkeley Street Synagogue, we found that the main consideration was, at first view, submission to an ecclesiastical authority. But then it was seen that this was brushed aside for what the CHRONICLE thought, together with the leaders of the community, was of greater import: "union." In this section, again it has been seen that the CHRONICLE supported the communal leaders in wanting to strengthen this ecclesiastical authority as represented by the Chief Rabbi; but that when the situation arose, he was again cast aside in order to bolster and increase the power of the leaders of the United Synagogue, who were among the ruling groups of the Jewish community in England. And it is here again that we hear the cry for "unity" and "union." For example, in the same year, 1890, an editorial³² hails the resolution by the president of the Council of the United Synagogue, Lord Rothschild, demanding "one ecclesiastical authority" to direct the entire community, the United Synagogue as well as the East End Chevras and the Reform (Berkeley) congregation, in fact, even the entire body of Jews in the British Empire; and this would be effected "were the spiritual direction of the entire community focused into one center." Thus

what Rothschild asks for, and what the CHRONICLE agrees to, as has been shown, is that "control" be taken out of the Chief Rabbi's hands and be substituted by "direction, or guidance." But the "control" both the leaders of the community and the CHRONICLE want only in their hands. There is something else that is significant in this same editorial. It exemplifies the CHRONICLE's and the communal leaders' desire to centralize direction and control into one authority. And this process whereby this greater and increased control is to be effected has the exalted aim of what the CHRONICLE happily terms "union."

The United Synagogue:

Its Relationship to the Federation of Synagogues and the Chevras

At the end of the previous section there was an endeavor to point out that the CHRONICLE acquiesced in the machinations on the part of leaders of the community to extend the sphere of influence of the United Synagogue, that is, to further centralize the majority of the community's independent institutions under the banner of the United Synagogue. This, as has been stated was the goal of those who sought for greater communal "union."

It will be with regard to the present issue concerning the United Synagogue, the chevras and the union among them (itself representing an adoption of the attitude of the leaders of the Jewish community towards this principle of communal organization) as embodied in the Federation of Synagogues, or Chevras, that the movement for "union" becomes most apparent, and in the CHRONICLE, most vociferous. From the struggle between the United Synagogue on the one hand and the chevras and their Federation on the other, one can

gain insight as to where the CHRONICLE stands in the issue, which was one of the most vital facing the community. Having seen that whether the Berkeley deputies were seated on the Board and how much power the Chief Rabbi had were secondary considerations, we will discover eventually how this matter of "union" becomes the more important issue. We will also investigate just why this was so.

In 1885, after the settlement between the Board of Deputies and the Berkeley Street Congregation, the CHRONICLE (as was cited above)³³ praises the cooperative spirit shown by both sides as a major step toward "unity," and then said that "union" is to be ruthlessly carried out as the watchword of the community. At this point, in giving practical application to this idea, our source maintains that "the institution which is most fitted to constitute the rallying point of the three sections (viz., Ashkenazi, Sephardic, and Reform) is the United Synagogue" and this advance toward communal consolidation and "union" is most welcome "for the building up of the strength of the Synagogue, to use the word in its broadest sense."³⁴ Here is then an unequivocal statement of the stand taken by the CHRONICLE in this entire issue. It consistently, throughout this period of our research, looks upon the United Synagogue as the most vital institution and tool of Anglo-Jewry to carry out the plans and solutions of its leaders. And the concept of "union" of this community for the CHRONICLE is translated into a strictly anglican term, the "Synagogue," used everywhere as an Anglican would use "the Church (of England)."

Not long afterwards, another editorial³⁵ heaps praises upon another great advance towards "union." This consisted of the new

ashkenazi synagogue in the East End (an independent chevra) has recently concluded an arrangement with the United Synagogue to pay it a fee for the use of its burial grounds. The CHRONICLE hails the extension of power and scope of the United Synagogue because this contract heralds further communal consolidation, as a binding together of all sections more closely so that there can be a concerted action in dealing with all communal problems, especially those with regard to "our foreign brethren."

In the same spirit and for the same ulterior motives, that the CHRONICLE happily refers to the movement among the chevras to form a cooperative society which will bring them into closer contact with the community with the result that the condition of these "minor" congregations will improve.³⁶ And this is exactly the purpose with which Samuel Montagu founded the Federation which united these chevras. As Montagu stated in a letter to the editor,³⁷ a little more than two years after its inception in December of 1887, the Federation had "the object of associating together the synagogues of East London (viz., the chevras), which had heretofore been isolated, for the purpose of raising the condition of the members religiously, morally and socially." And in the same epistle Montagu goes further and argues that the proposed synagogue in the East End (this is a reference to the United Synagogue's "East End Scheme") will interfere especially if it will be a larger synagogue which will draw many members of the chevras away from their own "minor synagogues" — exactly what the United Synagogue wanted to accomplish. It had been agreed, he continues, that there would be no interference from the United Synagogue except general advice, as promised by Rothschild,

honorary president of the Federation and member of the Council of the United Synagogue. Thus, it is evident that the latter group through its East End Scheme was competing with the Federation for control over the foreign-born of the chevras, according to the purposes stated above.

In fact, an editorial³⁸ admitting that there has been a ferment in the community over the relationship of these "minor congregations" to the United Synagogue since their founding as a Federation in 1887, tells us what the United Synagogue really wanted to do. It endeavored to accomplish its long-term goals of "union" of the entire community with all its various sections by making the chevras extinct, because they are, it is admitted, irreconcilable to the movement for "union" due to the fact that they perpetuate the separatism of the foreign Jewish poor of the East End. In this same editorial, the CHRONICLE agrees with the Executive-Committee of the Council of the United Synagogue in all except that, instead of getting rid of the chevras outright, our source thinks that it would be more feasible to make them extinct by "building a synagogue on the basis of the chevras." Either way their death knell is to be sounded. And, moreover, the CHRONICLE also agrees with the leaders of the United Synagogue that the Federation perpetuates the chevras, with the implication, therefore, that the Federation, too, must go. That it was the intent of the leaders of the United Synagogue to bring to an end both the chevras and their Federation by means of their East End Scheme is made very clear also in the report of Wolff's speech, previously referred to. There he says³⁹ "the East End Scheme has been pushed through by the United Synagogue," and this

plan in establishing a popular synagogue in that place for immigrants has the goal of "constituting them members of the United Synagogue," and of taking them out of the chevras, thereby dissolving the Federation. The attitude of the CHRONICLE can be made no clearer than when it writes in an editorial⁴⁰ entitled, "Lights and Shades of '95":

"If the great East End Scheme is not made a reality in 1896, then the wrath of the community will be justly and inextinguishably kindled ... its social and moral promise is no longer a matter for discussion or compromise. The size of the synagogue to be built is surely a minor matter in comparison with the crying need for a point round which may be focused the glowing enthusiasm for ameliorating the social condition of the East End Jews ... The East End Scheme must be put into motion at once. The community will tolerate no further delay."

Either the CHRONICLE is projecting its feelings and ascribing them to the community as a whole, or it means by "the community," as it consistently does, its leading and ruling element which it represents.

Thus it becomes clear that the CHRONICLE supports the Scheme of the leaders of the United Synagogue because it represents an extension of the area of control and "moral" influence of the United Synagogue. This plan, then, is necessary, according to its way of thinking, as one very important step in the movement towards "union" of all its sections and elements of the community, especially the foreign poor. But it will be soon discovered that "union" is merely a means to what the CHRONICLE together with the leaders of the community believe to be the ultimate goal of all their communal efforts with regard to the foreign-born poor, East End Jews.

Consequently, in this chapter, we have demonstrated the position of the CHRONICLE: it supported the vertical authority structure of the community, from Parliament through the Board of Deputies and the "Ecclesiastical Authorities" to the Jewish community. It supported the role and the aims of the Board and the "Ecclesiastical Authorities" in this structure against the unorthodox tendencies of the Berkeley Street Congregation. Yet it reduced the authority of the "Ecclesiastical Chiefs" in order to achieve "union" between the Berkeley Synagogue and the Board of Deputies. The CHRONICLE supported the movement of the United Synagogue to gain more control and influence over all elements of the community, and to centralize and unite them under its power, as seen in the strengthening of "Ecclesiastical Authorities" of the United Synagogue as a whole at the expense of the Chief Rabbi, and as seen in its East End Scheme which had the purpose of bringing foreign Jewish poor under its influence.

ANGLIFICATION, then, is the term we have used to represent the vertical authority structure of the Jewish community, its desire for one "Ecclesiastical Authority" which would be amenable to control, and its desire of "union" under the United Synagogue as "the Synagogue" of England. These characteristics of Anglo-Jewry — vertical, centralized authority structure and "union" of religious institutions — are characteristics very similar to the ecclesiastical-religious structure of English life. Therefore, in conclusion, by virtue of the fact that the CHRONICLE identifies itself with the authority structure of the Anglo-Jewish community and zealously supports it, ANGLIFICATION is thus characteristic of the

attitudes of the CIRCLE.

There is another aspect of ANGLIFICATION which will be revealed when we investigate the relationship of "union" to ANGLIFICATION with reference to the problem of the Jewish immigrant poor.

Chapter Three

THE PROBLEM OF THE FOREIGN JEWISH POOR: ANGLIFICATION

The Problem of the Jewish Poor and "Alien Immigrant"

Though the problem of the foreign Jewish poor was not new, it took on extremely serious proportions from the early 1880's to the middle of the 90's due to the great influx of refugees fleeing from the severe Russian persecutions of the Jews in 1881-2 and in 1890. There was no longer as in the past just an incessant trickle of Jews from the Continent. The steady and large flow of pauperized refugees descending on London during this period, swollen immensely in the years of the harshest persecution, increased the number of Jewish poor in the metropolis so much that the Anglo-Jewish community soon after 1881 was faced with a very serious problem of the Jewish poor, almost all of whom were "Alien Immigrants." The CHRONICLE reflects the urgency this difficulty had for the community by the excessive amount of material, not only directly on this problem, but on all problems related to it.

It is easier now to understand why the major portion of the years of the 1880's became the battleground between the United Synagogue and the chevras, and therefore why in 1887 the Federation of Synagogues was established and the East End Scheme proposed not long afterwards. It is also easier now to understand that one of the major factors leading to the settlement in 1885 between the Board of Deputies and the Berkeley Street Synagogue was the threat of the "Alien Immigrant" looming ominously at the Jewish community in England. And, starting in the early 1890's, there appears a

these of interest in the colonization of Palestine. And then interest in a Jewish homeland quickly rises to a full crescendo in the mid 1890's with the appearance of the JUDENSTAAT, (The Jewish State, by Theodor Herzl), and continues even stronger after that time.

Returning directly to the matter of immigration and emigration, the vicarious vengeance heaped upon the Jews in Russia and Poland by the peasants and the villagers once more began to shift Jewish populations so that the East European Jew became the majority of Anglo and American Jewry. But immigration into British aggravated conditions there. Whereas the East European immigration coincided in the United States with the period of great industrial expansion in the last half of the nineteenth century with the result that the factories there could absorb these refugees, England had already reached her peak and her prosperity was already leveling off noticeably by the 1880's. The result therefore was that in England the immigrant was not readily absorbed, and many not at all.

The Relation of "Union" and ANGLIFICATION

We have seen, to some degree, how the Anglo-Jewish community tried to deal with their East End Jews. "Union," through the agency of all the institutional forces which the community could master, was aimed squarely at these foreign Jewish immigrants from the backward parts of Europe. When one asks why there was so much concern for them, on the part of the established community and its leaders — especially concern shown in its overwhelming desire to bring them under the influences of "union" — we do not disavow humanitarian and philanthropic motives. But these in no manner exhaust all

motives. Why was it that the overconcern for the East European, and in the 1870's even the German, immigrant, pauper and workman of the East End takes on the nature of overt, incisive antagonism towards them? It was thought, that this element in the community was unassimilated and un-English, and the established community feared that it would become unassimilable. This antagonism is well reflected in the pages of the CHRONICLE and manifests itself in many ways. Commenting about the conference to be held to do something about the Chief Rabbinate and the Beth Din of the United Synagogue the CHRONICLE remarks¹ that most of the delegates from the Federations of Synagogues are "ultra-Orthodox" (a label attached by the CHRONICLE especially to East European Jews). And therefore they "are likely but scantily to regard, even if they could understand, or appreciate, the spiritual needs of the Modern English Jew." It is clear therefore that the CHRONICLE in a very important way denies the identification of their "brethern" in the East End with the established Anglo-Jewish community. Furthermore, the CHRONICLE demonstrates an inordinant concern with the sanitation and cleanliness of the Jewish immigrant poor.²

But far more important to our source is the "separatism" of these Jews, which it finds most objectionable. That "they bring Poland to England and retain it while they stay here," that "they make a community within a community" is not only undesirable and unfortunate; "it is more than a misfortune, it is a calamity ..."³ "As it is, they join a Hebra, mix only with their fellow-countrymen, and do in England as the Poles do ..."⁴ Again we have the same thought:

"Another aspect of the unwisdom of keeping these unfortunate stragglers here in London

... is a distinct danger that the Jews in the East of London will relapse into that state of separatism which has done so much in the past to embitter the relations of Jews and their neighbours. English Jews have fortunately risen above both the separatism and its consequences. But there is a great danger that the recent accessions to our ranks will not follow our example, and will create, if they have not already created, a little Poland in the East End of London."⁵

This criticism is directed against the East End Jews both because exclusivism and tribalism are despicable traits and undesirable;⁶ and because this supposed character of the East European Jew is a barrier to "union." As in the early 1870's with regard to the poor element of the German Jews,⁷ the CHRONICLE repeats the charge that the East European variety comes to England's shores only to live a life which has specific reference to the nationality of their birth instead of assimilating themselves to English Jewry.

Thus their "separatism" is not only a barrier to "union" but, even more important, also to assimilating themselves into English life and manners. Thus the East End Scheme is necessary, as far as the CHRONICLE is concerned, to:

"provide a general center for the elevating influences of which the East End Jews stand in need ... (to provide) a greater, more sustained effort than has ever been made before to Anglicize the foreign immigrants, to make English citizens of them, to save them from the degeneration which inevitably results from an attempt to transplant ghetto life into a free country ..."⁸

Thus, it would seem that it was not only "separatism" which antagonized the CHRONICLE, but also what it thought was a concomitant objectionable trait, their low state of culture and civilization. This attitude, which at bottom is often a form of antagonism of classes,

is brought out very clearly by the CHRONICLE all through the period of our study. Not only is their poverty embarrassing to the Jewish community, our source declares,⁹ but especially their status of society. While noting that the Russian Jews even in England have a deep attachment to Judaism, but on a level socially and culturally different from the native English Jew, an editorial states that if gentle help and guidance is given, the Russian immigrant will show his usual willingness to "tone down the points which unfavorably single him out from the rest of the population" and that this meets with the purpose of the CHRONICLE and the leaders of the community to "bring his general life into closer harmony with Western Civilization."¹⁰ Over and over again the CHRONICLE states that there is a need of the community to rid these Eastern European immigrants of their crude and uncivilized religious ideas,¹¹ and of the "tyranny of their ignorance," their superstition, their prayer without thought and their ceremonial drill,¹² and of their ungodliness and irreligious spirit.¹³ The CHRONICLE's attitude to these traits is indicated by the fact that it fears the grave danger that the non-Jew might judge the entire Jewish community by them.¹⁴ Again and again our source maintains that "one of the most pressing problems with regard to the future of the community is how we are best to facilitate the transformation of Polish into English Jews."¹⁵ For these East European Jews, reiterates the CHRONICLE, there is an urgent necessity to moralize them, to civilize them, to acclimatise them, to improve their social position, to elevate their spiritual condition, and this is exactly what the CHRONICLE¹⁶ and the leaders of the Jewish community¹⁷ have in mind when they talk about the need

"to anglicize the Jewish poor."

In an editorial, late in 1885,¹⁸ it is clear that to the CHRONICLE, AMELIORATION means an increase in the value of a human being, and an elevation to a higher degree of civilization. Though our source harangues against those who would want to "Anglicize" Judaism¹⁹ it cheers those, especially the leaders of the United Synagogue who carry out a fervent desire to anglicize foreign Jews. And here it may be seen that the East End Scheme proposed by the leaders of the United Synagogue, with whom the CHRONICLE so happily concurs throughout, has the purpose of anglicizing the foreign immigrants, that is, to make English citizens of them.²⁰ This attitude toward the Jews of the East End and toward their groups, the chevras, is no more clearly stated than in an editorial in early 1885. It epitomizes the upper class condescension, prevalent in Victorian literature, toward the "poor savage" when it speaks of these poor, suffering devils of the East End. They must be moralized and civilized and the way to do this is to have a first-class minister to accomplish the purposes of AMELIORATION of the Jewish poor:

"... he must possess ... sympathy and tact and know which is needful for every minister, but especially for the minister who would labour among the Jewish poor ... He will correct all that is unwholesome in the Chebra system; for he will constitute religion a civilising and moral force, instead of a power that makes for ignorance and superstition, and that mutes the moral sense. He will teach his flock that to patter strings of prayer without thought, and to go through a sort of ceremonial drill, is not the true duty of man; and by such doctrine he will pull down the Cheder, not at once, but slowly, brick by brick ... failing such a labourer in the sacred vineyard, the work of morally acclimatizing the Russian immigrant, and bringing the Chebras into closer relationship with the United Synagogue will proceed but slowly."²¹

This editorial emphasizes also that the moral lowness and the mean estate of the Jewish poor immigrant of the East End who are attached neither to the United Synagogue nor to any chevra is because they are being deprived of religious teaching; for outside the "Synagogue" morality is low since it is the essential nature of the synagogue "the task of quickening dormant religious feeling."²² Nowhere is there the idea that they are in dire need of aid because they are human beings, fellow Jews, who have been cut down by misfortune and misuse. There is only the idea that they must be made into nice little Englishmen.

Thus again we return, by way of the United Synagogue and its East End Scheme, whose minister will do the job of turning out civilized Englishmen, to the relationship between UNION, which is to be carried out through the United Synagogue, and ANGLIFICATION. It has been shown that for the CHRONICLE and the leaders of the community "The great experiment of Anglo-Jewry is Union ..."²³ The CHRONICLE seems to be worried that anything might begin the fragmentation of the community into parties which will destroy its "unity." It is overly concerned with a possible schism in the community-wide controversy with regard to the organ and ritual in the synagogue question.²⁴ The CHRONICLE was overly concerned with a widening of the split between the Berkeley Street Congregation and the orthodox community (discussed above in chapter two), fearful of the consequences that the movement towards "union" would be destroyed.

But it is predominantly with regard to the foreign poor and their chevras in relation to the United Synagogue, its religious authorities, and its East End Scheme that the purpose of "union" can be understood to be, according to the CHRONICLE and the

communal leaders, the ANGLIFICATION of these foreign poor. The CHRONICLE welcomes a movement, some time before the plans of the Federation of Synagogues were carried out, of the chevras to combine into a union amongst themselves; for this will bring them, the CHRONICLE asserts, into closer contact with the community as a whole with the ultimate result that the condition of these "minor congregations" will be improved.²⁵

That ANGLIFICATION constituted the ultimate goal of "union" can be seen, for example, also in two editorials. One in 1886 hails the growing centralization of power and control of the United Synagogue over all communal elements and synagogues and then, because of the threat which especially the East European immigrant places before the community, concludes with the necessity of consolidating all parts of the community more — by which it means, to anglicize the foreign Jewish element — and to attain this by first attaching the chevras to the United Synagogue.²⁶ Thus, the creation of communal "union" has the purpose of anglicizing the immigrant in the Jewish community. And the other editorial, in 1896, points out that the most important factor in the East End Scheme, with a permanent minister, lecture and meeting halls, all "specially designed to meet the requirements of the Jewish working classes in the East End," is its being a "center for missionary work" among the East European immigrant. And the reason for this, states the editorial, is that each Jew in the East End " sorely needs Anglicizing."²⁷ Here, it is revealed that the centralizing forces of "union" under the United Synagogue, as it extends itself into the East End of London by means of this "missionary center," have just this as their

aim. And in all this the CHRONICLE again proves itself to be the foremost spokesman for the leaders of the United Synagogue, and to this extent for the ruling groups of the Anglo-Jewish community who hold high the banner of "union" in order to assure themselves of anglicizing their un-anglicized and therefore uncivilized foreign-born brethren in the East End of London. Not only is this relationship between "union" and ANGLIFICATION revealed when the CHRONICLE asks for a minister who will be able to both morally acclimatize, that is anglicize, the immigrant and to bring the chevras into closer relationship with the United Synagogue.²⁸ But this relationship is brought sharply into relief in a very revealing editorial. In this place the CHRONICLE asks the question, "How are we to aid these brethren of ours in their progress towards the higher stage of culture offered by English life?" and how to prevent them from disintegrating the community by destroying its "unity" which is its source of strength? The answer is that "by attracting them to our synagogues, (by) breaking down their isolation ... (and by their) educating their children in an English fashion, we can do much to change our foreign poor into brethren who shall not only be Jews but English Jews."²⁹

With more scrutiny of the attitudes expressed in the CHRONICLE it is not difficult to realize that ANGLIFICATION of the foreign Jewish poor is not the end of the matter. There is even a reason for this, a reason which is basic to the reaction of human beings who are afraid of losing something they prize very highly. We find this attitude, which now occupies our attention, so frequently expressed during the 1880's that with a little reflection it

is not difficult to understand that the great inundation of "uncouth" and un-anglicized East European immigrants during this decade is the explanation for the frequency of this attitude and the intensity of feeling on the part of the CHRONICLE. It states in an editorial³⁰ that the purpose of the efforts on the part of the communal leaders is "to transform these struggling, forsaken brethren of ours into Israelites whose Judaism shall be at once a source of joy to themselves and of strength and credit to the community — this is the work to be done, and there can be none more noble." Under the banner of noble deed and in behalf of the community — remembering that by "the community" the CHRONICLE makes reference to the leaders — our source in other places throughout the whole of this period of our study becomes no more articulate in expressing what it means by "strength and credit to the community" when it says,

"Our fair fame is bound up with theirs; the outside world is not capable of making minute discrimination between Jew and Jew, and forms its opinion of Jews in general as much, if not more, from them than from the Anglicized portion of the community. We are then responsible for them ..."³¹

And the same is meant when the CHRONICLE supports the Board of Guardians, the charity agency of the Jewish community, in its purpose of anglicizing the "humblest person of the East End" which strengthens the "communal good name" and in its purpose of

"saving the community from 'the defeat of Fame' which would inevitably result were no attempt made to bring immigrants from Russia and Roumania within the influence of civilisation. It is not only the welfare of the poor, BUT THE REPUTATION OF THE COMMUNITY WHICH IS INVOLVED IN ITS EFFORTS."³² (Capitalization mine)

Again and again in almost the same words each time the CHRONICLE

lifts this cry that the "popular estimate of the Jewish character is in great measure moulded by the conduct of the humblest hawker of Whitechapel (in the East End)."³³

Thus it is seen that the CHRONICLE, together with those whom it supports in the community, appear apprehensive that the Jewish immigrants will cause a loss of reputation of the established Jewish ruling groups. They and the CHRONICLE are anxious concerning their position in the community. Again it is found that in their anxiety they tend too much to push consideration for the needs of their poor fellow-Jews into the background. The CHRONICLE does this when, for example, it "admits that the Chebras present a field of action which may be cultivated EVEN WITH PECUNIARY PROFIT (capitalization mine) by our men of light and leading."³⁴ And so does Benjamin L. Cohen, the President of the Board of Guardians in 1885, according to a report in the CHRONICLE,³⁵ when he appeals for more funds for operation of the Board on the basis that if money is withheld now, in the end more and more of the Jewish poor of the East End will become permanent charges on public charity because they were not taken care of properly at first, and thus the community is the one who suffers. Though the CHRONICLE states clearly that this is not the highest motive in caring for the Jewish poor, it thus is concerned, as is the president of the Board of Guardians, with the "market value" of the "Alien Immigrant." Again human considerations are pushed aside, as they are in a representative editorial on the subject of the "Alien Immigrant" who constituted the greater majority of the foreign poor of the East End. The CHRONICLE supports the Board of Guardians for sending back to their "native places" from which per-

secution forced them to flee, those immigrants who remained unemployed after a period of six months, concluding with the remark that the case is different for those who have already found jobs in England, who show signs of becoming industrious members of the community, and who raise their children as Englishmen — these and these alone will be aided by the community to become self-supporting, for these alone will decent houses be built.³⁶

Relation of Charity and Industrialization to ANGLIFICATION

That these are the standards by which charity is to be given leads us directly into the matter of charity and industrialization. These are other frequent topics in the CHRONICLE. The purpose of the remainder of this chapter will be to expose the desire on the part of the leaders of the community, and on the part of the CHRONICLE who represents them, to help the Jewish poor through charity and through industrialization.

It has been demonstrated in the first part of this chapter that behind the usually noble cry for "union," and behind the usually generous attempt at helping immigrants become adjusted to their newly adopted land, there was in the CHRONICLE as in the leaders of the community an ulterior motive, born of apprehension over the status of their newly won political emancipation and under the threat of again being depicted in the popular mind as a loathsome creature — an ulterior motive of concern for their own interests, their position and their reputation. This motive though certainly not in all possibility the only one, was one having the intent to manipulate the "alien" Jewish immigrant in such a way that he would quickly blend

with the anglicized protective coloration which the leaders of the Anglo-Jewish community had painted with painfully difficult and costly strokes. Similarly charity and industrialization had the same motive. And though the predicament of the Anglo-Jewry of this period can be well understood (though however not condoning its attitude) some idea of tragedy is conveyed in the pages of the CHRONICLE. At the same time that it expresses a desire to help the immigrant poor -- but according to the needs, the position and the reputation of the ruling elements of the Anglo-Jewish community -- especially during the 1880's and 1890's, the pages of the CHRONICLE are literally glutted with the most excruciatingly painful and nerve-racking descriptions, reports and eye-witness accounts of the attacks upon Jewish men, the violation of Jewish women and the ripping up of Jewish infants in Russia and in Poland and even in North Africa. And it was those who managed to escape, and come to "havens" such as England, who were forced to "acclimatize" themselves much like one tries to fit a large square peg into a small round hole.

It is found that "charity and industrialization" in the CHRONICLE of our period have, besides the goal of ANGLIFICATION, the urgency of an immediate but long-term economic need of the established community. This need is seen in the fact that both "charity and industrialization" had the same purpose of making the "Alien Immigrant" self-supporting, of finally rendering them independent of charity.³⁷ There is the obvious desire to aid them in their distress, so says the CHRONICLE,³⁸ but the ultimate aim here is to lessen the burden of the established, almost fully anglicized

Jewish community, and especially the burden that the wealthier men had to carry. The burden admittedly was quite heavy, even for men with thousands of pounds of Sterling. And therefore our source emphasizes³⁹ frequently the kind of charity which helps the recipient learn to support himself and his family; thus would many of those who ask for charity without anything done in return on their part be able to relieve this serious problem of the great number of Jewish poor. Here the CHRONICLE plays up the responsibility of the recipients of charity in such a way that it would make it appear that it is mainly up to the Jewish poor class itself to relieve their own distress.

Therefore, "poor relief" must be "the means of exercising the industrial capacity of the recipient"⁴⁰ and "to stimulate the industrial powers of the poor."⁴¹ This is the work of the Board of Guardians with its Work-rooms and its Apprentice-system.⁴² Thus it follows that those who are unable to support themselves, who find themselves unemployed after a while, those who are idle because they are not as yet self-supporting, these are not to be aided and helped through charity.⁴³ These are to be sent back to their native places or to be prevented from coming to the "haven" that is traditionally England.⁴⁴ In the same place the CHRONICLE⁴⁵ offers another prerequisite, that the community will aid those poor who "show signs of becoming industrious members of the community and who raise their children as Englishmen ..." Thus the ruling elements of the Anglo-Jewish community are to wield its double-edged sword to cut down those who are unworthy and to keep away the unfit from its shores. For poverty is truly ignominious.⁴⁶ And so for a great purpose is

this sword brandished. The CHRONICLE praises the "charity" of the Board of Guardians as the real kind of "charity" which discriminates between deserving and undeserving poor and which is "the substitution of industrial help for doles in money or in kind -- all this might easily conflict with even Jewish notions of charity."⁴⁷

On the contrary, this could be said to agree with Maimonides' highest form of giving charity, i.e. to finally make charity unnecessary. But the purpose does not occupy such an esteemed position high on the scale of values. And this is just the point, that human considerations are almost always ignored and the effect of the policy of giving charity is to withhold aid from the neediest. The CHRONICLE asks for "charity," for implementing the "industrialization" of the Jewish poor, for support for the Board of Guardians, for helping the poor, for taking them out of sweat-shops, for improving their social and physical condition, all predominantly for the sake of lightening the burden of the community and of future generations.⁴⁸ This, in fact, was stated by its president in 1895 to be the major reason for giving more financial support to the Board of Guardians.⁴⁹ There is no appeal in all the pages of the CHRONICLE because of the exigencies of human suffering but only because in the end there will be less need for money -- and for worry. Charity is the best insurance policy for both. In fact, it is after the human deluge, resulting from the terrible persecutions in Russia in the early 1880's, had settled in England that the CHRONICLE in an editorial⁵⁰ writes of its "satisfaction in seeing definite results from a definite outlay of time and money," and then continues to develop this theme with little reference to the human needs of the Jewish poor.

The Board of Guardians, as the double-edged sword of the Anglo-Jewish community, was effective in saving the community a great deal of money. This weapon also was to mitigate anxiety; for both "charity and industrialization," by means of aiding the process of ANGLIFICATION, were to help protect the established community and its leaders from any supposed dire punishments, resulting from an unassimilated, stiff-necked people in its midst. "Charity and industrialization" served not only a very important need economically, but also protected the reputation and position of the anglicized Jewish community.

What seriously impeded the process of acclimatizing the foreign poor is the condition of their housing. Improving this, providing them with clean and sanitary dwellings, according to the CHRONICLE, was one of the most important methods of teaching the "Alien Immigrants" a standard of civilization higher than they have been accustomed to in their native country.⁵¹ This process of acclimatizing, or anglicizing, the Jewish foreign poor -- which is the "problem of Anglo-Jewish Philanthropy" -- was impeded also by the large numbers of immigrants.⁵²

It is with regard to the policy expressed in the CHRONICLE on the subject of restriction of immigration that we test our hypothesis that "charity" and ANGLIFICATION were to serve the interests of the established Jewish community rather than the needs of "Alien Immigrants." For if what has been posited was true, then the CHRONICLE should have demanded restriction of all "alien" Jewish immigration. But such was not the case, and this was due to other complicating factors, of equal importance to the CHRONICLE, that had

the effect of modifying their position.

Now we have seen the reasons why the CHRONICLE, together with the leaders of the community, wanted to restrict and to limit "alien" immigration. According to the development of our thesis, logically we would expect to find such an attitude. And it is just this that we do find. For the established Jewish community the immigration problem and the problem of the poor was severe because there was the influx of a great number of East European, lower class (paupers and workmen) immigrants, who, because of their large numbers and their character and disposition, posed several types of threats to the community. First, they posed an economic threat, not so much that they would upset the economic stability because even the CHRONICLE⁵³ maintains that the relatively few who do enter England create no competition with the English workmen, and in the mid 1880's when one would suppose that the swarms of immigrants would pose such a danger, there is virtually nothing in the CHRONICLE concerning this. But the economic danger was thought to be one facing the charity purse-strings of the philanthropic Anglo-Jewish community who possessed the means and the vested interests. Another threat which these East European immigrants posed was social in nature: That their extreme poverty, their not having learned a trade as yet, and their crushed spirit resulted in many of them resorting to crime and sundry unpalatable trades — and these embarrassed the community very much. As has been clearly outlined, there was also the threat, so the established community thought, to their reputation, position and vested interests because of the very nature of the East European Jews of being wont to isolate themselves into little East European

ghettos in the midst of London. Such separatism, the CHRONICLE says with remorse, "has done much in the past to embitter the relations of the Jews and their neighbors."⁵⁴

And thus it was, in the face of the hordes of Jews from East Europe, following upon the horrible persecutions in Russia of 1681-2, that the CHRONICLE in 1885⁵⁵ maintained that to solve "the problem of Anglo-Jewish Philanthropy ... (which is) ... how to Anglicize the Foreign Poor," the community must first "discourage the ingress of undesirable immigrants" and then attend to the housing project. Later in the same year the president of the Board of Guardians in a letter to the editor⁵⁶ makes it clear that the Board, the charity-dispensing arm of the community, is committed to the position to "foster emigration, and ... to diminish immigration." An editorial in 1885⁵⁷ fully sets forth the stand the CHRONICLE takes in this issue. In this editorial it heaps rationalization upon rationalization in support of the Board of Guardians' decision to prevent non-self-supporting Jews from coming to England in order to diminish the problem of the Jewish poor. The reasons given are that unrestricted "Alien Immigration" will only increase the misery of both the newcomer and the Jews already in England; and that the newcomer will be unable to become self-supporting. Thus they are better where they are now, where they know the language, where competition is not so severe and where they have shown they can earn a living. Therefore it is right even to send them back to their native places, as the Board has decided and has done in some cases. But, the CHRONICLE continues, the case is different for those who already have found jobs here, who show signs of becoming industrious,

and who raise their children as Englishmen. Aiding them is an advantage. And, we may add, that the Board carried out this policy by preventing the establishment of the Refuge, the Jewish Workhouse, which would care for those poor who are not self-supporting.⁵⁸ Even Samuel Montagu, who supported the existence of the Refuge, argued that it will actually discourage immigration and that those unemployed after a while will be sent back to the Continent from the Refuge.⁵⁹ And in other places, during the same period, the CHRONICLE reiterates this attitude that only those who are already employed will be aided by charity,⁶⁰ that the Board has the right kind of charity when it discriminates between the deserving and the undeserving poor, because it and its policies are the only salvation from the overwhelming of the community by uncontrollable "pauperism and its terrible consequences."⁶¹

It is against such obvious lack of consideration of the needs of those who needed the help of their "brethern" the most that a letter to the editor (signed "Public Opinion")⁶² raises its cry of condemnation. It criticizes the Board and especially its chairman for withholding charity from those with the most desperate needs and then laments, "I am grieved to the heart to think that a properly constituted body as the Board of Guardians should, without the slightest sense of shame, openly declare that their brethern in misfortune could find ample relief in a Christian workhouse." But this is a lone cry, except for a scattering of letters to the editor by persons with East European names.

And even as late as 1895, when the flood of immigrants from East Europe has been reduced to a trickle, when the first waves of the

1880's have already settled in England and have begin to blend in with the English country-side, the CHRONICLE makes itself very clear when it pleads, "In the interests of the poor people themself that stream of immigration must be reduced to a minimum."⁶³ Then it argues eloquently and says that it is the very "refinement of cruelty" to coax on these poor Jews to England or to the United States and then find that in these places "the industries affected by these poor immigrants are overcrowded beyond measure and the very existence of those now engaged in them is jeopardized by further immigration." At the same time it paints a picture of the suffering Russian immigrant who, having left his family behind in the hope of finding a better life in England or the United States, only to find everything overcrowded, then must begin his way back to Russia — oh! how cruel! the CHRONICLE sighs. And because of this it concludes, the Board of Guardians warns the "Alien Immigration" that restriction "is a right policy, which should be pursued vigorously and with increased energy." In the same issue,⁶⁴ an editorial note states the official position: " ... the supreme duty of the community ... both for their (the immigrants!) sake as well as for the well-being of the country ... is to dissuade and prevent and discourage further immigration of the nature that swells the ranks of our poor and which menaces us with difficulties with which one day we may find ourselves altogether unable to cope." Certainly for the Jewish laboring and pauper classes, the Jewish community was crowded — as were the factories and minor trades. But what could the Jew look forward to in Russia except restrictions and crowded graveyards?

This attitude, we repeat, can virtually be deduced from the

CHRONICLE's general attitude to the Jewish poor and pauperism in England and in its own country. But there is a somewhat unexpected turn of events in 1895 and 1896 when conditions have changed. By now the attitude to the East European immigrants has changed perceptibly. In the 1880's, as has been described, the "objectionable traits" and the threats to the stability and reputation of the established community which the "Alien Immigrant" brought with him were the object of much concern in the CHRONICLE. All the CHRONICLE could talk about was the restriction of immigration, sending the "alien" back to their native homeland. In early 1895, when immigration had subsided, an editorial⁶⁵ cried out for its poor immigrant "brethern" and criticizes "a large section of the Anglo-Jewish public" for its "illiberal" view of the "Alien Immigrant." The editorial continues and says that on this our Passover "by the sacred memory of the freedom which the Hebrew race on the first Passover in Egypt" won, we appeal to our fellow English Jews:

"to show themselves less selfish ... There is far too much readiness on the part of the Jews to accept malicious and derogatory statements regarding the morality and spiritual condition of the immigrants. There is far too little desire to look below the surface ... he (the West End Jew, i.e. the most wealthy) has to learn to be less bigoted, less selfish, in his mental attitude toward his persecuted brother ... he must learn to make room for him at the table of Judaism ... He may have to teach him to know his place, but a place must be found for him before he can know it ... But it is not merely the selfishness of acting that we condemn; there is also a moral selfishness which is even less worthy of English Jews. The Russian Jew has been persecuted in his own country; he is maligned here. He is contrasted with the Huguenot, much to his disadvantage, for the Huguenot suddenly becomes endowed with impossible virtues, just as the Russian Jew is charged with undeserved vices ..."

It is only here in this passage that the CHRONICLE first conceives of the idea of making a place for the immigrant rather than sending him back without any such serious attempt.

In spite of this change of view, there is no need to revise our hypothesis about the attitude of the CHRONICLE to the foreign Jewish poor when we realize just to what extent by 1895 have conditions changed since the 1880's. We can account for this shift in attitude by the following factors. As mentioned above, immigration had greatly reduced by the mid 1890's. What is more is that the Federation of Synagogues had been established for eight years so that by this time the East European immigrants, because the Federation had a quickening effect in drawing the foreign poor more and more into the anglicized Jewish community, was assimilated to a more or less comfortable degree. And thus the problem of the Jewish poor was not as severe as it was ten years before. Whereas in the 1880's there was a compulsion to exclude and evict the immigrant because of fear on the part of the established community, now, because the fear has been given reason to subside, there is this change of sentiment.

However, this change was due in large measure to another very significant factor. When a movement started in the English community, supported by the Conservative Party in 1895 as a means of gaining control of the government, to legally restrict "Alien Immigration" by an act of Parliament, the CHRONICLE becomes very agitated. This is so because of another factor which the CHRONICLE dreaded even more than the others. In an editorial early in 1895 the CHRONICLE clearly defines its attitude:

"Whenever we have had occasion to refer to

the question of Alien Immigration we have opposed the adoption by the State of any measure, for excluding the immigrants. But measures taken to counsel the unfitted against coming are a totally different matter. Prevention is one thing, repression is another ... The one method is prompted by true human kindness, whilst the exclusion of Alien Immigration by the power of the State is influenced by unworthy feelings of RACE HATRED ..."⁶⁷
(capitalization mine)

This self-imposed restriction is all right but government restriction of the "Alien Immigrant" is due to anti-Semitism. This is quite evident also in another editorial later in the year when the CHRONICLE compares the special legislation to the yellow-badge of the middle ages and then continues:

"Practically the whole agitation against the Russian and Polish (Jewish) Immigrant is the result of an antipathy towards Jews, albeit racial rather than religious. But our community, who are by no means unworthy of consideration amongst the subjects of the Queen, do not deserve the antipathy nourished and fostered by Her Majesty's Government."⁶⁸

And this feeling continued even until the next Rosh Hashannah when, in its review of the year 5656,⁶⁹ the CHRONICLE states, "a favorable form of displaying anti-Jewish hostility in England is by the advocacy of restricting alien immigration ..."

In this situation it must be remembered that the Anglo-Jewish community had just won complete political emancipation just at the turn of the decade of the 1870's and most of the leaders of the community, as well as the editors of the CHRONICLE, remember the bitter and embarrassing struggle. Thus to our source government restriction would seem to be a reversion to the older discriminatory practices of Her Majesty's government. Government restriction, above all, was a conscious policy, thought the CHRONICLE, of those governments which

persecute the Jews. And thus because the CHRONICLE opposed this policy, now adopted by the Conservative Party, with all its might, we find many editorials and editorial notes now supporting, defending, and exonerating the "Alien Immigration" from any damaging traits or behavior. The CHRONICLE moreover defends the immigrant from the charge that he is responsible for the industrial evils that exist in England, and asks for his protection from "unfair competition" and from "the prey of those who carry on trade under vile and reprehensible conditions."⁷⁰ And in many issues towards the end of 1895 the CHRONICLE runs special columns of "Notes on the Alien Immigrant," devoted to answering the many charges against him by means of its own expressed opinions and by allowing letters sent to its own publication and to the English dailies speak on its behalf and on behalf of the Jewish community. In one issue⁷¹ there is much material and marshalling of facts and arguments to show that the Jewish immigrants are not and have not been displacing the English working class, that women are competing with English labor more than the Jewish immigrants, and that (in opposition especially to the EVENING STANDARD) the immigrant does not give the magistrates extra trouble. They do not spread dangerous opinions because these aliens, in spite of the persecution they suffered, favor the most conservative type of government, since Judaism is opposed to violent and sudden changes.

There are other reasons, important to the CHRONICLE, for not wanting immigration restricted by the government. One such reason is that government restriction is a form of "Protectionism" while it champions Free Trade. It maintains that anti-Alien legislation is a form of protectionism and states, "It is important to remember

that they (who support it) are 'Protectionists' in trade as well as in travel, and that the final end of their policy can only be to make life harder for the worker, to increase the cost of living without raising the rate of wages."⁷²

Another argument which the CHRONICLE uses is that England has always benefitted by immigration of foreign labor. On this point our source quotes respected authorities, especially Asquith, the Home Secretary, whom the CHRONICLE lets speak against the proposal to evict by government law the unemployed poor. He states,⁷³

"There are not a few of the industries which are most prosperous in this country, which have brought us the greatest profit, which have helped us to maintain our command of the markets of the world — there are not a few of these industries which we owe to the Alien immigrants. Nor is there any population in the world which derives so much material benefit from free access to fields of labor in other countries beyond the seas."

In the same article, Sir Julian Goldsmid is used to confirm these statements and quoted as saying that "England owes some of its industries to alien immigrants, (notably) the trade in cheap but good clothing introduced in London by the Russian refugees." And in another place⁷⁴ the CHRONICLE uses Asquith when he says that "England of all nations has gained most from the free circulation and competition of labour" and thus would suffer most from exclusion of foreign labor. Late in 1897 the CHRONICLE states its attitude precisely:

"The real question involved in the discussions on alien immigration is whether, in order to free English workingmen from the additional competition of a few hundred adult male Jews who arrive each year from Russia to settle in England, we should abandon our traditional policy and give every country and colony a precedent for excluding Englishmen."⁷⁵

This appeal to the traditional policy of England as an argument against legal restriction of immigration was in its own time born out of economic reasons, if we remember the expansion of England's industry during the preceding period, the middle of the century, and its needs for a large working class of cheap labor. But now when abandonment of the traditional policy would not deprive industry of workers, our source is forced to look to other consequences of giving up the old policy, such as repercussions from other governments against emigrants from England. Whatever be the real consequences, what is important here is that the needs of the immigrants are not even mentioned as involved in the central problem.

Thus, again, we must point out that the foreign Jewish poor are defended in part because of the profit motive, that is, because of their "market value." This is evident from an editorial,⁷⁶ cited above, where there is an eloquent appeal on behalf of the "alien" immigrant and a condemnation of the "selfish" elements of the community. Then, in conclusion, the CHRONICLE states, "Who can say what economic advantages England may not deprive in the future desperate competition in the industrial world from the accession of a number of hard-working, law-abiding artisans?" In fact seldom in our source is there any clear statement that help must be given to the immigrant and to the poor simply because he is in need of it.

And thus to summarize the whole matter of the restriction of "alien" immigration it is safe to assert that according to the expressed attitudes of the CHRONICLE and according to the actions and opinions of the community, "charity" for the foreign Jewish poor had motives related to the needs of the ruling groups of Anglo-Jewry but

not to those of the immigrants themselves; that the CHRONICLE's defense of the character and traits of the East European immigrant and its opposition to government restriction of foreign immigration was due also to needs of the upper echelons of the Jewish community rather than the needs of refugees from persecution. And when it is considered that the standard of judgment of the CHRONICLE is not the needs of the Jewish immigrant but rather their market value and their employability, then it becomes clear that the CHRONICLE assumes the attitudes and thinking in this matter characteristic of the middle and upper classes.

This represents the adoption on the part of the CHRONICLE of what was known as the "Victorian Compromise," and to the extent that this was the economic-political philosophy of the middle and upper classes at this time in England it can be said that the attitude and position of the CHRONICLE is itself in this respect well anglicized — thus is ANGLIFICATION manifested here. This compromise was the result of the economic and political developments of nineteenth century England that witnessed the further entrenchment of the controlling power of the middle classes in relation to the aristocracy, and also the beginning of the rise to enfranchisement and thus political expression of the lower classes. This compromise (as described in the first chapter) was the policy of the ruling groups in England. It was the alliance of the middle classes and the aristocracy in order to retain and strengthen their power and control, in opposition to the lower classes, by adopting towards them a limited paternal attitude and policy which was expressed in the positions taken with reference to Free Trade vs. Protectionism, labor and

socialism, alien immigration, and "industrialization of the working-class, alien-immigration, and charity."

It has been especially concerning the latter — that the CHRONICLE has been seen to have adopted the Compromise as its way of thinking and as its program for the community. Such a philosophy excluded "too much" protection but favored a limited paternalistic attitude. The disavowal of such protection is seen when the CHRONICLE, in discussing how to help to improve the "industrial condition of the poor," states⁷⁷ that the way is not by any planned scheme: "Any pampering scheme of 'protection' is to be deprecated as economically unsound and utterly useless," such as would be the case if there would be government restriction of "alien" immigration. In an editorial note in 1895 the CHRONICLE maintains that:

"These Acts (Factory Acts) are passed for the protection of the worker against himself as well as against his employer ... It is because ... the worker is not able of his own motion to carry on his vocation in the manner best calculated to forward his own interests and those of the community, that government steps in with such laws (i.e. with the Factory Act just presented to the House by Asquith)."⁷⁸

Here the need for limited, paternalistic protection for the working class is articulated: they have to be helped and guided but not pampered. Even though the CHRONICLE does not clearly separate these two supposedly different attitudes to the working-class so as not to involve itself in a contradiction, it is unambiguous when it claims several times that it is Judaism which has always championed the cause of labor, has always in its own laws protected the workingman as against the capitalists, has championed his rights and his welfare and the amelioration of his lot, and that the "Bible is at once the

labourer's charter and textbook."⁷⁹ In fact, the CHRONICLE asserts that the Berlin Labor Conference is definitely a Jewish idea and that "the social-political legislation which is now being promoted in Europe for the benefit of the workmen is due to Semitic inspiration."⁸⁰

Relation of Religion, Orthodoxy and Education to ANGLIFICATION

In addition to "union," and "charity and industrialization" as means to ANGLIFICATION of the foreign Jewish poor, the CHRONICLE indicates other means that are also to serve this ideal goal in the prolonged emergency created by the problem of the immigrant poor. These other means to ANGLIFICATION are to be found in the CHRONICLE's concept of religion and orthodoxy, and of education-for-the-working-man. With regard to the first, there is fairly clear evidence of the relation of religion to the ultimate purpose of the established community to anglicize the "alien" immigrant. In connection with the agitation in 1885 over the continued existence of the Refuge, the Home for the Poor in Church Lane, which had been set up to take care of the immigrants just off the boat from East Europe, the CHRONICLE writes⁸¹ that the Home has kept these poor Jews from the synagogue (i.e. those of the Anglo-Jewish community) and thus they remain unreligious and ungodly. In an editorial⁸² the CHRONICLE tries to explain the "moral lowness" of the immigrant by referring to many of them being unattached either to "the Synagogue" or the chevra, and thus their moral nature is stunted by being deprived of religious teaching. The lack of religion, then, is the cause of what is considered as

the antithesis of ANGLIFICATION, "moral lowness" and ungodliness. But, analyses the CHRONICLE,⁸³ the historic consciousness and continuity of Judaism means that the Jew will always be faithful to "moral perfection" -- and, as it has been shown in this thesis, the embodiment of "moral perfection" in English-Jewish life is included in what we have termed ANGLIFICATION. Since our source believes that the purpose of religion is "to idealise morality,"⁸⁴ religion is the way of attaining the goal of the "moral perfection" inherent in the ANGLIFICATION of Anglo-Jewish life. "Moral perfection," then, is the safeguard of English-Jewish life -- and also is ANGLIFICATION just because it embodies "moral perfection." Thus religion -- and not forgetting the context, Judaism in England -- is the means of achieving it.

In another editorial,⁸⁵ the relationship we are examining clearly prevails: in proposing that in the East End there be a minister with special qualifications to deal with the Jewish poor, who will destroy the chevras with his superior Anglo-Jewish religion, the CHRONICLE maintains that "he will constitute religion as a civilising and moral force," that is, the kind of religion made in England. Such work as he must do is necessary in the task of "morally acclimatising the Russian immigrant." Thus, again, the workings of religion, of Judaism in England, is indispensable in the processes of ANGLIFICATION. In fact, the East End Scheme of the United Synagogue is the embodiment of this idea that religion can be used to anglicize the foreign Jewish poor. In an editorial⁸⁶ the CHRONICLE clearly states that the religious-educational program of the proposed synagogue of the Scheme will be the core of a mission-

ary program which will anglicise the Jews of the East and who sorely need it.

Now, although there are several consciously stated and articulated expressions revealing this relationship between religion and ANGLIFICATION, nevertheless there is abundant evidence here, as in the case of other issues, which is implicit and subtle rather than explicit and articulate. But it is unnecessary to base conclusions solely on conscious statements of purpose and attitudes of the CHRONICLE. To exclude the significance of what it is partially or wholly unconscious of would be to lose understanding of what the attitudes and programs of the CHRONICLE actually mean with reference to the Anglo-Jewish community. To do this would be to presuppose that our source is fully conscious of what it really wants and fully aware of the implication and effects of its attitudes and policies. But this cannot be admitted with regard to any source of human expression. Therefore, although some of the references offered above are clear as to the relationship of religion and ANGLIFICATION, still there is some evidence which supports our hypothesis only by virtue of its being potentially corroborating evidence which does not violate or contradict any relevant hypotheses or any other evidence. Moreover, such implicit evidence does corroborate our hypothesis because it is ambiguous if out of the context of the hypothesis we have posited but no longer ambiguous when placed there. And in the context of our hypothesis this evidence is just what we would expect to find.

With regard to the matter of orthodoxy, there must be much more caution in drawing conclusions to support the hypothesis that it is one of the means to ANGLIFICATION. Only in the sense that it

constitutes a means of communal control and authority, and thus supports and aids the communal status quo and stability, can it be said to be one of the means. There is a wealth of material with the idea that orthodoxy and traditional Judaism (the kind of religious life characteristic of the greater majority of the Anglo-Jewish community) based on the Mosaic Code is necessary for the very nature of man⁸⁷ and is in complete harmony with his well-being.⁸⁸ Happiness is a concomitant of the orthodox way of life, not of the Reform or liberal spirit of the age, and is the solution to all of life's problems.⁸⁹ Orthodoxy is the only sure way to become truly moral.⁹⁰ Traditional Judaism has been, and certainly is, the basis for the respect and honor paid to Jews.⁹¹ Therefore, one must conclude, orthodoxy, ala Anglo-Jewish style, is a necessity, as is ecclesiastical discipline and "church government" in order to "direct" the entire Jewish community of the British Empire.⁹² A special columnist (a rarity in the CHRONICLE of this period) in consonance with our source's editorial policy explains that the resistance to change and fashions in religion avoids endangering the "whole fabric of Jewish institutionalism."⁹³

At this point, one would have to admit that orthodoxy is the only kind of religion suitable for all men. But there is other material, clearly implying a further conclusion; and this conclusion is based on the following cumulative reasoning which is staggering in its effect when we have placed all the arguments together. Not only has traditional Judaism affected English jurisprudence with a principle basic to civilization: "that whom the law protects is the obedient,"⁹⁴ but also it has been "the spirit of Torah, in the

form of the Old Testament in England," which has been responsible for all that is good in the English nation.⁹⁵ It has been the "chief factor in the progress and expansion of the Empire"; it has been responsible for saving England from the atheism of the French Revolution; and the spirit of Torah has been responsible for the spirit of the Liberal Party and for the triumph of Free Trade. In fact,

"In no country have the teachings of the Torah been taken more zealously to heart, and nowhere have they produced more splendid results. The development of English constitutional liberty ... may be measured by the statistics of the circulation of the Old Testament in the country."⁹⁶

Thus, the effect of all these arguments upon the Jewish reader of the late nineteenth century is not unappreciable. One would feel compelled, not only to be zealous in supporting orthodox Judaism in England, but also, and even more, reaching, one would feel it his duty to support the existing institutions of all English life. It is in this manner that what the CHRONICLE says about religion and orthodoxy has the effect of seeking to gain further support for the existing Jewish community, for the policy of its leaders of ANGLIFICATION, and for the ANGLIFICATION of its institutional life, and support also for the existing structure of the general English community. This may not have been the conscious intention of our source's opinions on orthodoxy. Still this is their ultimate effect,

In connection with the matter of education for the workingmen, there are many consciously stated attitudes. It has been shown previously that the CHRONICLE and leaders of the community have expressed innumerable times the need for raising the level of

the Jewish "alien" immigrant both morally and spiritually. In most of these references they have suggested that this can be done largely by lectures and by addresses by competent persons.⁹⁷ The burden falls upon the method of education to accomplish such a tremendous task of acclimatizing and anglicizing these immigrant workmen.⁹⁸ The CHRONICLE states very plainly in an editorial⁹⁹ that the purpose of the "Jewish Working Men's Club," as of the Board of Guardians, was to solve the problem of the Jewish poor by emphasizing the intellectual method of imparting information and accumulated wisdom — thus, the spreading of knowledge is the thing. And elsewhere¹⁰⁰ the CHRONICLE praises the effort of the Russian and Polish poor Jews in establishing for themselves reading and lecturing rooms in order to raise their educational status and thus assimilate themselves into English life. Thus education of the immigrant workmen, who pose so much of a problem for the established community, is a means to ANGLIFICATION, and thus, according to the CHRONICLE and the leaders of the community, a way of solving the problem of the Jewish poor.

In this chapter we have seen the relationship of "union," "charity," "industrialization," religion and orthodoxy, and education to ANGLIFICATION (in the CHRONICLE published between the years of 1870 and 1897) as means to the latter. They are meant to solve the problem of the established community because they aim at, or should be made to aim at, supporting the communal status quo, and protecting the reputation and vested interests of the Anglo-Jewish community. In realizing that all of these had ulterior motives and purposes (at least within the period of our study), it is also realized that the attitudes and policy of the ruling groups of the

community, with whom the CHRONICLE identified itself, are directed at the needs of the established community more than at those of the Jewish immigrant poor.

But the whole situation becomes clearer when it is also realized that what the CHRONICLE and these ruling elements thought they were doing, besides taking care of the established community, is precisely to care for the needs and wants of the "alien" immigrants. There is no claim on our part that there is a conscious effort to deceive, or to care for the foreign Jewish poor only by caring for the established community. Rather what we have done has been to view the attitudes and programs of the CHRONICLE as having the consequences of aiding the Jewish immigrant poor, not really in accordance with their needs, but actually in accordance with the supposed needs of the established Jewish community. No one can conclude from our hypothesis that it implies that the CHRONICLE and the established community should adopt attitudes and policies only for the foreign Jewish poor. But what is implied — and even asserted categorically — is that the CHRONICLE is a source for the history of the Anglo-Jewish community of this period which goes along with the ruling groups of that community in advocating the solving of the problem of the Jewish poor and taking care of them according to their own needs and vested interests: that is, ANGLIFICATION is the solution.

When this is attained, the CHRONICLE and the leaders of Anglo-Jewry thought that their community would be safe because the benefits of ANGLIFICATION were to protect and to bolster its position, its reputation, and its vested interests, and to perpetuate the status

quo: that is, to perpetuate the basic relations between the elements of Anglo-Jewish society and also the basic solutions as institutionalized. And especially since complete emancipation had recently been won after a long and often bitter struggle, neither the CHRONICLE nor the leaders of Anglo-Jewry were going to permit anything or anyone to weaken or to threaten the structure of their community. Not even a Herzl or a Jewish State!

Chapter Four

SOLUTION TO "THE JEWISH PROBLEM": ANGLIFICATION

What "The Jewish Problem" Was

To the CHRONICLE, the "Jewish Problem" had two aspects which are not difficult to ascertain even by scanning its pages throughout the period of 1870-1897. The first aspect is violent persecution and discrimination abroad. This phase of anti-Semitism occupied a tremendous amount of space in the CHRONICLE all through the period with which we are dealing, but especially in the 1880's and in the first part of the 1890's. Knowing how burdensome the problem of the "alien" immigrant was to it, our source looked upon these upheavals in East Europe, in one aspect, as the direct cause of the continuing and at time inundating flow of poor immigrants from that area.

Throughout the 1870's the pages of the CHRONICLE are replete with the other aspect of the "Jewish Problem." This is their "Jewish Problem" as it manifested itself in England in the form of verbal attack and discrimination from certain quarters other than the government, a characteristic which to a great extent distinguished the "Jewish Problem" at home from the "Jewish Problem" abroad. In any case the "Jewish Problem" was a threat, a direct threat, to the established, anglicized Anglo-Jewish community: violence and wide-scale discrimination abroad, as in Russia, Roumania, and North Africa, threatened the community with an undiminishing supply of the Jewish poor and with all the dangers the established community could

imagine, as has been discussed in the previous chapter. The "Jewish Problem" at home also posed a constant threat to the reputation and position -- and therefore to the vested interests -- of its ruling groups, the Jewish middle and upper classes; and the efforts to combat it at home took the form of protecting the emancipation which had been so dearly and laboriously won not too long ago.

Quite often, especially during the 1870's, the CHRONICLE published short, but special reports of some offensive depiction of the Jew, his character or his religion. And many editorial articles, too, deal with this theme, such as the one¹ which, quoting an English publication, the ATHENAEUM, gives voice to its own sentiments in reply to Bishop Derry's accusation in THE LEADING IDEAS IN THE GOSPEL. There he vituperates the Jews as money-hungry and degraded creatures from what they were before the time of Jesus. In an editorial, "The Jew in Modern Fiction,"² the CHRONICLE tells that in most instances the Jew is pictured as loathsome and mean, as in Thackeray and Dickens. All such depictions -- and there were many, according to the indications in the CHRONICLE -- understandably posed a threat to the kind of life that the Jewish ruling and leading groups had built and created over the years in England. On the other hand, the "conversionists" were a thorn in the side of the community. Reports and editorial articles deal with them frequently throughout this period. Though at times the missionary platforms sent out false information about customs and ways of Jewish life and also "ridiculous claims" about Jews in general,³ what really bothered the CHRONICLE is clearly revealed in an editorial of February 1873. There, the editorial attacks professional conversionists "because their activity assumes,

as it must, some improvement in those who are to be converted."⁴ But this is inadmissible, even impossible, with regard to the Jews because they are on the same high level of civilization and culture as Englishmen, which of course is the highest in the world. Thus it can be seen with clearer insight now why the problem of the East European immigrant was so urgent in the mind of the established community. To allow this unassimilated, crude mass of people to remain in England unchanged and isolated would only serve to render the entire Anglo-Jewish community most vulnerable to attack and discrimination, especially when it is remembered that the CHRONICLE and leaders of Anglo-Jewry thought that the foreign poor obviously possessed a lower level of civilization and culture than what is proper and acceptable for Englishmen.

The Causes for Anti-Semitism

The CHRONICLE abounds in material dealing with explanations of the reasons for the "Jewish Problem." The explanations are not always consistent and the nature of them depends to some degree on what country the CHRONICLE speaks of and the period of time with which our source is dealing. Discussing the reasons for anti-Semitism in 1881, when the horrible Russian persecutions were just beginning and when the discrimination in Roumania and the Judenhetze in Germany had been going on steadily but not too strongly, the CHRONICLE sets the tone for all its analyses of this problem. It speaks of the direct causes as being both economic-political reasons and certain traits of the Jews themselves. In one editorial,⁵ where the analysis is most clear, the CHRONICLE shows how the historical processes

evolved whereby the Jew was denied wealth in the form of land but instead accumulated great wealth in the form of capital. Then it states,

"It is this possession of money and ... the ostentation with which it was used that have been the direct causes of persecution. Religious antipathy may have fanned the blaze but envy of commercial success has always lit the flames."

That the CHRONICLE singles out the traits of Jews, especially those of East European Jews, is one of the most obvious characteristics of our source. For example, it hails the establishment of the "Society for the Promoting of Knowledge" among the Jews of East Europe as a counter-agent against the extremism of the Jews there who "remain narrow and opposed to the spirit of the age" and thus helps those Jews to avoid the "evil effects" of the transition from their old ghetto, Talmid-ridden life to the new age.⁶ "Everything," our source continues, "which aids the intellectual progress of Russian Jews helps indirectly to raise the status of Jews throughout the world who are so largely recruited from Russia Poland" — our source thus refers to the situation in England itself. This is a common theme in the CHRONICLE which maintains that the treatment of the East European Jew, as well as Jews all over the world, is dependent on his traits.⁷ If you don't believe this, the CHRONICLE would interject, just look at the "anglicized" Jews in England.

The specific relationship of the traits of the East European Jew and his persecution is again and again explained by the CHRONICLE. This relationship takes the form of a causal connection between these traits and the actions of the government, something which reveals our source in its true light:

"The Russian intolerance against the Jews is, practically speaking, the root of all evil in Judaism throughout the world ... and the narrow and rigid ultra-orthodoxy of the Polish Jew is mainly an outcome of the intolerance on the part of his superiors."⁸

"... it cannot be denied ... that they (the East European Jews) possess several qualities which are not calculated to endear them to the peoples among whom they dwell ... that the raw, unledged 'Polack' starts with manners which are likely to raise ill feelings among the neighbors whom he calls 'goyim.' The fact remains that these qualities do exist in him and have in large measure been the occasion of the recent outbreaks against the Jews.

"Persistent persecution of a whole race can scarcely fail to produce evil effects ... all the 'narrowness,' all the 'tribalism' of the 'hard-shell Jew' is due directly to the unholy exercise of power which has kept the Jews crushed in a way that cannot be paralleled. Here then we have the true cause of this puzzling problem (the 'Jewish Problem') ..."⁹

And in still another editorial:

"It is, therefore, to the intolerance of the ruling classes that we can always trace back popular ill-will against the Jews.

"... if there are objectionable qualities to be discovered in Jews living in certain countries, the cause is to be sought in intolerant restrictions which have produced social disabilities that in their turn bring about certain anti-social feelings in the Jews ... at the present moment (June, 1881), the Jews ... are not altogether blameless. The offending governments have their duties to perform, but the Jews have likewise reciprocal duties to remove all sources of objection ...

"They (the Jews of Russia and Poland) must cease to give an excuse for exceptional legislation by ceasing to be exceptional in their manners and dealings with their fellow-citizens ... narrow-minded exclusiveness and slavish obedience to mere habit ... opposition to all modern ideas of the most violent character."¹⁰

Thus the CHRONICLE points out that these "objectionable

traits" of East European Jews are the result of a long policy of intolerance — even an intense religious intolerance¹¹ — and anti-Semitism. But at this time, 1881, they are the "excuse" for the persecution. The CHRONICLE's insight does include the realization that the initial source of persecution has been the government and the ruling classes, and not the East European Jews themselves:

"To oppress, and then to blame the victim for the evils which not he, but oppression, has created, is the veriest inanity."¹²

Still the CHRONICLE is morbidly preoccupied with the so-called "objectionable traits" of East European Jews as seen here in the quotations offered, thus rendering these "qualities" with undue importance and causal significance. There is seldom an instance when our source denounces the actions of the government without bringing in the specter of these "traits". The effect of this preoccupation only serves to highlight the CHRONICLE's anxiety concerning the East European immigrant Jewish poor in their own land.

Elsewhere the basic cause is made out to be something quite different. In the same period, 1881, an editorial argues with Professor Goldwin Smith, an anti-Semite of a gentle nature:

"... we contend that they were in the past persecuted for their religion; and if they are now persecuted for what he pleases to call their tribalism this is itself the result of their adherence to their religion ...

"Let us grant secondly what the Professor contends about much of the Judenhetze, that it is directed rather against Jews as different from their neighbours in manners and customs than as holders of a special religion. But what has brought about difference in customs? Religious persecution in the past and in the present in Russia ..."¹³

Here, the traits of the East European Jew are not the primary

cause. The root of the East European Jews' trouble is his strong adherence to his religion, although in two distinct places the CHRONICLE argues that the very nature of Judaism itself is not involved directly in the causes. One article concludes that the objectionable sanitation habits of the East European Jews are "the result of their Russian, but certainly not specially Jewish conceptions of sanitation."¹⁴ The other argues that, in all modern persecutions, the religious zeal that was supposed to be responsible for the excesses were only excuses which used the name of religion to hide the real causes for mob action; little has been the concern for the differences between dogmas of the Church of England and Judaism in Queen Anne's time, and even in other countries today.¹⁵

This leads us into the explanations of persecution in which the CHRONICLE does attain some insight and perspective. It almost reaches a full insight into the matter when it says,

"It is the aim of Russia to develop her interior trade, and to achieve this aim she has adopted the suicidal method of protection. Now, the Jews, above all men, represent international commerce and the principle of free trade. Thus purely from commercial principles, it might seem advisable to take advantage of any means to restrict their influence on Russian commerce."¹⁶

If the CHRONICLE did feel compelled to judge solely on the basis of whether a country espouses "free trade" or not, perhaps it would have continued with its partial and initial insight here which places the source of anti-Semitism in the sphere of commercial activity. That measures against the Jews have something to do with the conscious policy of a government the CHRONICLE seems to realize here, but no more than this.

Of all the analyses of anti-Semitism in the CHRONICLE the

most superior as far as having insight is an article written by Emile Zola and appearing in the Paris FIGARO, which the CHRONICLE quotes.¹⁷ However, the insight of the CHRONICLE does reach approximately that which was quoted in the paragraph above, and seems to be aiming in the general direction of Zola's depth of thought. For at times the CHRONICLE does explain persecution of and discrimination against Jews with a goodly amount of abstruseness, as when it analyzes the troubles of the German Jews in mid 1890's as due to a policy of the Conservative Junker Party who want to gain power by protecting the high price of corn and thus use the Jews, the competitors of this program.¹⁸ But this explanation is found in the context of decrying "the new protection" which the German Conservatives want to adopt. Thus what insight there is here is always related to the evils of "protectionism" and to the rejection of "free trade." The CHRONICLE again relates anti-Semitism to basic struggles going on within the national economy and political set-up when, in 1881, it blames the strains on Germany's resources by emigration and military service as the roots of anti-Semitism there; and on Bismarck insofar as he was diverting the attention of the disaffected class from "the disastrous results of his iron policy."¹⁹ In the same year,²⁰ another editor attributes Russia's continuing restrictions and persecutions of the Jew as "anything to divert attention from the social sores that are consuming the heart of Russian society ...". And the CHRONICLE has what might be considered as bordering on some kind of adequate explanation when it asserts that anti-Semitism is a result of the decline or disintegration or basic difficulties of a nation, a way of solving its problems; and when, in

another editorial,²¹ it makes the reason for persecution of the Jew his being needed as a scapegoat for evils suffered and also the lack of economic progress of the nation, this agitation (in Germany, 1881) being "fanned by the not uninfluential clerical party, winked at by the ruling powers, and countenanced by the academies. ..."

Now, it is evident that we have gone beyond the theme of the two previous chapters, of the identification of the CHRONICLE's attitude and viewpoint with the ruling elements of the Anglo-Jewish and English communities, the middle and upper classes, unless it be admitted that the CHRONICLE's analyses of Anti-Semitism — though when considered as a whole are somewhat inconsistent — attains profoundness of insight insofar as it is an organ of communication of the classes who possess "the high cultural" tradition. We have gone beyond this point in order to ascertain other limitations of our source, and one of these has been found to be understanding of the reasons and causes of anti-Semitism and persecution of the Jew. The further, and perhaps real, limitation of its analysis will be seen with regard to the conclusions it draws concerning how to put an end to anti-Semitism in all its forms.

Certainly the attitude of the CHRONICLE to the East European immigrants and his "objectionable traits" is due to at least in large measure to class antagonism. For it is usually the middle and upper classes who are concerned with refinement of manners, with etiquette, with decorum in religious services,²² with sanitation and cleanliness as a virtue, with proper and cultured religious and social ideas and customs, and thus disdain what they consider to be the lower level of civilization of the lower classes. Thus does our source's atti-

tude to the traits of the East European Jew point to its middle-upper class orientation.

Not only is our source limited with respect to its analysis of the "Jewish Problem," but it also has the further limitation of its philosophy of the source of social ills and evils in society. In connection with the CHRONICLE's explanations of the "Jewish Problem" the most significant disadvantage is that the CHRONICLE holds the view, even very popular today, that would find the source of trouble in evil traits of certain groups, in evil governments, and in evil men, rather than in society itself, which is the view preferred here. Throughout 1881 and 1882 General Ignatieff, the Russian Minister of the Interior, is played up as the grand villain of the prolonged and inhuman attacks and torture, together with the discriminatory edicts and legislation, against the Jews of Russia and Poland. In an editorial note dealing with his resignation²³ again it is he and his policy which the CHRONICLE makes out to be the direct cause of the widespread anti-Semitism. Constantly our source proceeds on this basis, that such an evil man is the root of the cancer. Or, if no one person can be found, then certain groups are the root of the cancer, such as the Conservative (Junker) Party of Germany, and such as the East European Jews themselves who, according to this philosophy of society, cannot be without blame for their own misery. This philosophy is consonant with another concept prevailing then as it still does in some quarters today, that there are absolute, eternal laws existing apart from embodiment in men or society which if unopposed or not violated allow civilization to proceed smoothly and peacefully, but when violated cause all the known social ills and

problems.²⁴ In an editorial note²⁵ in 1895 the CHRONICLE states that the Russian government's policy of persecution during the last thirteen years "cannot be defended." Now one would think that the CHRONICLE would then proceed to base its arguments on the needs of suffering human beings. But as usual it turns to other areas of thought, and continues in this note, that Russia's persecution "strikes at the root of the principles which are fundamental in the ethical as in the political order of things." That is, the tragedy of her policy is not to be gauged by human suffering, but only by the fact that this policy has violated the moral principles of the universe.

This view of society and its ills is no where better illustrated in the CHRONICLE than concerning the matter of moneylenders. Especially in two very brief periods, 1885 and 1895, this problem appears in the pages of the CHRONICLE. Moneylenders are denounced with fiery indignation and with unmatched terms of condemnation, rarely achieved in our source.

First our attention is drawn to a minor running battle between letters to the editors who take sides in this issue; the battle arises over whether they should be allowed to join, even to enter, the synagogue. Those who violently oppose moneylenders argue (as does Sergeant Simon, a top leader of the community) on the basis of these main points: the moneylender is an evil, mean creature who corrupts and brings dishonor to his fellow-Jews and who mars the dignity of Jews.²⁶

One especially vociferous letter states, " ... the communal good name is at the mercy of the unscrupulous Jew ... The injury

which money-lenders inflict upon us is incalculable," and then proceeds to condemn the "inhumanity" of these men "who even take the bed of a sick child away by high interest rates." The same writer then asks the CHRONICLE to attack them to show the non-Jew that they receive only contempt and scorn from the Jewish community, and then concludes, "Thus (if they are excluded from the Jewish community) will we be spared the humiliating spectacle of young Jews, and even Jewesses, who are little more than children, carrying on the business of a usurer, and setting ill-natured tongues wagging about the perverse direction taken by Jewish precociousness."²⁷ On the contrary, however, the same letter argues that the banker or bill-broker is not such, but merely deals in money as any commodity. And so argues another writer²⁸ that, as for bankers, dealing in money is as necessary as dealing in corn.

But in any case, argue these writers, among whom is Serjeant Simon, that neither is the risk that the moneylenders takes any justification for his high rates (so argues Simon) nor is there any longer any situation today in England, as there admittedly was in Angevin England, causing Jews to engage in such a "horrible" business.²⁹ Lewis Emanuel, another one of the leaders of the Anglo-Jewish community, in a letter to the editor, attacks the money-lenders and sums up this last point when he³⁰ admits that Joseph Jacobs has shown in his JEWS IN ANGEVIN ENGLAND that Jews were forced to become moneylenders for the crown. But, he continues,

"In the present day when we enjoy complete civil and religious liberty, and perfect social equality, when every professional and commercial avocation, every department of the public service, every avenue to honor and distinction is open to our sons who show themselves worthy, the

practice of usury is without a shadow of an excuse. ... Therefore (all) ... who honor their faith and their race ... Who aim at noble ideals, will endeavor to prevent the admission to our communal bodies of anyone who is tainted with the stigma of usury."³¹

It seems that Emanuel here is trying to use all the powers of persuasion to avoid the conclusion that in some way there is a lack of opportunity, or that the avenues to distinction and success are only partially open. Perhaps this was just the case, if it is remembered that by 1895 England's prosperity and control of world economy had levelled off, and if it be remembered how pressing was the problem of the Jewish poor to the community. This conclusion may be indicated by the letter to the editor,³² written by Isaac Tumpowsky, obviously not very well "anglicized," who criticizes Emanuel with the arguments that bankers and capitalists are money-lenders on a large scale but who are in a position to charge lower rates.

It may be conjectured here, with some slight support from what has been gathered above, that along with the severe problem of the "alien" immigrant Jewish poor went along a restricting of the avenues of opportunity and success, the opposite of which had characterized England during its phenomenal period of rise to prosperity — and that these avenues were especially closed to the foreign immigrants who brought little capital or skills with them. Another "champion," in a sense, of the moneylender, who wrote several letters protesting the mishandling of the moneylender in the letters to the editor (but who remains anonymous as most of the writers on this matter), would seem to point to this conclusion if he could be determined as a reliable source. He argues that the moneylender is a "necessary element of society, as a pawnbroker or scavenger" as

long as those who cry out against them do not remove the underlying cause for them: the innocent victim of the moneylender cannot secure what he needs from businessmen or philanthropists and therefore ~~must~~ become a victim of the moneylender.

This entire context of the struggle within the CHRONICLE, formed by these letters to the editor, has been delineated so that the full meaning of its own attitude on this matter can be appreciated. Especially in one editorial note³³ in 1895 it argues along the same lines of reasoning that those who condemned the moneylenders had. Since, it asserts, that the reason for their existence, which existed in Angevin England, no longer exists, the Jewish moneylenders is the vile creature that he is made out to be. The CHRONICLE here makes its position clear when it answers Walter Besant, who had asked for tolerance of the moneylender because this function was forced on them, and says, "This is all very kindly on the part of Mr. Besant, but not all moneylenders are Jews, though we wish that Jewish money-lenders did not invite this contempt in the present day when the business of usury is not forced upon them."³⁴ "The moral obliquity," the CHRONICLE complains, "of a few usurers drags us all down."

Now, the position of the CHRONICLE in this matter of moneylenders, which to our source is part of the "Jewish Problem," serves to further demonstrate its identification with the ruling elements of the Anglo-Jewish community, first because, as it has been argued above, it adopts the social philosophy that the ills of society can be traced to the wickedness of some person or persons who obstruct the natural and therefore beneficial working out of the

social-economic order of the universe. This is the protective and defensive philosophy of those who possess the wealth and the power of the community and do not want to lose it, who comprise the "established community" and thus who must protect its reputation, its position within the larger community (especially when a minority) and its vested interests. This is not the social philosophy of those, whether rich or poor, whether in power and control or not, who want to have communal life with all its blessings shared and who thus conceive that social ills are because of a sick society, or at least an imperfect one.

Secondly, in connection with this matter of moneylenders, our source shows its identification with the middle and upper classes of the community when it is realized what the position of bankers were in the community. Especially in England, because of a combination of various forces, did the Jewish bankers play a tremendous role in England's economy, in its very rise to the leading power and commercial empire of the world. The Sephardim and the members of the Hofjude's court in Germany all brought large sums of capital with them to England and served the credit needs of the expanding empire for over two hundred years. And the results were such families as the Rothschilds and the Goldsmids. And what is significant for us here is that, unlike in our own land in America, the top men of the Anglo-Jewish community, those who were leaders, counselors and officers of the Board of Deputies, the Board of Guardians and the United Synagogue, were largely these same men. All the important bankers — and there were many of them — became leaders of the Jewish community. And many became leaders of England itself as members

of Parliament, first in Commons and then even in the House of Lords. Imagine, then, the CHRONICLE not taking sides with those who condemn the moneylenders and not supporting these upper echelons in the Jewish community!

The Solutions of "The Jewish Problem:" In General

Having delineated what the CHRONICLE believes to be (in the period of 1870 - 1897) the two main reasons for anti-Semitism: the policy of governments (or of certain political parties) and the traits of Jews themselves, the simple solutions our source offers are obviously a better and improved government policy and ridding the Jews of their "objectionable traits." The latter solution was similar to the one by which the bankers and their friends — notably the CHRONICLE — thought that the Anglo-Jewish community could be saved and its integrity unimpaired if the money-lenders would be rooted out, like some cancerous growth, by means of humiliation and social and economic ostracism. It is the solution of disencumbering Jews of their "undesirable" traits upon which our source dwells.

However, there are statements in the CHRONICLE in 1881, the very first year of the severe persecutions, emphasizing the need for an improved government policy:

"As the hidden cause is undoubtedly the exceptional status of the Jew in the eyes of Russian law, it is hoped that the removal of one of these limitations (freedom to move about) may have the effect of removing the impression current among the Russian peasantry that the Jews are

outside the law and fit subjects for attack."³⁶

In the same year another editorial offers a similar conclusion concerning the need for action on the part of the state:

"While the (Russian) Government treats the Jews different from the rest of its subjects, the other Russians will regard them as different beings and hate them accordingly ... social hatred depends for its existence on political exclusiveness.

"The political liberation of the Jews in Russia (is) the only sure solution of the problem (of persecution of the Jews) as all experience shows ..."³⁷

However, considering this conclusion in its context, it is seen to follow after statements in the same editorial which are, as usual, preoccupied with the "objectionable traits" of the Jews involved. What the CHRONICLE is attempting here is to search for the cause of these traits and then finds it in the intolerant policy of the state. Yes, the East European Jews are implicated in that they have been partly to blame insofar as they have not removed these traits; but "political exclusiveness" is found to be their cause. Thus does the CHRONICLE conclude here that the solution lies in an improved policy of the government. But it is not because of human considerations that our source arrives at this conclusion. A new national policy is necessary in order to rid the Jews in Russia of their traits! Another editorial clearly shows this reasoning process employed by the CHRONICLE. It argues that since the main charge leveled against the Jews of East Europe is their "Jewish exclusiveness," the only way of removing "the features objected to by the ruling powers" is to grant them equality: if they are no longer treated as exceptional then they will become acceptably non-excep-

tional as in other European countries. "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness!" -- what is the reason that these should be granted to the East European Jew? To rid him of his "objectionable traits!" As in every other article on this specific problem of East European Jewish traits and political emancipation, the reason for equality and emancipation is never because Jews are human beings -- God forbid! that fellow Jews should be the ones to raise this cry for their "brotherhood!" The reason always is that liberation will free these Jews of their "obnoxious" traits and the "defects" of their character.

Once again in an editorial in 1881 we find:

"... all the 'narrowness,' all the 'tribalism' of the 'hardshell Jew' is due directly to the unholy exercise of power which has kept the Jew crushed in a way that cannot be paralleled. Here then we have the true cause of this puzzling problem (the Jewish Problem) ... And it is an amelioration of the social and intellectual condition of the Russian Jews which alone can stem the tide of anti-Jewish feeling that is being displayed in so many directions."39

That the CHRONICLE is really concerned with the "objectionable traits" of East European Jews and much less with a better government policy is seen further on in this same editorial. The editors quickly pass over the necessity of an improved policy of the Russian state:

"If action on the part of the Czar be out of the question, there only remains an appeal to the Russian Jews to become less narrow and more cultured ... to let in the light of reason on the mass of superstition that too often forms the main ingredient in the mind of a Russian Jew."

In fact, continues the same editorial,

"... a favorite plan for settling the Jewish Question by the recovery and colonisation of Pales-

time, would become almost worse than useless unless the immigrants (from East Europe) could be instructed to look at things in the light of science and common sense, and not through the spectacles of the Talmud ..."

Thus, the "objectionable traits" of these Jews seem to loom large as the real determining factor in the mind of the editors of our source in relation to the "Jewish Problem." This was true because our source was convinced that the Jews in East Europe had an effect more far-reaching than merely on their own community, due to the fact that, at that time, the East European Jews constituted the greater majority of all Jews in the world. And thus, because of the unending streams of immigrants from Russia, the CHRONICLE believed that "any improvement in the intellectual status of the Russian Jews may have ultimate influence on the Jews throughout the world."⁴⁰

Not only does the CHRONICLE here, in wanting "better class" immigrants from Russia if they must come, look out for the interests of the Jewish community in England, but also by now it should be clear enough the extent to which our source thinks that the low status of the persecuted Jew and the improvement of his condition is largely an intellectual matter. This concept of resolving the problem is an intellectual matter is exemplified in an editorial in 1890, when the persecutions had reached another severe phase:

"Its (i.e. The Anglo-Jewish Association) most faithwork lies in the more congenial sphere of education ... To raise Eastern Jewish populations intellectually and morally is obviously a potent means of averting further persecution by depriving it of one of its pretexts. Superstition and inferior morale positively invite cruelty ... A semi-barbaric population cannot but feel some respect for those who are palpably their intellectual superiors."⁴¹

Our final proof that the real concern of the CHRONICLE is

those traits and not much else is the following excerpt from an editorial in 1894, by which time our source has formulated its own "insight" into the matter:

"The Russian government ... attaches an exaggerated importance to the narrow religious views which characterize some of the Hebrew communities. THE MERE ACT OF EMANCIPATION WOULD, OF COURSE, NOT CURE THESE EVILS. OF THIS WE HAVE STRIKING PROOF IN THE CONDITION OF OUR CO-RELIGIONISTS IN GALICIA. THE ONLY EFFECTUAL SOLUTIONS ARE TO BE FOUND IN LIBERAL FACILITIES FOR SECULAR EDUCATION AND FOR DECENTRALISATION. PRACTICAL SCHEMES TO THIS END WOULD BE EVEN MORE WELCOME AT THE PRESENT MOMENT THAN THE MOST UNFETTERED LIBERTY."-2 (capitalization mine)

It seems as if by now the CHRONICLE found that the solution of an improved government policy did not have its sought-for effects of removing the "defects" in the character of the Russian Jews. And therefore our source now searches for the "real" solution in other areas — even if this means that emancipation would have to be ignored.

But what emancipation fails to do, participation in the national life will. Therefore the CHRONICLE, more and more during the 1890's, reiterates that making the Jews part of the national life of Russia will rid its Jews of their "objectionable traits" — and at the same time enrich and ennoble the nation in every way. In an editorial in 1894, after analyzing the "defects in the character of the Russian Jew" as due to persecution, the CHRONICLE has hopes that the new tolerant and benevolent policy expected of Nicholas II upon his ascension to the throne "will ensure to them (his Jewish "subjects") the opportunity of displaying the same capacities of civic virtue and patriotic usefulness which Jews have developed wherever they have been placed on a footing of equality with their fellow-

citizens."¹³ Look what participation of the English Jews in the national life of England has done! Just think, then, of what it could do for the East European Jew!¹⁴

What strikes the reader in the final analysis is that the CHRONICLE, with reference to these "objectionable traits," has adopted the attitude of the non-Jewish ruling classes who were in no way committed, as was Anglo-Jewry, to endeavor to improve their East European "brethern."

Solutions of "The Jewish Problem": In England

The solution of participating in the national life as equal citizens was, as it has become increasingly clear, what the CHRONICLE meant when it spoke of assimilation, or acclimatization. The CHRONICLE applied this solution in general, wherever "the Jewish Problem" existed, whether in foreign lands or in England where it existed in the form of the "objectionable" traits of the foreign immigrant poor and in the form of "minor" anti-Semitism. In England, we have seen that participation, acclimatization and assimilation were the elements comprising what we have termed ANGLIFICATION. Thus ANGLIFICATION was thought to have been an insurance policy for the established, ruling eschelons of the Anglo-Jewish community for protection against these "obnoxious" traits (including money-lending) of some Jews which were believed to have been the cause of the "minor" discriminations and inequalities which still existed in England. And thus, also, ANGLIFICATION was protection against what the CHRONICLE and the leaders of the community believed to have been the real threat to the reputation, position and vested interests of Anglo-

Jewry and its ruling classes — and it must be remembered that they thought that preservation of the victory of political emancipation in England was something to be saved at all costs, even to the extent of ignoring the needs of their immigrant "bretheren."

What the CHRONICLE thought ANGLIFICATION has done and can do is understood from several clear statements. One editorial⁴⁵ on "The Position of the Jewish Community" expresses the attitude that as soon as the Jews were allowed to participate in English politics and society as equals they became and remained top-notch citizens and members of the nation. And the way of getting rid of the "minor forms of anti-Semitism" that still remain in England, and caused by exclusiveness, is that "the more freely the Jew mixes (our emphasis) with his neighbours, the better chance there will be of those small prejudices disappearing which still linger on to his detriment." The obvious way of putting an end to the unfair practice of condemning all Jews because of a few is "to make ourself better known ... and mix more and make ourself better acquainted with Christians ..."⁴⁶

And finally, as if to offer further incontrovertible proof if all else fails, the CHRONICLE says,⁴⁷ just look at us who only a few generations ago were "Polaks!" Just see what enlightenment and culture have done for us, and then think of what it could do for the foreign poor now in our land. And our source could be no clearer than it is in one editorial note where there is a comment on the occasion of two young upper class Jewish ladies, a Rothschild and a Sassoon, riding with the royal princess and her husband,

"Hebrews whose refinement and unselfishness make them welcome companions to the most cultivated and influential of their fellow-country-

men render many services, often quite unconsciously, to their co-religionists. Just as the squalor of certain ghettos, and the moral obliquity of a few usurers, drags us all down, the elevation of some fortunate and gifted people tends to ennoble us in the public mind. Had Jews in Roumania and Russia been able to attain the confidence and esteem of a large and powerful section of society in those countries before the persecution set in, their misfortunes might never have overtaken them."⁴⁸

And this refinement and culture is most likely to happen in England. For in the Jewish character is something inherent which is developed by the right conditions and environment, by contact with civilized and moral conditions, such as exist in England's anglicized Jewish community.⁴⁹

Yes, just imagine what some culture and refinement, some ANGLIFICATION, will do for the Jews in England! Just imagine what participation and equality, culture and refinement, the counterparts in other lands of ANGLIFICATION, will do for the Jews living in Russia, in Roumania, and in other foreign countries. Once all Jews adopt the manners and etiquette of the upper classes, and of the middle classes, who want more than anything else to become upper class, then "the Jewish Problem" will be well on the way to being solved for all time.

Solutions of "The Jewish Problem": ANGLIFICATION Par Excellence

It was the manifestation of the solution as it had appeared in England — ie. ANGLIFICATION — with which the CHRONICLE was pre-occupied. Now, because of the fervent desire of the CHRONICLE to see all Jews in England anglicized, ANGLIFICATION takes on a most interesting form, par excellence, which at times can be termed "out Britishing the British." And for an introduction into this topic nothing

could be more suitable than an item in which the CHRONICLE quotes what it believes to be a case of minor discrimination: "'I know he is a Jew,' said the Lady in the English comic paper, 'because his name is Reginald Herbert Stuart de Montmorency.'"⁵⁰ This form of ANGLIFICATION par excellence was, for the CHRONICLE and the elite element of the Jewish community which it represented, a "sure cure" and preventive for all phases of the "Jewish Problem" at home. In essence it was the solution reached in various phases by the established Anglo-Jewish community: that is, its solutions as they were institutionalized and as they were implemented in its way of life. It can also be described as a strong PATRIOTISM. However, whatever terminology be used, this more eccentric form of ANGLIFICATION occurs in a context which is overcast, throughout the pages of the CHRONICLE, by an ominous whisper that we Jews are being watched, so be careful, most careful. Thus when discussing the despicable depiction of the Jew in modern literature, an editorial^{51a} concludes with an appeal to be especially careful about "our actions and general conduct, ... to be ... better than ... (our) neighbours" and, it concludes, when "Jew" becomes synonymous with honor and honesty and morality, then the Jew will cease to be maligned. In the same train of thought an editorial essay^{51b} makes the condition of the toleration of the Jew his own "careful and meticulous behavior" by means of avoiding any misunderstanding of thought and deed. This same mode of thought also runs throughout those letters to the editor cited above which condemn the Jewish moneylenders — especially is this the theme in one⁵² which is obsessed with the appearance and spectacle that Jews make before the eyes of the gentiles. In this manner does

the CHRONICLE and its friends in spirit set up for the Jew in England quite impossible and self-defeating standards to live up to.

Patriotism in the CHRONICLE and in the Anglo-Jewish community took the form of declaring, "We Jews in England are Englishmen" and differ from other Englishmen only in the matter of religion. We are not separate from the rest of the nation except by religious persuasion. Therefore we Jews, the argument continues, who live in England are not really different, nor more than the Anglican, or the non-Conformist, or Catholic, who differs only in being a member of a different religion. This attitude is exemplified in the CHRONICLE with regard to the matter of "the Jewish vote" and with regard to the issue of Zionism vs nationalism (the latter being dealt with later on).

In an editorial in February of 1874, when the Anglo-Jewish community had just emerged from its final victory of complete political emancipation in Parliament, the CHRONICLE admits that among both Jews and non-Jews there is a confusion as to the relation of the Jewish community to the nation: there is a distinct danger to band together as a party on a party question, as the Birmingham Jews had done recently. Then the editors emphasize, something they had been doing for some time, that the Jewish community as a whole cannot be put to use for any one faction or party in English society. The reason is that,

"The Jewish subjects of Her Majesty the Queen are Englishmen ...; quite as fully English by birth, feeling, right, duty and privilege, as if they were members of the National Church ... Englishmen of Jewish faith and race are just as fully Englishmen as if they were born of Anglo-Saxon, or Norman or British race ..."

This is, the editorial continues, the only basis on which the Jew will

he neither hated nor feared. In any case, however, political rights must not be purchased at the price of giving up one's distinct religious faith and practice. It concludes, certainly there are certain political and social positions that Judaism leads one to, still the Jew in England "takes these positions, not as a Jew, but as an Englishman, a full free-born Englishman." Here as elsewhere throughout the pages of the CHRONICLE⁵⁴ the idea is brought out that the Jews are separate religiously only and not politically. They are not separate even socially and culturally. In another editorial⁵⁵ the CHRONICLE assures its readers that such cases as men like Disraeli who left the Jewish fold "proved that at least there was nothing inherent in Jewish blood to prevent those in whose veins it flowed from becoming as cultured and as able as their fellow-Englishmen." The reason why the CHRONICLE — and the leaders of the community — find so much urgency in inculcating that English Jews are just like any other Englishmen can be gathered from an editorial note. Political emancipation, it admits, has been recently won by overcoming the opinion that Jews felt "they owed to the British government only a divided allegiance ... They convinced Englishmen that English Jews are as whole hearted in their patriotism as English Christians ..."⁵⁶ English Jews ARE Englishmen.

That English Jews cannot be put to use for any one faction or party is true even with regard to the Liberal Party under whose administration the Jews in England won their political emancipation. An editorial,⁵⁷ in the midst of the campaigning for the elections of 1885, agrees with Lionel Cohen (Conservative), in opposition to Serjeant Simon (Liberal) that English Jews cannot vote straight Liberal

but must decide on the basis of the nation's welfare, for it is possible that a Liberal government would not always be best. Another editorial in 1881 decries the fact that a number of journals of radical leanings have harped on the presence of a "Jewish influence" in politics, and then argues with much insight,

"It is not because they are Jews that 'City' Jews are Tory; it is because they are 'City' men and it is notorious that the City of London 'went' Tory under Lord Beaconsfield (Disraeli). A few years ago most Jews were Liberal, so were most 'City' men ... the City has changed within late years from Liberal to Conservative, and City Jews have gone with the tide of City opinion. It is one of the clearest signs of the thorough identification of English Jews with English feeling that they are influenced by exactly the same causes as those which influence their fellow citizens in similar grades of life ... Their political opinions are determined like those of other Englishmen, by their training, their surroundings, their personal interests and piques ... (they) prove by their sharing the political opinions of their milieu that they do not judge of politics from a Jewish standpoint, but SIMPLY AND PURELY FROM THEIR POSITIONS IN THE MULTIFARIOUS LIFE OF ENGLAND. Their politics are determined by the same causes as those of other Englishmen, and not in any way by their Judaism."⁵⁸ (capitalization mine)

Thus the CHRONICLE makes itself perfectly clear that "We Englishmen who are Jews by religion are Englishmen." And it will be noticed that the clause that we have capitalized in the quote above is emphasized because it represents some kind of initial but accurate understanding of the role that the Jew plays in the majority, and dominant, culture. Elsewhere an editorial⁵⁹ points with pride at the fact that Jews have entered the race for Parliament under both the banners of the Liberal and Conservative parties and that this shows up the "chimera" that Judaism determines their politics:

"... they are too powerfully dominated by the desire to see that party controlling affairs which each (candidate) considers the more calculated to perfect the task successfully, to allow mere considerations of racial pride or interest to influence them." Again and again the CHRONICLE denies that there is anything remotely resembling a "Jewish vote."⁶⁰ And, in 1895, still during the prolonged controversy of anti-Alien Immigration, when (as has been shown) the problem of the Jewish poor was beginning to be controllable, the CHRONICLE readily states that if such anti-Alien legislation comes, even though it has been consistently opposing such legislation, if there would be the necessity to criticize it, "that our criticism will be not entirely from the Jewish point of view, and that we shall not allow national interests to become subservient to Jewish, our readers are quite aware."⁶¹ According to what has been revealed of the CHRONICLE's attitude to the foreign Jewish "alien" immigrant, this comes as no surprise and is quite consistent with its entire position, as we have viewed it. This same sentiment is evident when the CHRONICLE states, again in 1895, "If Parliament found that the Immigration of Jews was highly detrimental to our country — if Parliament found that legislation for restraining and restricting further arrivals was urgently necessary for the sake of the general community — then against any reasonable Bill we should not utter a word."⁶²

Thus it was that immediately after the last battles for political emancipation the Jewish community still felt compelled to define its relationship to the nation. The occasion for these definitions was the heat of the election battles. But throughout the period under investigation the CHRONICLE finds itself constantly

defining the position of the Jews also because of the depiction of Jews, because of the conversionists' activities, and in general because of the "minor" discrimination which the CHRONICLE attributed to the undesirable traits to be found in Jews in England left over from their East European origins. And the reaction found in the CHRONICLE is not only that English Jews are Englishmen, that they are not really different; but there is also a clear current of opinion that Jews are inherently somewhat different, that Jews possess superiority, both because of their religion and because of their "racial" characteristics. There is no attempt on the part of the CHRONICLE to reconcile its notion that English Jews differ from other Englishmen only with regard to their religion and the notion that by virtue of their racial traits Jews are superior.

Speaking of Disraeli soon after his death in 1881, the CHRONICLE maintains that his special talents and "rare combination of qualities which distinguished him and laid the foundation of his successes were eminently characteristic of the race from which he sprung."⁶³ An editorial in 1895 clarifies what our source means here by distinguishing in the Jew "two elements, the religious and the racial, so that when a Jew converts (as in the case of Disraeli) his racial heritage survives the change, and if he then attains pre-eminence it is because of the race from which he sprung."⁶⁴

Other articles further clarify the attitude of the CHRONICLE, and appear also in the first half of the 1880's, when the CHRONICLE seemed to have indulged in defining its position, perhaps due to the facts that political equality had just been won and that the position and reputation of the Jewish community were in great danger

because of the severity of the problem of the Jewish poor. One of these entitled "Jewish Ability" actually maintains that "the Semitic race is more talented than the Aryan race, more practical and sharp-witted" due to their varied and prolonged experience in many civilizations. Then it continues,

"All these causes of Jewish ability assume steadfast adherence of the Jewish race to its ideals. Unless the Jewish feeling had been kept up (none of these causes could have operated) ... Thus in the final resort it is to the Jewish religion that Jewish ability is due, indirectly by enabling these historical causes to operate, and directly by many of its provisions."⁶⁵

Thus, the superiority of the Jew is due to some superior talents and qualities that have been stored up in his religion. In spite of the fact that this same article admits that "the Teutonic nature seems to have been peculiarly incensed by the Semitic cleverness of Lord Beaconsfield," still "with all these drawbacks however, we feel sure that Jews would prefer to be clever, even if they were persecuted for it, than to live dull and inglorious lives." It seems that our source does not remember that the East European Jew, not especially known for his cleverness, is nevertheless persecuted.

To continue to reveal this idea of hereditary superiority, the CHRONICLE elsewhere asserts that the reason that Jewish children do so well in the schools, is not because of knowledge of their tradition, because most Jews now are ignorant of it; but it is due to the "hereditary love of learning implanted by the rabbis and by the Talmud" and to oppression which has "sharpened their minds and made them rely on their own inner resources and opportunities."⁶⁶ In an editorial dealing with the Jews of the East End, the Jewish poor, in

order to encourage the community in its task of anglicizing them, the CHRONICLE appeals to the "spiritual fountain" in every Jewish heart "whose waters never fail ..."⁶⁷

Other attitudes of superiority are that Judaism is more rational than the Christian religion⁶⁸ and even boasts that Dr. Gibbon has published statistics "testifying to the extra longevity and healthfulness of the Jew, due, in large measure ... to the observance of their dietary enactments."⁶⁹ And if this would not be enough, the CHRONICLE publishes an article in toto by "the professor of Natural Science at Geneva and the celebrated naturalist, Karl Vogt," which appeared in the FRANKFURTER ZEITUNG. Our source calls attention to its great truths and lets the Professor speak on its behalf. Professor Vogt writes a superb apotheosis of the Jew and his abilities, his moral excellence, his talents at becoming prosperous, even stating that if there were only Jews in Europe, everything would improve all at once, the status of the arts and sciences likewise and all national debts would disappear. How else, concludes the professor, could the Jews have attained all that he did if it were not for his shrewdness, his intelligence in getting control of the money market and of banking, control of the press and professions by virtue of his greater industry, energy, thrift and his blameless family life. But just look at the German nation who squanders its wealth on drinking, lacks the intelligence or desire to cultivate itself and thus shows itself to be the descendants of the barbaric hordes which could not hold a candle to the Jews centuries ago, etc., etc.⁷⁰ After reading such panegyrics what could the German do except to go out and kill a Jew or two? The CHRONICLE's greater restraint in its depiction of

the Jew and his abilities would not, of course, have quite the same effect.

Thus it was that the CHRONICLE shows an over-identification with the English people and at the same time, to meet other equally important needs, claims superiority for Jews, for their racial traits and for their religion. As a result we find our source claiming that Jews as Englishmen are not really different and at the same time maintaining that they are, to some degree at least, inherently different.

With regard to other matters also the attitude of the CHRONICLE can be seen to be identified with the attitude of the ruling groups of the Anglo-Jewish community which in turn was an over-identification with the attitude of the ruling groups of England. This over-identification, or ANGLIFICATION a la Britain, can be understood to be what may be called a COMMITMENT to English life, to its system of government and even to its imperialistic policy. In this connection, the vehement attitude of the CHRONICLE toward Jewish moneylenders can be brought up as a good example, as can the adoption of the hard and fast standards of Free Trade as against Protectionism. Our source even states that Judaism is traditionally on the side of the former.⁷¹

First, the CHRONICLE exemplifies this phenomenon which we have termed "out-Britishing the British," in connection with commitment to English life, in the following excerpt from an editorial note in 1895,

"The voice of the alien was heard in the land ... at the great mass meeting held at the Assembly Hall, Mile End ... A finer, better conducted, more earnest or more attentive meeting, it could not be possible to conceive ... the mark of stolid determination which characterized the proceedings throughout, these made

it hard to believe that THIS WAS A JEWISH GATHERING AT MILE END, AND NOT SAY A MASS MEETING SUCH AS CAN BE SEEN IN BIRMINGHAM, LEEDS OR NEWCASTLE ..."⁷² (capitalization mine)

In the same category is the statement by a correspondent of the CHRONICLE in a report on the East End Scheme in which he criticizes the Anglo-Jewish community for not accepting the decision of the majority in the matter of this proposal, as is proper for Englishmen to do; and then he says, "in this respect we Jews are not yet Englishmen ... The fault lies in our want of reserve ..."⁷³

This form of ANGLIFICATION is carried on to apply to England's form of government,

"We have enjoyed in England

Fair peace with freedom crowned,
thanks, under Providence, to the matchless
constitution under which it is our happiness
to live ... We may learn a lesson from the
countries around us as to the value of a
Constitutional Monarchy. While Austro-Hungary,
Holland, Belgium, Italy, Sweden and Portugal
are prosperous and happy, France and Spain
are in the throes of political uneasiness
... let us keep the old fortress of our
freedom in its ancient form — the fortress
based on the liberty of a strong people,
buttressed by a dignified nobility, and
crowned by a beloved dynasty."⁷⁴

In an article, "Judaism and Politics in America,"⁷⁵ the CHRONICLE makes the point that a constitution on the British model is the panacea for the political evils found in foreign countries; and to prove its point it states that it is unfortunate that—unlike the dynastic constitutional monarchies, as in England—the president of the United States is not above petty strife and popular agitation but subject to the disturbances and indignities of popular elections. In fact, argues an editorial, the history of Judaism proves that Jews and Judaism fare best under government by party and limited monarchy as in

England: for in totalitarian states Jews are subject to the State and to the Church, and in republics, like the United States, "it is a generally recognized fact that the Jew deteriorates intellectually under the Republican regime — and this is markedly shown by the circumstances than when more than the average intelligent skill is required, importation from England or Germany usually takes place."⁷⁶ Consequently, it is to be concluded, what more proof does one need that the English type of government is the best.

Next, this form of ANGELIFICATION is illustrated in the CHRONICLE's commitment to England's foreign policy. Our source in 1874 readily condemns Russia for her fervent desire to move southward and invade Constantinople⁷⁷ — and it must be remembered here that then England's foreign policy was still largely determined by what it thought was the necessity of maintaining its commercial routes to India through the Suez Canal at all costs. Thus England wanted above all stability in the Balkan and East Mediterranean area so that Russia would have no excuse for marching south and endangering the Suez. Therefore, both the CHRONICLE⁷⁸ and many of the top leaders of the Anglo-Jewish community⁷⁹ were more than willing to have England's imperialistic policy protect the Jews of Romania by intervening in that government. And in an editorial note in 1885 the editors congratulate the Council of the Anglo-Jewish Association for their handling, together with the Board of Deputies, the Romanian persecution situation by sending a delegation to the Foreign Secretary with the purpose of "soliciting the good offices of the British government on behalf of the Roumanian Jews."⁸⁰ And the same editorial remarks that six years ago a similar deputation was successful and

that the Secretary himself thought the protest which was subsequently made was most proper because England, in being one of the powers who helped to establish Romania as a state, has "brought the right to say what we have said." In the same editorial we see that the only reason that the editors are not hopeful for intervention in Romania by the British government is because of the political ties between England and the other powers of the Multiple Control -- which included Russia.

The hesitation that England should in no way get in Russia's way or to antagonize her is a common theme in the pages of our source. In 1881, for example, in the retrospect of the year, the CHRONICLE asserts, "Unfortunately, it is not within the competence of the English government to interfere in the internal affairs of so powerful and so jealous a power as Russia."⁸¹ The only instance of any kind of protest or intervention by the government of England was in the case of a British Jew (Lewisohn) who was ordered to leave St. Petersburg on the ground of being a Jew; but when England protested that he was a British subject and that Russia had violated a treaty with England, he was allowed to stay.⁸² But throughout all the years of persecution of the Jews by Russia (within the period of our investigation), with the numberless pages of first hand, eye-witness accounts of the brutalities and inhuman treatment of Jews in that land, neither the CHRONICLE nor the Jewish ruling classes it represented ever took a firm stand and asked that the British government make some protest. And in 1894 all the CHRONICLE can bring itself to say, at the end of one long period of Russian persecution is:

"Neither Europe nor America felt called on activity to interfere. Civilisation was shocked, but civilisation does not wage war

with cannon except when it is itself attacked. Protests and words were uttered which may one day have their effect. Up to the present their influence has been that of pop-gun pellets on the hide of one of the greater carnivora."⁸³

The pessimism and resignation shown here were the product of having experienced several giant protest meetings and having supported them to the fullest extent. Such a meeting at Guildhall was held in 1890. It was attended by thousands and the land's highest dignitaries were either there or they made known their sympathy to the cause of the persecuted Jews in Russia immediately before the meeting. The CHRONICLE, in a special supplement⁸⁴ devoted entirely to the Guildhall Meeting, quotes each word spoken and describes each event, in a lengthy, unbridged article by a special correspondent. Representatives from the government, from the royal family and from the Church — all non-Jews — speak eloquently on behalf of the persecuted, without however antagonizing Russia in any way whatsoever. The undercurrent is that such a protest to the czar cannot fail to produce results simply because he is thus asked. The CHRONICLE itself states that the keynote of the Guildhall Meeting was "because we have faith in the gentle and noble character of the Czar, we appeal to him for his personal interference to save the Russian Jews from their present miserable condition."⁸⁵ The Lord Mayor of London closes the meeting with this sentiment, "I only hope that the eloquent words to which we have listened, and the unanimous voice of the citizens of this city (London), may reach the Czar of Russia, and may convince him that we are in earnest in the cause which we have undertaken — (Cheers)." This is the most that THE representatives of "culture" and of "civilization" could do for the victims of persecution in

Russia.

And the CHRONICLE in an editorial on the Meeting⁸⁶ supports the whole affair to the hilt. It really believes that protest meetings and public indignation do the trick, and gives as evidence for this the result of the Mansion House Meeting to protest the persecutions in Russia during the previous decade. These, the editorial maintains, "attained their end": the outrages stopped, the government official most responsible for them (Ignatieff) was dismissed, and so on. It is possible, the editorial concludes, that this meeting will accomplish the same. This is one more step, it promises, in the accumulated force of European protests that will end in breaking this persecution, the force "to which the bolts and bars of the Russian ghetto must ultimately give way."

But it was Sidney Wolff at a meeting of the Anglo-Jewish Association in 1881 who delved to the root of the matter when he said, "It was quite in accord with the present political notions to bully a small state like Roumania and to keep silent when a great state like Russia was guilty of similar misdeeds."⁸⁷

All that the CHRONICLE can do throughout the period of the persecutions in Russia is to report and give credence to reports of new, liberal trends of Nicholas II during the several years after his becoming czar in 1894. Jewish subjects of the czar, the CHRONICLE announces, "will quickly be stirred to feelings of utmost loyalty as they perceive the tokens of a policy of good will towards them. We rejoice to observe that already there are signs ..."⁸⁸ Several months later our source finds comfort in verbal promises: "there was an opportunity ... to enquire as to the attitude that would

likely to be adopted under the new Tsar toward the Jews, satisfactory assurances were given, which were accepted in good faith; and we see no reason whatever why any doubt should be expressed regarding those assurances."⁸⁹

The CHRONICLE is optimistic because of what it takes out to be good evidence of religious tolerance by the new czar insofar as he himself stated to the Polish delegation that religious tolerance will be the keynote of his regime. Then the conclusion is, "to Nicholas ... therefore we look with confidence to extend to his Jewish subjects the blessings of an enlightened rule."⁹⁰ Since the CHRONICLE believed that one of the two major solutions to the Jewish problem was improvement of the national policy of a government, then, as far as the CHRONICLE is concerned, it is obvious that whenever a government or its ruler gives assurance by word or by communication, one can rest securely in the belief that one solution is actually in operation already or will be soon afterwards. Even though, in the very first issues of 1895, our source, as it has consistently maintained or implied, admitted that Russia's policy of persecution during the last thirteen years "cannot be defended" and that it forces Russia's "Western champions" to think that "all is not for the best in the land of the Tsar," yet in the same article there is hope expressed that now with the "new" policy of the new czar, one of the last barriers between Russian and Western genius will be swept away.⁹¹ In the previous issue we find the sentiment of gratitude that, with the "new" policy which the new czar has promised, "Rapprochement" between England and Russia is now fully developed.⁹² The reasons why our source speaks as though it would want to defend

Russia and why it uses the phrase "Western champions" as ostensibly referring to England, cannot be ascertained from the data or opinions in the CHRONICLE. The reasons why our source is eager to witness the development of intimate relationship with Russia is also not clear from material in our source. Perhaps the CHRONICLE reflects the desire of the British government and nation at this time (mid 1890's) to make Russia a friend due to the fact that England's "splendid isolation" over the years had by that time left her friendless and the fact that the economic competition of Germany was then forcing her to find important friends. But whatever the reasons, it is interesting, even pathetic, that the CHRONICLE has conveniently put aside the spectre of the persecution of Russian Jews in its seeking to make excuses for and to attain a reconciliation with Russia.

But why does the CHRONICLE put so much faith in promises? Why does it place so much confidence in "the gentle and noble character of the Czar?"⁹³ Why does the CHRONICLE readily condone⁹⁴ the many Russian Jewish refugees in London (who did not want to become British citizens) swarming to the Great Synagogue in December of 1894 to take their oath of allegiance to the new czar, Nicholas II? Why does it, with understanding and approval, rationalize the eagerness of these Jews to do this by saying that the "Jewish heart possesses a remarkable power of forgiving, if not forgetting the past"⁹⁵ and by declaring that "...loyalty to sovereign authority ... is a characteristic feature of the Jewish race, as it is one of the foremost duties of their religious code?"⁹⁶ Why does not the CHRONICLE raise a voice of protest when the Chief Rabbi offi-

ciated at the taking of the oath of allegiance to the new czar, when with such ceremony psalms were sung, and when the Chief Rabbi sermonized,

"...even if you were not able to take this oath of fidelity and allegiance, the duty would still rest upon you in virtue of your being subjects of the Russian Empire ... Our holy faith ... enjoins the duty of love for our country ... and many a Russian Jew, who has sought refuge in every quarter of the globe still turns wistful eyes and longing heart to the spot where the cradle of his infancy stood and where the ashes of his kindred repose?"

It may be conjectured that, because the CHRONICLE in these matters thus showed a willingness to overlook and to put out of mind the treatment of the Jews in Russia, the answer lies in a situation beyond persecution of the Jews by Russia, to a situation beyond the Jewish community of England or even of Russia. Most likely this situation consisted of the exigencies of Britain's foreign policy as it is related by the government to Russia. And this policy in some way dictated that, either because Russia was a powerful factor in European politics or a needed ally against Germany or because Russia had to be kept from encroaching upon India, the leaders of England would not in any manner antagonize or oppose Russia on any grounds other than the interests of the imperialistic policy of England alone. And thus many groups in England found they had to adopt England's foreign policy as a matter of patriotism (much like support of Nationalist China is a test of American patriotism to-day), — especially such groups as the Jewish community whose middle and upper classes were determined to be one hundred per cent patriotic.

However, there was another factor which enters into the picture here, which had the result of committing to it those who felt they had to be patriotic. The CHRONICLE lets us know this other very important factor in its editorial commenting on the Guildhall Meeting. It quotes what it refers to as the "eloquent letter" of Cardinal Manning to Sir John Simon (a leader of the Jewish community) in lieu of his not being able to personally attend the protest meeting:

"The personal and domestic virtues of the Czar (Alexander III) are indeed a sure pledge that he is incapable of harshness to the least of his subjects; and the illustrious lady who shares his throne, like her royal sister, to whom all Englishmen are chivalrously devoted, is a supreme guarantee of the imperial justice and clemency."⁹⁸

And similarly in 1894 the CHRONICLE notes with much pleasure, in an editorial⁹⁹ on the new czar, Nicholas II, the Chief Rabbi's emphasis, at the oath taking ceremony in the Great Synagogue, on the relation of Nicholas with England's royalty: the czar had just married the granddaughter of Queen Victoria. Therefore, it seems safe to involve the close ties between the ruling houses of England and Russia as a factor in the failure of the CHRONICLE — together with the leaders of the Anglo-Jewish community — to agitate for the British government to criticize or to strongly censure the czar for his treatment of the Jews — remembering that the severe persecutions of the Jews occurred under Alexander III and Nicholas II. For to do this would be to assail the person and character of the czar, and thus indirectly also England's beloved royal family. And neither the CHRONICLE nor the Jewish community were going to be out-Britished in their

love and loyalty to the royal family of England. And if the marriages between the two royal families was arranged for political convenience and expediency, then even more so would it be forbidden for patriotic Englishmen to criticize or have criticized the ruler of Russia with a denunciation equal to the magnitude of the crimes of the state. And, consequently, there is with some probability here another manifestation of the CHRONICLE's commitment and over-identification with England's system of imperialism -- and only some probability is admitted because of the fact that much is conjecture in this matter. But that this manifestation is a factor can be admitted on the ground that, without violating any other evidence extant, it accounts for much of the inconsistent and illogical attitudes toward Russia and toward its rulers.

Solution of "The Jewish Problem": Zionism vs. Nationalism

For the CHRONICLE, being a Jew was a problem with many complications. By the mid 1890's, the problem of the foreign Jewish poor had been alleviated by the first stages of ANGLIFICATION of the two large groups of immigrants who had come en mass in the first half of the 1880's and in the beginning of the 1890's. And evidence of this initial stage is present in the issues of our source by 1895; especially noteworthy is the editorial note in which the editors express great pride in the British manner in which Jewish aliens conducted their meeting and in their British appearance.¹⁰⁰ Certainly, by 1895, because of the efforts of the community and because the Jew in England was not isolated from non-Jews, it is logical that the pro-

cesses of anglicizing the "alien" Jewish immigrant had begun to work with at least some success. And thus the tension in the CHRONICLE is somewhat relaxed, and there is a breath of relief felt in its pages beginning with the middle years of the 90's. It will be remembered that our source's opposition to government restriction of the "alien" was traced, in part, to this improved situation. Thus at this time the CHRONICLE was beginning to feel that the position, reputation, and interests of the established Anglo-Jewish community were beginning to be safe.

Then Theodor Herzl sent forth his JUDENSTAAT in 1896 and even presented some aspects of his proposal in a special article in the CHRONICLE.¹⁰¹ And it is not difficult to ascertain the reaction of the CHRONICLE together with that of the established Anglo-Jewish community to this solution of the problem of persecution and discrimination.

Neither is it difficult to ascertain their attitude to Palestine before the appearance of the JUDENSTAAT. Previous to this time, the CHRONICLE as spokesman for the established orthodox community showed concern and consideration towards Palestine as the place of our origin, the home of the prophets and the land of the Messianic future. The reasons for this consisted largely in the fact that the Anglo-Jewish community remained orthodox because the existence and continuance of their orthodoxy was encouraged and buttressed by the religious orthodoxy of England as this manifested itself in the Church of England. And thus there was no social compulsion to forsake tradition, either the Biblical or the Rabbinical traditions, especially since the Hebrew Bible in the form of the Old Testament was

accepted by the Church as divinely revealed. This religious structure of English life therefore permitted the Anglo-Jewish community to retain a way of religious life that may easily be classified within the limits of orthodoxy.

Consequently, a positive attitude toward the land of their ancestors was integrally involved in the thinking and feeling of the Jewish community of England and of the CHRONICLE. However there was almost an obsession on their part to avoid any indications of divided allegiance to the British government because it was thought that suspicion of such an allegiance was the major obstacle to overcome so that complete emancipation and equality could be had, according to an admission by the CHRONICLE itself.¹⁰² Thus we find in 1881, when speaking of the racial traits of Disraeli that won for him so much success, an editorial note maintains that, as all good English Jews, those who feel close to Palestine are not unpatriotic. Just look at Disraeli! His love for Palestine made him even more patriotic because his interest in that land led him to strengthen England's position in the Near East.¹⁰³ And in 1885 another note says that the solution to the dual loyalty problem has been offered by the Prince of Wales, in reaction to remarks in a Hungarian anti-Semitic newspaper while abroad, who asserted that Moses Montefiore was the best proof "to anti-Semites in Hungary and elsewhere that a Jew can at one and the same time be attached to the land of his ancestors, and loyal to the ruler of the country of his adoption."¹⁰⁴ In 1895 a note states, "The movement of the Jews towards the Holy Land is a natural one, and of the highest interest," and then shows great interest in developments there, in the literature about Pales-

time and even in the Hoveve Zion,¹⁰⁵ who for the CHRONICLE embody this interest and nostalgia for the land of their ancestors.

Now, after the appearance of Herzl's plan, the CHRONICLE does not throw away these attitudes which had to be defined to permit adherence to Judaism and at the same time to avoid any suspicion of divided allegiance. Thus while discussing Herzl's scheme, together with others, the CHRONICLE still emphasizes the importance of implementing resettlement.¹⁰⁶ Elsewhere it agrees to some "legally assured home" in Palestine ... that the Jewish colonies should be absolutely unfettered in the Holy Land is an objective for which we have ever contended.¹⁰⁷ And when first discussing the JUDENSTAAT the idea of resettlement and return is quite acceptable.¹⁰⁸

However, concerning the scheme of Herzl, our source rejects it as a solution to the "Jewish Problem." Its position with regard to this solution is unambiguously defined in an editorial note in 1897,

"Zionism and Nationalism are, in fact, not only not identical, they are even antagonistic ... The one returns to the past, which it would restore, the other looks to the future, which it would strengthen and idealize ... The one throws itself on the material and the physical, the other on the spiritual and the religious. Zionism, taken in its true sense, is quite compatible with colonising zeal, indeed among the friends and supporters of colonisation have been Jews who reject the national idea with unmeasured scorn ... Zion was necessary to give the mission of Judaism its starting point; and the Diaspora... was needed to provide a scope for the mission. Thus, finally, while Nationalism narrows and degrades the notion of the Jewish mission, Zionism is compatible, nay, is essentially bound up with an aspiration towards glorifying and widening the mission, for which alone

Israel was chosen of God, for which alone Israel survives ... Judaism is safe even from the allurements of a Sham Nationalism, while Zionism is a word calling Israel to realise its destiny and its duty."¹⁰⁹

And again the CHRONICLE makes the distinction, "We have given reasons why we do not regard the formation of a Jewish State as quite identical with the nationalisation of the Jews ..."¹¹⁰

This position of the CHRONICLE is quite consistent with what has been ascertained of its attitudes throughout this thesis. We have seen how the Anglo-Jewish community prepared and armed itself against anything that might endanger its position, reputation or interests, a task which the CHRONICLE readily helped. We have seen the extent to which both the CHRONICLE and the community were committed to the structure of English life and to its institutions and to what extent they went to avoid any indications of dual loyalty. That is, there was, as seen in our source, a supreme effort to constantly strengthen the ANGLIFICATION of the Jewish community together with a similar effort to resist anything which might weaken it. Consequently the total activity of the Anglo-Jewish community was directed toward, not Palestine, but toward their adopted home in England. The community saw its future in the Diaspora and thus became Diaspora-oriented. Though orthodox in its religious life, nevertheless, the traditional hope for return of all Jews to the land of their forefathers had to be adjusted to this orientation; and consequently there is a resultant emphasis solely on the prophetic mission of Judaism.

In the quote above, the CHRONICLE clearly distinguishes between Zionism and nationalism and rejects only the latter because it

would destroy the mission that Israel is to fulfill — and of course which English Jews can especially fulfill because of their high morality and culture and because of their prosperity and influence throughout the world. The CHRONICLE in many other places clarifies further this reason for rejecting any solution of the "Jewish Problem" that relies on the concept of the Jews being a nation. An editorial states that "the Jews are not a nation ... (but are) a religious community ..."¹¹¹ Now, even though in other places our source seems to believe that there are more than religious ties that bind all Jews together¹¹² (this inconsistency explained perhaps only by the fact that in those places the CHRONICLE is very intent on engendering a feeling of kinship for the "alien" immigrant Jews on the part of English Jews), still the predominant idea is that Jews are a religious community. This was exemplified in the insistence that English Jews differ from English Christians only with regard to their religion. Jews are a religious community with a mission to save mankind¹¹³ and therefore are destined to remain among the nations to teach them about God.¹¹⁴ This is the future self-fulfillment of Israel and not any schemes of becoming a nation again; and thus, as the CHRONICLE thinks Herzl does, he yields to the fashion of becoming a nation like all the others.¹¹⁵ Herzl's scheme is rejected because he casts aside the Messiah,¹¹⁶ because he thinks that the Biblical prophecies will be fulfilled by "a Joint-Stock Company with \$10,000,000."¹¹⁷ His plan is unacceptable because it is a political scheme and not a religious program.¹¹⁸ Nationalism in any form, so the CHRONICLE reasons, means death to these deathless ideals. And what has nationalism brought? In

September, 1897, the CHRONICLE wrote, while commenting on the first Zionist Congress,

"The Jewish question remains exactly where it was before Dr. Herzl ... It will not be solved by artificial attempts to convert the religious consciousness of Judaism into a pseudo-nationalism. Prophecy will be fulfilled in God's own way. But in the meantime, the Jews, instead of wasting their energies on the unattainable, must concentrate them on an effort to live up to those of the ideals of their religion which are well within their reach ..."¹¹⁹

Nationalism is not only rejected because it thus threatens the mission of Israel, which is the CHRONICLE's way of saying that it endangers their position and future in England, but also because above all it would mean that Jews have a divided allegiance and a dual loyalty, if they actually are a nation. And it has been seen to what extent the CHRONICLE goes to avoid any suspicion or appearance of this. It states elsewhere,

"The Jews belong to the nations in whose midst they live, if they share the national aspirations, if they work for the national aims, participate in the national life and have no international league with the Jews of other nations. All these conditions are fulfilled by 'Israel among the nations.'"¹²⁰

And agreeing with the expressed thoughts of Claude Montefiore, the CHRONICLE states,

"...the national aspiration of a section of modern Jews is a retrograde and regrettable phenomenon — this view is shared by a large number of our co-religionists. The same difficulty lies at the root of Dr. Herzl's scheme. Jews have for centuries been learning to throw off the national idea, to merge their patriotisms in the patriotisms of other peoples. Have they succeeded? Surely ... in overflowing measure. This is the initial obstacle to all these new schemes."¹²¹

And our source also thinks that schemes of nationalism are regrettable because "Nationalism, so far from offering an escape from anti-Semitism, is the avenue to it."¹²² And the CHRONICLE agrees with the following statement made by Oswald J. Simon: "And my belief is that so soon as it could be shown that the energies of the Jewish race were concentrated upon the spiritual mission which ... alone justifies their separateness, the voice of anti-Semitism would be silenced forever."¹²³ Certainly, the CHRONICLE is thus saying that Herzl's scheme offers no solution to the "Jewish Problem"; in fact, it would only serve to make it worse. A more practical scheme would be emigration of some Russian Jews to colonies and the liberal development of coardon.¹²⁴

The CHRONICLE also rejects Herzl's scheme of nationalism because it thinks he overaggregates the permanence of anti-Semitism in the world and bases his plan on this false premise. In an editorial¹²⁵ commenting on Herzl's article, written especially for the CHRONICLE and especially for Anglo-Jewry (A "Solution of the Jewish Question"¹²⁶) our source states,

"Here he takes a dark and discouraging view. He sees in anti-Semitism a deep-seated and lasting tendency for the elimination or the neutralisation of which there is absolutely no hope ... He bids us prepare for an ever fiercer and more general outbreak ... From these catastrophes there is, in his view, no possible escape, unless the Jews deliberately determine to remove themselves from the storm-laden atmosphere. We find it ourselves hard to accept these gloomy prognostications."

Thus, to our source, because of Herzl's view on the future of the Jews, his is

"a scheme of despair, wrung from him as the only possible antidote to anti-Semitism ...

It is conceived moreover mainly in the interests of the Jews, for whom deliverance from their present troubles is to be found only in the reestablishment of a Jewish State, either in Palestine, or elsewhere."¹²⁷

Two months later an editorial note continues to attack Herzl on the matter of his theory of anti-Semitism,

"And Dr. Herzl postulates that anti-Semitism always arises when the Jews become gathered in appreciable quantities. There is a good deal to support this theory. But IT IS AN OBVIOUS THEORY TO ACCEPT (capitalization mine). Are we to admit that, in spite of consummate virtues, Jews have only to be numerous to be hated? ... Unhappy beings, debased and degraded by oppression, may make themselves hated when they are too numerous to be disregarded, but ENLIGHTENED, TRULY RELIGIOUS, AND PATRIOTIC JEWS WILL, WE HOPE AND TRUST, IN ENLIGHTENED COUNTRIES BE ABLE TO SHOW THEIR FELLOW CITIZENS THAT THEY ARE WORTHY AND HELPFUL ASSOCIATES."¹²⁸ (capitalization mine)

Obviously, from what we have learned about the attitudes of the CHRONICLE and even from the context of this excerpt, it is not difficult to comprehend the intention of this editorial note to place the blame for anti-Semitism on such as the East European Jews: anglicized Jews could never offend or cause hatred. Moreover, concludes the CHRONICLE in the same place, "It has not been proved that when both these requisites exist (i.e. enlightened Jews and enlightened Christians), any increase in the number of Jews can cause a real or permanent Judenhetze," — obviously maintaining this without the insight which events of the twentieth century must impart.

In the same issue an editorial asks, is prejudice and anti-Semitism like a

"passing storm ... or does it represent a deep and irresistible current which must ever and anon work its destructive progress? ... But we

cannot believe that the battle of religious liberty ... will be lost because for a time Europe has become a hot-bed of struggling and antagonistic nations ... We cannot away with the hope that the Hebrew prophets dreamed no vain vision when they foresaw the coming reign of peace and brotherhood."¹²⁹

Thus it is clear that for the CHRONICLE to admit Herzl's position would be tantamount to denying what it has consistently asserted: the permanence of the security of the Jew in England and the superiority of English life and government. For our source to concede the truth of Herzl's theory would be to admit that the position of the Jewish community is actually precarious indeed, with the possibility that at any moment the specter of anti-Semitism would haunt the English Jews too.

But the CHRONICLE asserts over and over again that anti-Semitism is not permanent and that in fact it is slowly dying out. Herzl, maintains our source, has overexaggerated the real nature of anti-Semitism in Austria, which is the reason for his scheme; but anti-Semitism there is really "partly anti-Capitalism, partly anti-liberalism, and partly general obscurantism."¹³⁰ In reality, anti-Semitism is only a shadow of what it was, "and there are many indications that Austrian anti-Semitism is not an outcome of deeply-rooted feelings, but is rather an accompaniment of the general unrest from which Austria has of late been suffering."¹³¹ In the review of events of the year 1897 the CHRONICLE is sure that anti-Semitism is dying out and points as proof to the fact that the biggest anti-Semites have been jailed or fined, that outbreaks are only sporadic now, and that they are put down by the government.¹³² And thus, our source argues, when such men as Herzl misconceive of the

real nature of events, then we can understand how "persecution has driven sober and business-like Jews to the conclusion that tolerance is an impossible dream, and that the Jews have no other hope of reasonable happiness than may be won by yielding to the prevailing fashion and becoming a nation themselves once more."¹³³

What we therefore find is that the CHRONICLE speaks complacently through its prosperity and British citizenship. Herzl's scheme has the effect of threatening, in the mind of the CHRONICLE, its commitments to English life and to its institutions. And it readily admitted that this was true when it stated in an editorial, in 1896, that "the Jews of England are too hopeful of their present prospects to believe that so radical a change as a revived Nationality is either feasible or desirable."¹³⁴ And in the same editorial, in answer to the criticism of English Jewry's unfavorable reaction to Herzl's scheme, the editors maintain that it is not true that the "Anglo-Jewish public has dismissed with a sneer the whole of the proposals for founding a Jewish State," and concludes with this belief about "Jewish solidarity,"

"... why should it not mean that, despite differences in thought and belief, Jews can, nevertheless, sympathize as a whole with the feelings of any particular section of Jews? Jewish solidarity would justify itself, in the highest sense, if it taught them that their own point of view, however elevated it may be, is not the only coin of ventage from which to survey the world's horizon."

And, in conclusion, this is exactly the position that the CHRONICLE takes with regard to any solution which proposes the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine: that it is all right for the persecuted Jews, especially those of Russia and Poland, of

Hungary, Persia or Tunisia, but it can never be conceived to be a solution for the British Jews who in no way stand in need of a refuge. Especially such a scheme as Herzl's, simply because it would have all Jews become a nation again, can never be, and must never be, thought of as a solution for British Jews who belong to one nation and one alone, the British nation. Herzl's plan, for the CHRONICLE, is no solution to the "Jewish Problem", but would only intensify and perpetuate it. In fact, in all fairness to the CHRONICLE and to the English-Jewish ruling classes, the British Jews (at least during the years of 1870 - 1897) need no such radical solution because Anglo-Jewry has no really great or difficult problems. ANGLIFICATION, as far as it was concerned, will take care of its few "minor" problems.

Chapter Five

EPILOGUE

To conclude, then, the over-all theme of the CHRONICLE can be said to be ANGLIFICATION. This has been seen to have meant first that the CHRONICLE fully supported and condoned the established authority structure of the Anglo-Jewish community, itself patterned along the lines of the structure and established authority of the English community and nation. Therefore, we have asserted that the CHRONICLE was identified with and committed to the institutions and sources of authority of both the Anglo-Jewish and the English communities. In other words, the CHRONICLE identified itself with all bases of authority of both communal structures. For Anglo-Jewry, ANGLIFICATION thus represented this patterning of the Jewish community after the British. It represented both the solutions to the problems of English-Jewish life and also its norms as structuralized in its institutions. And this structure is what our source identified itself with.

ANGLIFICATION secondly meant the policy of bringing to bear all means of authority and communal agencies to anglicize the Jewish community more and more; and when a foreign, unassimilated mass of refugees attached itself to the community, this process of ANGLIFICATION was intensified to meet the challenge. To this too the CHRONICLE committed itself.

Thus did the CHRONICLE adopt and assimilate the attitudes and policies of the ruling classes of both communal structures,

the middle and upper classes. Our source represents an acceptance of these ruling echelons of English life and at the same time also of necessity an acceptance of the institutions of its own community since these constituted the only basis for providing the status and authority of the Anglo-Jewish ruling elements. As spokesman for the middle and upper classes of its own immediate society, the CHRONICLE to this extent is limited as a source, unless history be made out to be something confined to the viewpoints and notions of those in control and in positions of authority. The CHRONICLE is limited in this manner especially because it has little conscious and expressed awareness of the real nature of its involvement and commitment.¹

It is not difficult to find fault and to criticize in such matters, even though one who evaluates a source for history may understand this purely social phenomenon which stems from fears and illusions concerning life and its challenges, or from misguided solutions of life and its problems. The nature of the involvement and commitment of Anglo-Jewry stemmed from its attempt to solve the problems consequent to living both as Jews and as Englishmen among a dominant society of English Christians, such problems as loyalty, status, defense and livelihood. A greater portion of these solutions as structuralized took on the nature of defensive phenomena, especially since the recently won political emancipation gave Anglo-Jewry its best opportunity for status and livelihood. In the present thesis, the solution to the problem of the Jewish poor was implemented in terms of defense and protection rather than the mutual needs of the immigrants and the total community. And

the fears and misconceptions of the ruling classes of Anglo-Jewry brought about the situation in which it found itself having to care for and to anglicize the East European Jews. But they not only antagonized the British Jews but became the concern of Anglo-Jewry, it seems, mainly because unassimilated and un-anglicized the foreign poor represented a constant threat to what the Jewish community wanted to defend and to protect at all costs, — even at the expense of real consideration of fellow Jews.

Still the important question is, if such a significant source for Anglo-Jewish history as the CHRONICLE is limited to the extent that it is committed as has been described and, what is of equal consequence, that it is almost unaware of its involvement, what is the standard by which even a comparatively objective history can be written? Can one escape the pitfalls in which the present source is found? How can objective history be attempted, since the one who wants to evaluate sources in order to understand or write history himself cannot escape the involvements and commitments of his age and of his social milieu? Perhaps the one who evaluates the CHRONICLE is merely viewing it through his own time and society. Certainly this must be true because it is society and its culture alone which provides its members with the tools of knowledge, with the modes of conceiving life and all reality. The only solution, then, lies in the direction of first becoming aware of one's own involvements, commitments and prejudices, and then seeing to it that one is able to deal with them all as one aspect of the major factors involved in the total situation which is being investigated.

And this is of the highest urgency because to the extent that one fails to realize and then not take into account these commitments, he is thus adopting the attitudes and behavior patterns of the ruling classes of society. And very often in adopting these from the ruling groups of society, the ruling Jewish classes themselves adopt not only what maintains the power of the controlling groups over the lower classes, but also what often results in the exploitation or the elimination of Jews, both the rulers and the ruled, and of the Jewish community. Therefore, to the extent that the leaders of the Jewish community adopt ways of thinking and living which, when threatened with decline or disintegration, can conveniently be salvaged or saved by using the Jew for ignoble and cruel purposes, — to this extent do those, such as the CHRONICLE who support and further the aims of the ruling groups, aid in the discrimination or persecution of the Jews. To be aware of this is the first necessary step toward a solution of it.

REFERENCES

Chapter Two

1. Julian Goldsmid. "Berkeley Street Synagogue" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 13, 1874, p. 827.
2. a. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 23, 1885, p. 5.
b. "The Berkeley Street Congregation" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 23, 1874, p. 844.
3. "The Board of Deputies and the Berkeley Street Congregation" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 30, 1874, p. 733f.
4. "Progress Without Party" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 25, 1895, p. 14.
5. "Board of Deputies and Jewish Marriage Registrars" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 26, 1897, p. 13.
6. "Retrospect of the Year" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 11, 1874. pp. 382-383.
7. "Constitution of the Board of Deputies - Admission of the Representatives of the Berkeley Street Congregation" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 26, 1873. pp. 648-650.
8. "The Board of Deputies" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 26, 1873, p. 653f.
9. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 23, 1885, p. 5.
10. Ibid., #6.
11. "The Marriage Law" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 3, 1873, p. 445f.
12. Ibid., #7.
13. Ibid., #2a and 2b.
14. Ibid., #7.
15. "Board of Deputies" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 23, 1885, p. 12.
16. Ibid., #7.
17. Ibid., #15.

18. a. *Ibid.*, #7.
b. "Berkeley Street Synagogue" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 13, 1874, p. 287.
19. "The Approach to Union" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 30, 1873, p. 115.
20. "The Board of Deputies" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 26, 1873, p. 653f.
21. "The Berkeley Street Congregation" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 6, 1874, p. 812.
22. "Berkeley Street Congregation and Board of Deputies" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 27, 1874, p. 864f.
23. *Ibid.*, #7.
24. "Berkeley Street Congregation" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 20, 1874, p. 752.
25. "The Marriage Law" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 31, 1873, p. 445f.
26. *Ibid.*, #7.
27. "Unity - Not Uniformity" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 7, 1890, p. 6.
28. "New West End Synagogue Religious Classes - Proposed 'Progressive Party'" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 18, 1895, p. 9f.
29. "The Year 1873" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 2, 1874, p. 688f.
30. "The Rabbinate Question" (Jewish Chronicle). London, November 21, 1890, p. 62.
31. "The Rav and the Beth Din" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 5, 1890, p. 11.
32. "A Momentous Debate" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 9, 1890, p. 13.
33. *Ibid.*, #19.
34. *Ibid.*, #19.
35. "The Consolidation of the Community" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 22, 1886, p. 9.
36. "The Hebras" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 6, 1881, p. 5.

37. Samuel Montagu, "The Federation and the Last End Scheme of the United Synagogues" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 17, 1890.
38. "A Heroic Scheme" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 10, 1890, p. 11.
39. Ibid., #28.
40. "Lights and Shades of 1895" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 3, 1896, p. 135.

REFERENCES

Chapter Three

1. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, July 4, 1890, p. 4.
2. a. "The Foreign Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 15, 1885, p. 9.
 b. "Notes" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 17, 1895, p. 6.
 c. "The Foreign Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 15, 1885, p. 9.
3. "The Work to be Done. II. Our Foreign Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, August 12, 1881, p. 9.
4. Ibid., #3.
5. "The Foreign Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 15, 1885, p. 9.
6. "The Consolidation of the Community" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 22, 1886, p. 9.
7. "The Synagogue" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 22, 1872, p. 8f.
8. "Adoption of the East End Scheme" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 24, 1896, p. 13.
9. Ibid., #6.
10. "The Condition of the Jewish Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 6, 1885, p. 13.
11. "Judaism at the East End" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 2, 1885, p. 10.
12. "Judaism at the East End" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 2, 1885, p. 9.
13. "Proposed Home for the Foreign Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 1, 1885, p. 12.
14. a. Ibid., #11.
 b. Ibid., #12.
15. a. "Dwellings for the Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 20, 1885, p. 11.
 b. Ibid., #4.

16. a. Ibid., #15a.
b. "The Jewish Board of Guardians" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 11, 1885, p. 9.
17. a. "The East End Scheme" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 30, 1897, p. 9.
b. "Board of Guardians" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 15, 1885, p. 11.
18. Ibid., #16b.
19. "Progress Without Party" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 25, 1895, p. 13f.
20. Ibid., #8.
21. Ibid., #12.
22. "Judaism at the East End" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 2, 1885, p. 9f.
23. Ibid., #19.
24. "The Organ in the Synagogue" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 18, 1895, p. 13.
25. "The Hebras" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 6, 1881, p. 5.
26. Ibid., #6.
27. "The East End Scheme" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 13, 1896, p. 15.
28. Ibid., #12.
29. Ibid., #3.
30. Ibid., #22.
31. Ibid., #3.
32. a. Ibid., #16b.
b. cf. Also "The Jewish Board of Guardians" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 11, 1885, p. 9.
33. Ibid., #11.
34. Ibid., #11.
35. Benjamin L. Cohen. "Board of Guardians and the Relief of the Jewish Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 13, 1895, p. 7.
36. Ibid., #5.

37. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 8, 1886, p. 5.
38. Ibid., #21.
39. "Work for the Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 3, 1887, p. 9.
40. Ibid., #39.
41. "The Industrial Condition of the Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 15, 1886, p. 9.
42. Ibid., #39.
43. "The Industrial Condition of the Jewish Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 19, 1886, p. 9.
44. Ibid., #5.
45. Ibid., #5.
46. Ibid., #37.
47. Ibid., #16b.
48. "Notes: The Chronicle on Industrial Training" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 5, 1897, p. 15.
49. "Board of Guardians and the Relief of the Jewish Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 13, 1895, p. 7.
50. "The 'New Departure' and its Results" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 25, 1895, p. 14.
51. a. Ibid., #15a.
b. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 27, 1885, p. 5.
52. Ibid., #2c.
53. "The Invasion of the Alien" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 8, 1897, p. 18.
54. Ibid., #5.
55. Ibid., #2c.
56. Lionel L. Cohen, "The Board of Guardians" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 4, 1885, p. 5.
57. Ibid., #5.

58. Samuel Montagu. "Proposed Home for the Jewish Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, June 19, 1895, p. 6.
59. Ibid., #58.
60. Ibid., #43.
61. Ibid., #160.
62. Ibid., #56.
63. "Out of the Depths" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 22, 1895, p. 11.
64. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 22, 1895, p. 7.
65. "An Open Heart" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 5, 1895, p. 15.
66. "Russo-Jewish Committee Report" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 25, 1895, p. 15.
67. Ibid., #63.
68. "The Government and the Alien" (Jewish Chronicle). London, November 22, 1895, p. 11.
69. "5656" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 1, 1896, p. 6.
70. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 8, 1895, p. 5.
71. "Notes on Alien Immigration" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 6, 1895, p. 12.
72. "The New Protection" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 15, 1895, p. 13.
73. "The Home Secretary on Alien Immigration" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 1, 1895, p. 9.
74. "The Government and Alien Immigration" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 16, 1895, p. 7.
75. Ibid., #53.
76. Ibid., #65.
77. Ibid., #43.
78. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 8, 1895, p. 5.

79. "Judaism and Labor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 2, 1890, p. 13f.
80. "The Labour Conference" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 28, 1890, p. 11.
81. Ibid., #12.
82. Ibid., #22.
83. "The Jew and the Historic Consciousness" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 2, 1886, p. 10.
84. "Judaism as Discipline." (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 15, 1886, p. 9.
85. Ibid., #12.
86. Ibid., #27.
87. "The Influence of Judaism on Modern Civilization." (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 28, 1873, p. 769.
88. "Forbidden Food." (Jewish Chronicle). London, August 16, 1872, p. 277f.
89. "Notes of the Week - The Mosaic Law and Modern Life." (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 15, 1896, p. 15.
90. Ibid., #81.
91. "The Jews of the United States." (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 31, 1873, p. 813f.
92. a. "The Year 1873." (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 2, 1874, p. 668f.
b. "A Momentous Debate." (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 9, 1890, p. 13.
93. "The True Aspect of Judaism" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 19, 1875, p. 755.
94. "Influence of Judaism on Modern Civilization." (Jewish Chronicle). London, June 6, 1873, p. 165.
95. "The Torah in England." (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 10, 1890, p. 9.
96. Ibid., #95.
97. a. Ibid., #51b.
b. 'Sarjeant Simon, M.P. on the Jewish Working Classes.' (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 28, 1873, p. 694f.

98. a. Ibid., #12.
b. Ibid., #27.
99. "Dwellings for the Poor." (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 20, 1889, p. 12.
100. "Notes of the Week." (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 10, 1890, p. 5.

REFERENCES

Chapter Four

1. a. "A Gentle Bishop" (Jewish Chronicle). London, August 16, 1872, p. 273.
 b. Cf. also "The Progress of Jewish Tolerance" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 17, 1873, p. 589f.
2. "The Jew in Modern Fiction" (Jewish Chronicle). London, 1872 (March) - 1873 (December), p. 302.
3. Ibid., #1b.
4. "Conversion and Conversionists" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 7, 1873, p. 636f.
5. a. "Persecution" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 28, 1881, p. 9f.
 b. Cf. also "The Jews of Germany" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 14, 1881, p. 9f.
6. "Intellectual Progress in Russia" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 6, 1881, p. 4.
7. "The Jews of Russia" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 25, 1881, p. 9f.
8. "The Jews in Russia" (Jewish Chronicle). London, July 29, 1881, p. 9.
9. "The Answer to the Jewish Question" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 21, 1881, p. 9.
10. "The Jews and the Nations" (Jewish Chronicle). London, June 10, 1881, p. 9f.
11. "The Jews of Russia" (Jewish Chronicle). London, August 26, 1881, p. 9.
12. a. "Judaism and Labor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 2, 1890, p. 14.
 b. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 26, 1895, p. 6.
13. "Mr. Goldwin Smith on 'Tribalism'" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 14, 1881, p. 9f.
14. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 9, 1890, p. 5.

15. "The Progress of Jewish Toleration" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 7, 1873, p. 837 f.
16. Ibid., # 11.
17. "Zola on Anti-Semitism" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 22, 1896, p. 9f.
18. "The New Protection" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 15, 1895, p. 13.
19. "5641" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 23, 1881, p. 9f.
20. "Dr. Hermann Adler on Recent Phases of Judeophobia" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 16, 1881, p. 9.
21. "The Anti-Semitic Movement in Germany" (Jewish Chronicle). London, August 5, 1881, p. 9f.
22. "Synagogue Decorum" (Jewish Chronicle). London, August 29, 1873, p. 36lf.
23. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, June 16, 1882, p. 3.
24. For example, cf. "The Industrial Condition of the Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 15, 1886, p. 9.
25. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 4, 1895, p. 5.
26. a. Serjeant Simon. "Mr. Serjeant Simon on Usury" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 6, 1885, p. 6.
b. "Jews and Money-Lending" (Jewish Chronicle), signed "Vigilans." London, January 2, 1885, p. 6f.
c. "Jews and Money-Lending" (Jewish Chronicle), signed "Riah." London, January 23, 1885, p. 4f.
27. "Jews and Money-Lending" (Jewish Chronicle), signed "Vigilans." London, January 2, 1885, p. 6.
28. "Jews and Money-Lending" (Jewish Chronicle), signed "Riah." London, January 23, 1885, p. 4f.
29. a. Ibid., # 26a.
b. "Jews and Money-Lending" (Jewish Chronicle), signed "Riah." London, January 23, 1885, p. 4f.
30. Lewis Emanuel. "Money-Lenders and Synagogue Honors" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 19, 1895, p. 7.
31. Ibid.

32. Isaac Turgensky. "The Money-Lenders" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 26, 1895, p. 8.
33. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 22, 1895, p. 6.
34. Ibid.
35. "Notes of the Week: Social Emancipation and Political Emancipation" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 24, 1896, p. 6.
36. Ibid., #12.
37. Ibid., #10.
38. Ibid., #7.
39. Ibid., #9.
40. Ibid., #7.
41. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 9, 1890, p. 6.
42. "The Russo-Jewish Rapprochement" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 28, 1894, p. 11.
43. "Nicholas II and His Jewish Subjects" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 7, 1894, p. 11.
44. Ibid., #9.
45. "The Position of the Jewish Community" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 8, 1874, p. 752f.
46. "The Season of Good Fellowship" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 26, 1890, p. 9.
47. Ibid., #9.
48. Ibid., #35.
49. "Dwellings for the Poor" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 20, 1885, p. 12.
50. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 5, 1895, p. 7.
51. a. Ibid., #2.
b. "The Progress of Jewish Toleration" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 17, 1873, p. 589f.
52. Ibid., #68

53. Ibid., #45.
54. Ex. of. "The Board of Deputies and the Berkeley Street Congregation" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 30, 1874, p. 732f.
55. "Laws and Jain" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 29, 1881, p. 9f.
56. "Dr. Gaster on the Zionist Congress" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 3, 1897, p. 11.
57. "The Jews and the Elections" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 4, 1885, p. 9f.
58. "Radicals and Jews" (Jewish Chronicle). London, August 19, 1881, p. 9.
59. "Jews and Politics" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 13, 1885, p. 11f.
60. a. "The Elections" (Jewish Chronicle). London, July 19, 1895, p. 11.
b. "Jews and Emancipation" (Jewish Chronicle). London, November 20, 1885, p. 9f.
61. "Notes: An Object Lesson" (Jewish Chronicle). London, July 12, 1895, p. 8.
62. "The Germent and the Alien" (Jewish Chronicle). London, November 22, 1895, p. 11.
63. "The Jewish Characteristics of Lord Beaconsfield" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 29, 1881, p. 4.
64. "What to Chronicle" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 25, 1895, p. 12.
65. "Jewish Ability" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 11, 1881, p. 9f.
66. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 6, 1885, p. 7.
67. "Judaism or the East End" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 2, 1885, p. 9.
68. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 11, 1885, p. 5.
69. "5641" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 23, 1881, pp. 9-10.
70. "The Jewish Question in Germany" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 14, 1881, p. 12.

71. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, November 11, 1890, p. 5.
72. "Notes on Alien Immigration" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 13, 1895, p. 9.
73. "The East End Scheme" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 22, 1895, p. 7.
74. "The Year 1874" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 1, 1875, p. 643.
75. "Judaism and Politics in America" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 25, 1872, p. 406-7.
76. "Intervention as an Imperialistic Policy" (Jewish Chronicle). London.
77. "The Roumanian Committee" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 21, 1874, p. 432.
78. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, June 12, 1885, p. 5.
79.
 - a. "The Board of Deputies" (Jewish Chronicle). London, March 22, 1872, p. 7.
 - b. "The Jews of Roumania" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 12, 1872, p. 26.
 - c. "The Roumanian Persecutions" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 3, 1872, p. 68.
80. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, June 12, 1885, p. 5.
81. Ibid., # 19.
82. Ibid., # 19.
83. "The Tsar" (Jewish Chronicle). London, November 2, 1894, p. 13.
84. "Public Protest to Czaristic Persecutions" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 12, 1890, pp. 21-27.
85. "The Guildhall Meeting" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 12, 1890, p. 11f.
86. "After the Guildhall Meeting" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 19, 1890, p. 11.
87. "Anglo-Jewish Associations" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 27, 1881, p. 9.
88. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, November 30, 1894, p. 5.

89. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 11, 1895, p. 5.
90. "Nicholas II and His Jewish Subjects" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 7, 1894, p. 11.
91. Ibid., # 25.
92. "The Russo-Jewish Rapprochement" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 28, 1894, p. 11.
93. Ibid., # 85.
94. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 7, 1894, p. 5.
95. Ibid., # 94.
96. Ibid., # 90.
97. "Swearing Allegiance to the Tsar" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 7, 1894, p. 12.
98. Ibid., # 85.
99. Ibid., # 90.
100. Ibid., # 78.
101. "A Dream of a Jewish State" (Jewish Chronicle). London, January 17, 1896, p. 15.
102. Ibid., # 56.
103. Ibid., # 63.
104. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 30, 1885, p. 5.
105. "Notes of the Week" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 15, 1895, p. 5.
106. "The Dream of a Return" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 21, 1896, p. 5f.
107. "The Practical Outcome of the Congress" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 3, 1897, p. 17.
108. "Notes: Dr. Herzl and Baron Hirsch, The Jewish State; Dr. Herzl and Mr. Holman Hunt" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 24, 1896, p. 5f.
109. "Notes: Zionism versus Nationalism" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 21, 1897, p. 15f.

110. "Mr. Lecky on Religious Liberty" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 3, 1896, p. 11.
111. "Sense and Sensibility" (Jewish Chronicle). London, February 7, 1896, p. 11.
112. a. Ibid., # 64.
b. "Dr. Hermann Adler on Recent Phases of Judeophobia" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 16, 1881, p. 9.
113. a. "Retrospect of the Year" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 11, 1874, p. 360-4.
b. "Literature" (Jewish Chronicle). London, June 14, 1872, p. 153.
114. "The Destiny of Judaism" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 1, 1897, p. 18.
115. Ibid., # 110.
116. "The Zionist Congress" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 17, 1897, p. 20.
117. Ibid., # 107.
118. a. "5656" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 4, 1896, p. 5.
b. Ibid., # 101.
c. Ibid., # 108.
119. "The Zionist Congress" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 3, 1897, p. 17.
120. Ibid., # 110.
121. "Notes: 'Palestine'" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 8, 1896, p. 7.
122. "Notes: 'The Present Position of Zionism versus Nationalism'" (Jewish Chronicle). London, May 21, 1897, p. 15.
123. "Notes: 'The Mission of Judaism'" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 30, 1897, p. 16.
124. "England and Continental Judaism" (Jewish Chronicle). London, September 10, 1897, p. 13.
125. Ibid., # 101.
126. Ibid., # 101.
127. Ibid., # 106.
128. Ibid., # 108.

129. Ibid., # 110.
130. Ibid., # 108.
131. Ibid., # 124.
132. "5657" (*Jewish Chronicle*). London, September 24, 1897,
p. 10.
133. Ibid., # 119.
134. "A New Exodus?" (*Jewish Chronicle*). London, March 27, 1896.

REFERENCES

Chapter Five

1. a. "The Board of Deputies" (Jewish Chronicle). London, December 12, 1873, p. 653f.
- b. "The Jews of the United States" (Jewish Chronicle). London, October 31, 1873, p. 613f.
- c. "The Anglo-German Alliance" (Jewish Chronicle). London, April 25, 1873, p. 50f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Source: Publication Quoted and Consulted

The Jewish Chronicle (Sefer Zikaron). London, 1870 - 1897.

Secondary Sources: Books Consulted

Walter Phelps Hall and Robert Greenhalgh Albion. A History of England and the British Empire. Boston, Ginn and Company, 1937.

J. Salwyn Schapiro. Modern and Contemporary European History (1615 - 1941). Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1942.

Cecil Roth. A History of the Jews of England. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1941.

Albert M. Hyamson. A History of the Jews in England. London, Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1928.

Albert M. Hyamson. The Sephardin of England (A History of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Community, 1492 - 1951). London, Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1951.