

THE STRUGGLE FOR JEWISH EMANCIPATION
IN ENGLAND 1830 - 1858

An Examination of the Arguments and
Claims Advanced by the Advocates and
Opponents in the Emancipatory
Controversy.

"Seek ye the peace of the city where
ye dwell, and pray for it, for in
the peace thereof ye shall have peace."

Jer. 29:7

Submitted to the faculty
of the Department of History
at the Jewish Institute of
Religion in partial
Fulfilment of the requirements
for the degrees of M. H. L.
and Rabbi

by

Augustus F. Loeb

January, 1939.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
BIBLIOGRAPHY,	I-VII

Part I

THE JEWISH STATUS IN ENGLAND FROM RESETTLEMENT TO EMANCIPATION

Chapter I	The Legal Status of the Jews in England from their Resettlement until 1830	1- 8
Chapter II	The Struggle for Emancipation: 1830-1858	9-15
Chapter III	Catholic Emancipation	16-25

Part II

THE ARGUMENTS AND CLAIMS FOR AND AGAINST EMANCIPATION

Chapter IV	Introduction	27-28
Chapter V	Arguments Against Emancipation A. Religious-Opposition to Jewish Teaching B. Religious-In defense of Christianity C. Economic and Social D. Political E. Minor	29-37
Chapter VI	Arguments For Emancipation A. Refutations B. Affirmations	38-57
Chapter VII	Summary	58-63
Chapter VIII	After Emancipation	64-68
NOTES TO CHAPTERS I - VIII		69-81
APPENDIX		82-87

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Series 2, Vols. 20, 21, 23, 24.
Series 3, Vols. 15-20, 23-24, 35, 39, 56-58,
78, 82, 88, 95-98, 102, 104-106,
113, 115-118, 124-126, 130, 133,
140-142, 145-146, 148-150, 181.

BOOKS

- HENRIQUES, H. S. Q., "The Jews and the English Law." London, 1908.
- HYAMSON, A. M., "A History of the Jews in England." London, 1908.
- STOKES, H. P., "A Short History of the Jews in England." London, 1921.
- BLUNT, JOHN E., "A History of the Establishment and Residence of the Jews in England, Etc." London, 1830.
- EGAN, CHARLES, "The status of the Jews in England, from the time of the Normans to the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, Etc." London, 1848.
- ABRAHAMSON AND LEVY (Editors), "Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities." Edinburgh, 1910.
- MORRIS, JOHN, "Catholic England in Modern Times." London, 1892.
- GWYN, DENIS, "The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation." London, 1928.
- WOLF, LUCIEN, "The First Stage of Anglo-Jewish Emancipation," in his "Essays in Jewish History", pp. 117-136 (edited by Cecil Roth, London, 1934).
- ROTH, CECIL, "The Jewish Contribution to Civilization." London, 1938.

PAMPHLETS

- "An Appeal to the Humanity of the English Nation in behalf of the Jews." Dunstable, 1812.
- CAMPBELL, W. F., "A Short Statement of the Grounds which justify the House of Lords, etc., London, 1817.
- "An Epistle from a High Priest of the Jews, to the Chief Priest of Canterbury, on the extension of Catholic Emancipation to the Jews." London, 1821.
- "Statement of the Civil Disabilities and Privations Affecting Jews in England." London, 1829.
- ANICHINI, "A Few Remarks on the Expediency and Justice of Emancipating the Jews, etc." London, 1829.
- PELLATT, APSLEY, "Brief Memoir of the Jews in relation to their Civil and Municipal Disabilities." London, 1829.
- VAN OVEN, BARNARD, "An Appeal to the British Nation on Behalf of the Jews." London, 1830.
- GOIDSMID, FRANCIS H., "Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of British Jews." London, 1830.
- F. H. G., "Two Letters, in answer to the Objections urged against Mr. Grant's Bill for the Relief of the Jews, etc." London, 1830.
- GOIDSMID, F. H., "The Arguments advanced against the Enfranchisement of the Jews, considered in a Series of Letters." " London, 1833.
- "Emancipation of the Jews." 1833.
- MONTAGU, BASIL, "A Letter to Henry Warburton, Esq., M. P., upon the Emancipation of the Jews." London, 1833.
- "The British Jew to his Fellow Countrymen." London, 1833.
- MONTAGU, BASIL, "A Letter to the Rt. Rev., the Lord Bishop of Chichester, upon the Emancipation of the Jews." London, 1834.
- "An Appeal to the Public in behalf of the Jews, etc." London, 1834.

- COLES, JOHN, "Observations on the Civil Disabilities of British Jews." London, 1834.
- SALOMONS, DAVID, ESQ., "A Short Statement on behalf of His Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion, etc." London, 1835.
- SALOMONS, DAVID, "Further Observations on behalf of His Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion, etc." London, 1836.
- QUIZINUS, "Cursory Glance at the present Social State of the Jewish People of Great Britain." Edinburgh, 1844.
- PERCEVAL, DUDLEY M., "Maynooth and the Jew Bill, etc." London, 1845.
- VAN OVEN, BARNARD, "Ought Baron de Rothschild to sit in Parliament?" London, 1847.
- D. R., "An Imaginary Speech in Parliament against the Jewish Disabilities Bill." London, 1847.
- GAWLER, COL. GEORGE, "The Emancipation of the Jews indispensable for the maintenance of the Protestant Profession of the Empire, etc." London, 1847.
- "A Clergyman's Apology for favouring the Removal of Jewish Disabilities, etc." London, 1847.
- MACKENZIE, REV. H. "A Letter to the Parishioners of Great Yarmouth." Yarmouth, 1847.
- ROBERTSON, JOHN, "Jewish Disabilities." Edinburgh, 1847.
- THORNBORROW, WILLIAM, "Advocacy of the Jewish Freedom." London, 1848.
- "One of the People," "A Word with the Earl of Winchilsea." London, 1848.
- "Progress of Jewish Emancipation since 1829." London, 1848.
- A Barrister, "An Answer to the Speech of the Right Hon. Sir Robt. Peel, M. P., in the House of Commons, on Fri., Feb. 11, 1848, upon the second reading of the Jewish Disabilities Bill." London, 1848.

FAUDEL, HENRY, "A Few Words on the Jewish Disabilities addressed to Sir Robert H. Inglis, Bart., M. P." London, 1848.

GOLDSMID, F. H., "Reply to the Arguments advanced against the Removal of the remaining Disabilities of the Jews." London, 1848.

ROBINSON, REV. JOHN T., "Remarks, deprecating the proposed Admission of Her Majesty's Jewish Subjects to Seats in the House of Commons." London, 1848.

A Graduate of the University of Cambridge, "A Few Words on the proposed Admission of Jews into Parliament." London, 1848.

EUPHRON, "Remarks on the proposed Bill for admitting Jews into Parliament, etc." London, 1848.

A Christian, "Emancipation of the Jews." London, 1848 (?)

"Jews' Disabilities Bill--Protest by A Believing Jew." 1848.

BIRKS, REV. T. R., "A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M. P., on the Admission of Jews to Parliament." Seeleys, 1848.

CROLY, REV. GEORGE, "The Claims of the Jews incompatible with the National Profession of Christianity." Seeleys, 1848.

A Christian, "Jewish Admission into Parliament, considered in an address to the English People." London, 1849.

HUGHES, REV. HENRY, "A Few Plain Thoughts on the Christianity of excluding a Jew from Parliament, etc." London, 1849.

An Observer, "Some Remarks upon the 'Series of Anomalies' in the Leading Article of THE TIMES newspaper, etc." London, 1849 (?).

GREEN, AARON LEVY, "Dr. Croly, LL.D., versus Civil and Religious Liberty." London, 1850.

PYNE, REV. THOMAS, "Judaea Libera; or, the Eligibility of the Jews to Parliament." London, 1850.

PHOENIX, "Scriptural Reasonings in support of the Jewish Claims to sit in the Commons House of Parliament." London, 1850.

MR. ALDERMAN SALOMONS, "Parliamentary Oaths--Observations, etc." London, 1850.

DIAGAMMA, "The Exclusion of Baron Lionel de Rothschild from Parliament, etc." London, 1850.

A Protectionist, "Some Arguments Against the Admission of Jews into Parliament." London, 1852.

BRANDON, ALFRED, "A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord J. Russell on the Jewish Measure." Chelsea, 1853.

MR. ALDERMAN SALOMONS, "Alterations of Oaths considered in a Letter to the Earl of Derby, etc." London, 1853.

"The Lords and the Jews." London, 1853.

KENWARD, REV. ROBERT BRUCE, "A Plea for the Maintenance of Our National Christianity." London, 1857.

"Forty Reasons for Resisting the Removal of the Jewish Disabilities, etc." London

A Conservative, "Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of the Jews." London, 1842(?).

NEWSPAPERS

THE TIMES, London

Dates: Jan. 30, 1830; Feb. 3, 1830;
May 3, 1830; April 19, 1833;
Aug. 2, 1833; March 12, 1845;
Dec. 18, 1847; Feb. 7, 1848;
Feb. 10, 1848; May 26, 1848;
Feb. 21, 1849; May 8, 1849;
June 28, 1849; July 27, 1850;
Aug. 2, 1850; Aug. 5, 1850;
April 5, 1851; May 3, 1851;
July 17, 1851; March 14, 1853;
March 18, 1858; Nov. 20, 1897.

JOHN BULL, London

Dates: April 11, 1830; April 25, 1830;

JOHN BULL, cont.

Dates: Aug. 4, 1833; March 15, 1845;
Dec. 11, 1847; Feb. 12, 1848;
May 27, 1848; Feb. 24, 1849;

THE ATLAS, London

Dates: April 21, 1833; June 15, 1834.

THE LIVERPOOL MAIL, Liverpool

Date: March 29, 1845.

THE JEWISH CHRONICLE, London

For years 1841 - 1858.

PERIODICALS

P. H. L., "Jewish Emancipation in England"
(THE CENTRAL LITERARY MAGAZINE, Vol. 15,
No. 3, July, 1901).

MODDER, MONTAGU FRANK, "An Aspect of Jewish
Emancipation in England" (LONDON QUARTERLY
REVIEW, 158:453-463, October, 1933).

MONTEFIORE, C. G., "Jewish Emancipation and the
English Jew" (THE HIBBERT JOURNAL,
32:244-252, January, 1934).

HENRIQUES, H. S. Q., "The Political Rights of
English Jews" (THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW,
Vol. 19, pp. 298-341, 751-799, January and
July, 1907).

MACCOBY, S., "The Emancipation of British Jewry."
(THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, Vol. 145,
pp. 600-607, May 1934).

MYERS, MAURICE, "Some Ms. Sidelights on
Anglo-Jewish Emancipation." (TRANSACTIONS OF
THE JEWISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF ENGLAND,
Vol. VI, pp. 240-246, London, 1912).

"Sir I. L. Goldsmid and the Admission of Jews of
England to Parliament." (TRANSACTIONS OF THE
JEWISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF ENGLAND, Vol. IV,
pp. 116-176, London, 1903).

ROTH, CECIL, "The Challenge to Jewish History".
(Presidential Address delivered before the
Jewish Historical Society of England,
October 20, 1936.).

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

ENCYCLOPAEDIA JUDAICA, Vol. VI, pp. 652-668
(Inadequate).

JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA, Vol. V, pp. 171-174
(Inadequate).

ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA(14th Edition),
Vol. XIX, pp. 4-925.

DUBNOW, SIMON, "Weltgeschichte des jüdischen
Volkes IX (Berlin, 1929), Sections 31, 51.

THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, Vol. VII,
Chap. 22.

ROTH, CECIL, "Magna Bibliotheca Anglo-Judaica",
pp. 203-245. London, 1937.

PART I

THE JEWISH STATUS IN ENGLAND
FROM RESETTLEMENT TO
E M A N C I P A T I O N

Chapter I
LEGAL POSITION OF THE JEWS OF ENGLAND FROM
THEIR RE-SETTLEMENT UNTIL 1830

For a period of more than three and a half centuries, after their expulsion in 1290, Jews were not permitted to live in England. Their exclusion during this interval was not, indeed, absolute, and individual Jews continued to appear in the country intermittently. But the re-establishment of an organized community of publicly professing Jews was impossible until the 17th century. At no time did Parliament explicitly sanction their settlement in the country, although, when their numbers became considerable, a tacit consent was granted by legislative enactments which took cognizance of their presence.

It was not until the reign of Charles I that Jews began to settle in England in estimable numbers. They came as crypto-Jews, mostly fugitive Marranos from the oppression of the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisition, and established

themselves as merchants. Of necessity they continued to conceal their Judaism. They were treated as foreigners, and as such they were subject to the laws that governed aliens, and hence, forbidden to practice their own religion.(1)

An attempt was made in 1655 to secure the legal admission of Jews into England. Oliver Cromwell who had, two years before, become Lord Protector of England, anxiously desired Jewish settlement within his realm, for he was shrewdly aware that the commercial genius of the Jews would be invaluable to the attainment of his ideal, an all-powerful England. In pursuance of his object, Cromwell invited Menasseh ben Israel, a learned rabbi of Amsterdam, to visit England in behalf of the Jewish cause. Menasseh appeared in 1655, and presented to the Whitehall Conference, convoked by Cromwell, a petition asking, among other concessions, for the security of Jewish life and property, liberty of public worship, and freedom of trade. Despite the Protector's avowed wishes, the Conference proved hostile to the petition and was consequently dissolved. It is to be noted, however, that at the first session of that assembly, the two judges present concurred in the opinion that "there was no law which forbade the Jews' return into England.(2) Realizing the futility of

attempting legislative methods, Cromwell concluded that his only hope lay in unofficial action and connivance at a Jewish settlement. He therefore gave a verbal assurance to the Jews residing in London, numbering about two hundred persons, of his personal protection and permission to exercise their religion, provided it was done privately and unobtrusively.(3) The Marranos, thus encouraged by the Protector's favor, threw off their disguise in 1657 and publicly avowed their true faith. The same year witnessed the lease of a plot of ground for a Jewish cemetery. The Corporation of London, although resenting the presence of Jews, feared Cromwell more, and consequently, upon their application, admitted Jews as brokers to the Royal Exchange. In 1697 their right of entry was made permanent.(4) It must be recognized, however, that, despite the good-will of Cromwell, the law of the land was in no way altered to the advantage of the Jews. At the death of Cromwell, in 1658, the law continued to prohibit any Jewish religious service and to impose severe penalties on all who did not attend a Protestant place of worship.

With the restoration of Charles II, in 1660, the re-establishment of the Jews in England was assured. The king, deeply grateful for the

financial assistance rendered him by the Dutch Jews in his efforts to regain his throne, extended to the Jews resident in his realm the protection he had avowed. Paradoxically enough, at a time when the English Parliament established the supremacy of the Established Church by a series of Acts(5) directed against all Nonconformists of every creed and denomination, the Jews obtained a permanent settlement in the country. They discarded the secrecy that had surrounded their synagogue and religious worship, and an organized community was formed. In 1664, and again in 1674, the rights of the Jews to residence and public worship were formally recognized by Charles II, although the latter right was in direct defiance of the law.(6) This recognition was confirmed by his successor, James II, in 1683.(7) In the meantime, the Jewish community was rapidly increasing. Through royal grants of letters of denization (i. e. naturalization), a large number of its members acquired the rights of English citizenship, no less than seventy during the reign of Charles II and thirty-four during that of James II.(8) The Jew's presence and his customs were acknowledged in the courts of law, where it was decided that a Jew should be sworn on the Old,

rather than on the New, Testament in all legal proceedings, and consideration was given to the Jewish Sabbath.(9)

The Revolution of 1688 did not affect the position of the Jews. The Toleration Act, which was passed in the first year of the reign of William III (1689) and which granted freedom of religious worship to Protestant Dissenters, did not include the Jews, nor were its benefits extended to them until the year 1846. Until then, in lieu of legislative sanction, the Jewish religion found adequate protection from the penal laws in the Orders in Council of 1674 and 1685, issued by Charles II and James II respectively. Beginning with the year 1689 Parliament gave frequent recognition to the permanent settlement of the Jews, both in its debates and in its Acts.(10)

Before we enumerate the disabilities under which the Jews of England labored down till 1830, in which year agitation for their removal began, two questions remain for consideration, the right of Jews to hold real property and their right to acquire British nationality. The capacity of Jews to possess land or other real property in England was in doubt for a long time. As late as 1830 there were those who questioned

their right in this respect. If all Jews, whether born within the kingdom or not, were, by law, aliens, then they were to be denied the acquisition of real property, for until the year 1870 no alien could own land in England. The most prominent jurists, however, consistently held, whenever they were consulted on this question, that a Jew born in England, was a bona fide subject of the king, and could consequently hold and dispose of, by will, real property. Despite the doubt that existed in some quarters, the native-born British Jews enjoyed undisturbed possessions of the houses and lands that they had purchased.(11)

Turning to the second question, that of the right to acquire British citizenship, two methods of naturalization were practised in England. It was a prerogative of the Crown to grant letters patent of denization, which conferred many, but not all, of the rights of a natural-born subject upon the alien. As we have seen, many Jews were made denizens during the reign of Charles II and James II. On the other hand, naturalization by Act of Parliament granted the full rights of a natural-born subject to the alien. A statute of Parliament, however, passed in 1609, precluded Jewish foreigners

from enjoying this privilege by requiring all applicants to take the Sacrament. To correct this injustice the Jewish Naturalization Act was carried through Parliament in 1753, by which Jews could be naturalized by an Act of Parliament without receiving the Sacrament. But during the summer recess such a storm of violent passion was whipped up in the country against this measure by unscrupulous appeals to prejudice and hate that the Government, cognizant of an impending general election, yielded to the popular clamor and secured the repeal of the Naturalization Act the following year. Seventy-two years later a statute was passed, abolishing the Sacrament as a qualification for parliamentary naturalization.(12)

The civil disabilities which were imposed upon the Jews, as will be seen, arose almost entirely from certain tests and forms of oaths prescribed by various statutes enacted by Parliament. As a consequence, the Jews were excluded from both Houses of Parliament, from all corporate offices, and from all places of trust, civil and military, under the Crown. The elective franchise could be denied them on occasion. In common with all nonconformists they were denied admission to the universities.

Because of the unvarying custom of administering the requisite oath upon the New Testament, the Jews of London were disabled from becoming freemen of the city and thereby excluded from any retail trade within the city boundaries.

So long as Roman Catholics were excluded from Parliament, and all Christians, except Churchmen, from public office, the English Jews could not, with good grace, ask for a removal of their disabilities. But when, in 1828 and 1829, the Protestant Dissenters and Roman Catholics were, respectively, admitted to full political rights, the moment for Jewish emancipation appeared to be at hand.

Chapter II

THE ROAD TO EMANCIPATION : 1830 - 1858

The civil disabilities of the Jews, (13) as we have observed, were effected by certain tests and oaths which had to be subscribed as a condition to the admission of various rights. In order to comprehend rightly the development of the emancipatory struggle, which lasted almost a generation, it is necessary to possess a clear understanding of the nature of these prescribed tests and oath formulae.

The Corporation and Test Acts (14) excluded Jews from all civil offices, whether corporate or national. These two Acts were originally directed against the Protestant Dissenters and Papists respectively, yet the Jews could not escape their provisions. Whereas neither the oaths of allegiance and supremacy (15) nor the declaration against Transubstantiation, which they imposed, was objectionable, the obligation to take the Sacrament effectually disabled them from holding office. This disability they shared with all Dissenters from the Church of England. After 1727 these Acts were rendered nugatory by the annual enactment of Indemnity Acts, which enabled all persons elected or appointed

to any office to postpone taking the necessary oaths and tests until a specified day of the following year. In 1828 the Corporation and Test Acts were repealed, and the measure effecting the repeal substituted for the Sacramental test a "Declaration"(16) for the protection of the Established Church. This Declaration, however, contained the words, "upon the true faith of a Christian," and therefore could not be taken by any self-respecting Jew. Moreover, although the annual Indemnity Act was extended to include the Declaration and consequently permitted Jews to hold positions of trust under the Crown, municipal offices were closed to them. In the case of municipal offices the Declaration had to be made "before or upon" admission to such office; as for appointments under the Crown, it might be "after" admission, and only in the latter situation did the Act of Indemnity apply.

Before a member could take his seat in Parliament, he had to take three oaths: the oath of allegiance, the oath of supremacy, and the oath of abjuration.(17) The first two oaths contained nothing obnoxious to Jewish tenets, but the oath of abjuration, concluding with the words, "upon the true faith of a Christian," could not be taken by a Jew with decency and

propriety. The disability thus established was, as in the case of the Corporation and Test Acts, wholly accidental, for the sole purpose of the oath of abjuration was to abjure Stuart claims to the English throne, and the phrase, "upon the true faith of a Christian," was affixed to give greater sanction and binding force to the oath.(18) To summarize, the exclusion of the English Jews from political power was attributable to a seemingly harmless phrase, "upon the true faith of a Christian," which, though unintentionally imposed, was deliberately maintained and fastened upon the Jew the stigma of legal degradation.

On the fifth of April, 1830, Mr. Robert Grant introduced in the House of Commons a Bill to remove the civil disabilities affecting "His Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion." It proposed that Jewish subjects be granted the same rights and privileges as enjoyed by the Roman Catholic subjects, who had achieved political freedom the preceding year. The Bill was rejected on the second reading.(19) Following the passage of the Reform Act of 1832, which reconstituted the House of Commons, a similar Bill was introduced three times in Parliament, in 1833, 1834, and 1836. On each of

these occasions it was carried in the Commons by large majorities, only to be lost in the House of Lords. But in the meanwhile partial triumphs were attained. In December of 1830 the freedom of the City of London was won, when the municipal council authorized the use of the Old Testament when administering the necessary oath to members of the Jewish faith. Thus were the Jews capacitated to participate in the retail trade of the city. The year 1833 witnessed the first Jew admitted to the bar. Mr. Francis Goldsmid, (20) upon application, was granted permission to omit the obnoxious, final words from the oath of abjuration, which was the sole barrier between the Jew and the legal profession. This precedent was followed by all the Inns of Court, and another vexing disability was removed. Of great importance was the enactment of the "Sheriffs' Declaration Bill" of 1835, which enabled Mr. David Salomons, who had been elected, in that year, Sheriff of the county of London and Middlesex, to assume his office, by dispensing with the Declaration and its objectionable words in all cases of persons elected to the office of Sheriff. In the same year the Jews were secured in their right to vote at parliamentary elections.

A genuine sentiment favorable to the emancipation of the Jews was steadily mounting throughout the country. It expressed itself generously in 1840, when news of the Damascus ritual murder affair reached London. The sympathy of the English people was offered the Jews, and Sir Moses Montefiore, the leader of the Anglo-Jewish community, obtained the aid of the government. The pressure of the English ministry, together with the judicious diplomacy of Montefiore, succeeded in routing the foul calumny and in liberating the accused Jews. This same public opinion prevailed upon the House of Lords, in 1845, to pass a Bill opening all municipal Offices to persons of the Jewish religion. The Commons, with decisive majorities, gave its assent to the measure. Thus, Mr. David Salomons, after two unsuccessful attempts in 1835 and 1844, was permitted to enter upon his duties as an Alderman of the city of London, to which office he was elected for the third time in 1847. All doubt respecting the right of Jews to possess land in the country was finally removed, and legal recognition and protection were at last conferred upon the Jewish religion by the Religious Opinions Relief Act of 1846.

What Mr. Robert Grant had failed to accomplish in 1830 with his general emancipation Bill, was being realized piecemeal. By the year 1847 all the civil disabilities were removed, except the exclusion from seats in Parliament. The attack upon the closed doors of the legislature was begun by the City of London, when it returned, in 1847, as one of its representatives in Parliament, Baron Lionel de Rothschild. The Baron, however, was denied his seat because he refused to pronounce the words, "upon the true faith of a Christian," which concluded the Oath of Abjuration. Accordingly, Lord John Russel, the Prime Minister and also Baron de Rothschild's colleague for the City of London, introduced in the Commons a Jewish Disabilities Removal Bill, where it was carried, like its predecessors, by large majorities. But the House of Lords rejected it. In 1850 Rothschild, having resigned, was re-elected by the city, and in the following year Mr. David Salomons was returned to represent the Borough of Greenwich. Neither was allowed to take his seat.

Beginning with 1853, each succeeding year marked an attempt by Lord Russell to secure the admission of Jews into the legislature. His efforts, however, continued to be thwarted by

the intolerance of the Lords. This impasse was finally broken in 1858, under a threat of the Commons to take unilateral action in the controversy. A compromise was adopted, which authorized either House to admit Jews by a resolution sanctioning the omission of the words, "upon the true faith of a Christian," from the new single Oath substituted for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy and Abjuration. On Monday, July 26, 1858, Baron Lionel de Rothschild took his seat, having previously recited the requisite Oath, substituting the phrase, "So help me, Jehovah," for the Christian formula which for eleven years had deprived him of his rights.(21) Thus ended the long and laborious struggle for Jewish emancipation.(22)

Chapter III

CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

It may appear curious, *prima facie*, to recount, in our study, the Catholic struggle in the United Kingdom for religious and political liberation. The conflict, however, that was fought between the English and Irish Catholics, on the one hand, and the British Government and Established Church, on the other, throws into bolder relief and makes more comprehensible many of the aspects of the similar struggle for Jewish emancipation that subsequently followed. The same bigoted opposition, the same uncompromising resistance to any threatened invasion of confirmed privileges and exclusions, which were battered down by the Roman Catholics, confronted the Jewish community. But whereas the Roman Catholics gained their objective through a menacing organized force, the Jews achieved their end with the assistance of a sympathetic public opinion that augmented their meagre numbers.

As a result of the persecutory legislation enacted from the reign of Elizabeth onward and designed to maintain the supremacy of the Established Church, the Roman Catholics were

subjected to many oppressive disabilities. They were prohibited, under severe penalties, from the exercise of their religion. They were excluded from the guilds, the legal and teaching professions, and the acquisition of real property. The Corporation Act (1661) made them ineligible to hold any corporate office or be a member of any municipal corporation(23), while the Test Act (1673) closed to them all offices and places of trust under the Crown, whether civil or military. Thus no Roman Catholic could share in either the local or the national government. They, moreover, were disqualified to exercise the franchise at parliamentary elections and could sit in neither House of Parliament.

In the year 1778, when concessions seemed expedient under the threat of war with France, the first important Bill for Catholic Relief was carried through both Houses of the English Parliament.(24) This Act, known as Sir George Savile's, exempted Roman Catholics who took the prescribed oath of allegiance, expressing loyalty to King George III and abjuring the Stuart claim to the throne and the deposing power of the Pope, from many disabilities and penalties. The penalty of perpetual

imprisonment on Popish priests and schoolmasters was repealed, and Papists were rendered capable of inheriting and buying land. A similar Bill was passed in Ireland(25), under instructions from London, which abolished, in addition, the malicious law that had enabled any Catholic who conformed to the Established Church to become possessed of the family property. Protestant bigotry, refusing to be reconciled to this small instalment of religious toleration, vented its hate in the Lord George Gordon riots. Truculent demands arose in England for the repeal of the Relief Act. Finally, in 1780, thousands of rioters, organized by Lord George Gordon, ran amuck in London, burning chapels, wrecking the houses of Roman Catholics and their sympathizers, and destroying prisons. After a week of unrestrained destruction, the mob was suppressed by military force.(26)

The next step toward liberation occurred in 1791, when the Catholic Relief Act of that year granted the English Catholics freedom to practice their religion publicly without incurring legal penalties. The professions of law and teaching were likewise opened to them. Two years later the Irish Catholics succeeded in procuring similar relief. As in 1778, so in 1793, expediency

dictated the new concessions. With the French armies advancing victoriously on the Continent and threatening the security of England, there was no desire to jeopardize the domestic peace of Ireland. The result was a Relief Act which conceded wider liberties to the Irish Catholics than their co-religionists in England had won. Besides freedom of religious worship and admission to the professions, all offices and places of trust, civil and military, were opened to them, subject to certain exceptions. They also received the elective franchise. As far as their civil condition was concerned, only one principal grievance remained to the Irish Catholics, namely, their exclusion from Parliament.(27)

Much was yet wanting, after 1793, before the Roman Catholics could look on themselves as fully liberated. It is true that the Irish Catholics had realized most of their demands, Parliament alone being closed to them. But the English Catholics had still a long way to go. They continued to be ineligible as members of Corporations; they were still barred by law from every position in the state; they were excluded from Parliament and even from the elective franchise. In the year 1800 the Catholic communities looked hopefully forward to an expected release from

their disabilities, for emancipation had been promised them by the English Government in return for their support of the Act of Union, which abolished the Irish Parliament. The support was freely offered and the Act successfully carried. Little did the Catholics foresee that a whole generation must pass before that promise was to be fulfilled, and then only in submission to a vast popular agitation, organized by one of themselves, Daniel O'Connell, whose indomitable courage and supreme genius as a popular leader were to override the opposition of King and Parliament.

Pitt, who headed the English Government in 1800, sought to fulfill his promise of civil liberty to the Catholics, but failed before the obdurate resistance of the King. What followed was a long and weary struggle. The Catholics were not without friends in both Houses of Parliament, who introduced petitions and Bills in their favor and spoke for their cause in many debates. But one measure after another was defeated. Neither professions of loyalty nor the actual proof of loyalty and allegiance on the battlefield during the long war with France was of any avail in supporting the Catholic claims to justice. In consequence, Catholic efforts in

their own behalf waned, and the people sank into a dismal dejection. At this juncture, in 1823, Daniel O'Connell, a brilliant Catholic barrister, organized the Irish Catholic Association to achieve political emancipation for his co-religionists through concentrated agitation, seeing that no hope of success could any longer be based on petitions and negotiations in London. This association, which grew to large proportions, embracing the Catholic millions of Ireland(28), loudly asserted their claim to possess a voice in the making of the laws by which they were governed. The alarmed Government, in 1825, rushed through Parliament a Bill which declared the Association illegal. O'Connell replied to this suppression with the formation of the New Catholic Association, constituted ostensibly as a charitable society, but in reality pursuing the same determined activities as its predecessor.

Events now occurred which made the denial of Catholic claims by Parliament and the Crown impossible. In the parliamentary election of 1826 the New Catholic Association displayed an astounding strength, when it snatched several seats from entrenched anti-Catholic landlords and returned avowed supporters of its demands in their

stead. Two years later, following upon the triumph of the Protestant Dissenters who were accorded complete freedom by the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts(29), the Catholic question was once again introduced in Parliament. A resolution emancipating all persons professing the Catholic religion passed through the Commons, but it was rejected by the Lords.

The time had at last arrived to force the issue. Due to a reshuffling of the British Ministry, the seat for the County of Clare fell vacant. O'Connell announced his candidature, bold enough to challenge the Cabinet Member, who was his opponent, and with the full knowledge that he would not be permitted to take his seat in the House of Commons, if successful. The Clare election was destined to be the deathblow to Protestant resistance of the Catholic claims. O'Connell won an overwhelming victory. Wildly enthusiastic demonstrations greeted him after the election, which were more alarming to the Government than the fact of his having been elected at the expense of a member of the Cabinet. At no time had any of O'Connell's activities or those of his Association been a challenge to authority or a defiance of the law. But the Government of

Wellington and Peel were afraid, afraid of the stubborn courage and determination in the cause of just rights that had transformed the Catholic masses. The situation had become truly threatening, with Catholic patience exhausted and rumors of imminent civil war in the air. Alarmed at this state of affairs in Ireland, Wellington and Peel, though pledged to resist Catholic concessions, capitulated to the inevitable.

On the fifth of March, 1829, Sir Robert Peel introduced into the House of Commons a Roman Catholic Relief Bill, which proposed an Oath of Allegiance not incompatible with Catholic doctrine, and the admission of Roman Catholics to full political rights, with certain exceptions.(30) This Bill proceeded triumphantly through Parliament, and on April 15, 1829, received the royal assent. Thus was consummated a struggle for emancipation that had consumed the energies of an entire generation.(31)

Of especial interest for our purpose are the arguments and claims made by the opponents of Catholic emancipation, particularly during the years 1828 and 1829, when the situation had become acute. It will be observed, by later comparison, that these objections bear a striking resemblance to those subsequently maintained against the efforts to remove the Jewish disabilities. Although the Catholics

sought access to all appointive and elective offices as well as to both Houses of Parliament, their opponents concentrated all their verbal artillery on the proposed admission to Parliament, in which eventuality some of the more fanatical beheld the doom of the Bill of Rights and the re-establishment of the jurisdiction of the See of Rome. Briefly stated, these were the principal objections raised against Catholic claims for emancipation:

1. England was essentially Protestant, and its well-being required that it be maintained so.
2. It would not be safe to admit to political power so large a population, who professed a faith and a doctrine hostile to the Established Church and Constitution.
3. The effect of emancipation would be to undermine the British Constitution, under which England had enjoyed, and had been able to impart to Ireland, so many blessings.
4. The admission of Roman Catholics to Parliament would establish a sentiment of religious indifference in Parliament, which would infect the people and generate a contempt for Christianity itself.
5. The Catholics held a divided allegiance between King and Pope, owing the same loyalty to the Pope as to the Protestant King. They were therefore unfit to hold civil office in Protestant England.
6. Political power was a matter, not of right, but of expediency, to

be dispensed by the supreme authority. Since the integrity of a Protestant Church and a Protestant country would be imperiled by yielding to Catholic demands, it was inexpedient to grant emancipation to the Catholic subjects.

7. It was folly to compare the situation of the Roman Catholics to that of the Protestant Dissenters (who were accorded complete equality in 1828). Although they dissented from the Established Church, nevertheless they were bound to it by their dissent likewise from the Church of Rome and by their protest against the corruption of the Catholic faith.
8. The emancipation of the Catholics would inevitably be followed by the ascendancy of the Catholic religion at the expense of the Protestant Church of Ireland.
9. The practices of the Catholic Church were idolatrous.(32)

We have seen above that the English Government granted the Catholic demands, not because they approved of them, but because to have refused them would have brought about still worse results, namely, an Irish rebellion. History has refuted the arguments of the opposition and has vindicated the decision of the Government.

PART II

THE ARGUMENTS AND CLAIMS
FOR AND AGAINST
E M A N C I P A T I O N

Chapter IV

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning of the emancipatory movement in 1830 to its end both pulpit and press vigorously joined the discussions and debates on this question in Parliament. The Members of Parliament themselves, during this entire period, never hesitated to press their points of view, pro or contra, both in and out of Session, with the full force of their ability. The art of the pamphleteer especially flourished. As in the years 1753-54, when the Jewish Naturalization Bill convulsed the country, and again in 1828-29, when the portals of political freedom were opened to the Dissenters and Roman Catholics, a flood of pamphlets issued from both sides to gain the support of the people and the vote of Parliament. Jew and non-Jew, clergy and laity participated, all genuinely convinced of the truth and justice of their cause.

The question of the admission of Jews to Parliament provoked the greatest controversy, for this question was rightly recognized by both advocates and opponents as crucial. It was not that the protection of the Jewish status

required Jewish members in Parliament. The Jews knew full well that if successful they could never attain more than numerical insignificance in the Commons. They realized, however, that only entry into the legislature would establish them, beyond peradventure of doubt, as full citizens of Great Britain. Their opponents, on the other hand, saw in this concession the end of that principle of political exclusion which had been so precious to them since the reformation of the English Church, and the "rag-end" of which, after the damage of 1828 and 1829, they sought to preserve. They were, therefore, determined to defend, with all the energy at their command, this last bastion of political privilege, parliamentary exclusion.(33)

Chapter V

ARGUMENTS AGAINST EMANCIPATION

The principal arguments urged against the Jewish claims were religious in character, proceeding upon two grounds, namely, opposition to Jewish teaching and in defense of Christianity. These we shall present in detail. Of much lesser importance were the political and economic charges made, which will also receive consideration.

A. RELIGIOUS-Opposition to Jewish Teaching

- (1) The Jews were aliens, members of a separate nation, the tenets of whose religion did not permit them to accord full allegiance to the King. The term "alien", as here applied, was used, not in any technical or legal sense, (34) but to denote the peculiarly distinctive character of the Jew. Because of their religious institutions and doctrines the Jews must ever remain strangers in all lands of their sojourn until their return to Palestine. Political identification and social amalgamation with their Christian neighbors is forbidden them. Although dispersed among the nations of the world, a strong community of sympathy and sentiment bound them all into a distinct people, standing aloof from their neighbors. Consequently, the Jews lacked a feeling of patriotism, a sentiment to make the welfare of the country of their residence an object of their concern, which rendered them unfit for political functions. "A conscientious Jew," wrote THE TIMES, "cannot feel a

Briton's interest; he cannot, while he professes Judaism, identify himself with England; he cannot love England as an Englishman should, without abjuring his faith and trampling underfoot the holy laws and institutions committed to his forefathers."(35) Several of the Jewish antagonists averred that the interests of this "nation" were even hostile to those of the people among whom they resided. An inveterate foe of religious freedom, Sir Robert Inglis, in the Commons, during the session of 1830, claimed that the Jews had been expelled from Bohemia in the preceding century for assisting an invading army, and that the Jews of London had furnished Napoleon with a loan to enable him to continue his hostilities.(36)

- (2) The Jews were constantly looking forward to their restoration in Palestine. England, consequently, could never become their homeland, but must remain merely a place of their sojourn; nor could the Jews become Englishmen, for they were firmly attached to the land of their forefathers, and their anticipation of return deprived them of real interest in the prosperity of England and its people. They were undoubtedly entitled to the protection of their persons and property and to the undisturbed exercise of their religion, but their Messianic hopes rendered them unworthy of the rights and privileges of English citizens. The Jew, exclaimed Lord Belgrave in 1830, "looked with an incessant and undivided regard to the history of another land--he was the patriot of another soil, all his hopes and wishes turned toward it; and his heroes were the inhabitants of another country, and it was upon their glories he reflected with confidence--it was to them his memory reverted with delight. This divided interest incapacitated the British Jew from

executing the duties he would be called upon to perform as one enjoying the full privileges of an Englishman." (37) In support of this argument, Sir Robert Inglis quoted to the House of Commons from a published letter by a certain Rabbi Crool, (38) teacher of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge-- "Jews, whether they spend two days, or two months, or twenty years in a country, are equally strangers and sojourners. They must look to another home and another country." (39)

- (3) The removal of Jewish disabilities would result in no practical advantage to the Jews because of their religion. Although the liberal countries, France, The Netherlands, and The United States, had placed their Jewish citizens on an equal footing with the rest of the population, pitifully few of them had obtained political office. Sir Robert Peel (40) argued in the Commons in 1830 that "We find them (i.e., the Jews) in the possession of political privileges in France, in The Netherlands, and in The United States of America--in the last, during a period of forty years and in the two former, during the last fifteen years, and only two Jews have in that time been admitted to political offices. (41) You may say, that since so few have been admitted, there is no danger in admitting English Jews to political power. Now the inference I draw from it is, that if the Jews expect to derive so little advantage from the removal of disabilities, the practical benefit to them must be very small; and for such a trifle are we to depart from what has formed for centuries one of the fundamental principles of the Constitution (i. e., belief in Christianity)?" (42)

B. RELIGIOUS-In Defense of Christianity

- (1) Since England was a Christian country, its Parliament should be a Christian legislature. Only persons professing the Christian faith should be admitted

to civil office. It would be a tragic anomaly to enable Jews to make and administer the laws of a Christian state, for the welfare of both Church and nation required that the legislature remain as it was, exclusively Christian. The character of the country, it was maintained, was determined by the character of the legislature. Consequently, it would be impossible to preserve the Christian character of the former by admitting into the latter persons hostile to Christianity. If the Jew wished to legislate, he could make himself fit through conversion to the Christian faith. (43)

- (2) The admission of Jews to equal rights would destroy the Christian character of the Constitution. From the earliest period Christianity was interwoven with the Constitution. Heretofore, only persons accepting Christian tenets could obtain political office. Now, however, an attempt was being made to depart from these first principles of the Constitution. (44) Gladstone, who did not speak in favor of the Jewish claims until 1847, declared in 1841 that "In our general practice our laws were modelled on the principle of Christianity, and they (i.e., Parliament) had a solemn recognition of those principles in a practice of commencing the daily proceedings in both Houses of Parliament by the solemn invocation and worship of the Almighty. Such being the case, they were not at liberty, according to the sense of the Constitution, to include every religion as the true one. The question then really before the House, as it appeared to him, was this--whether they would consent to destroy the distinctive Christianity of the Constitution?" (45)
- (3) Although the Jews enjoyed religious freedom and personal protection, their civil emancipation was made impossible by a great constitutional principle of law--that Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land. Consequently, it

was not an act of injustice or persecution to prevent a class of men denying the doctrines of Christianity from expounding the laws and administering the courts of England for adherents of those doctrines.(46)

- (4) The deletion of the words, "upon the true faith of a Christian," from the statute-book would create the impression that the Legislature was indifferent to religion. This consequence was fraught with grave danger. If the public saw that the Members of Parliament were indifferent to Christianity, making no distinction between Christian and Jew, but granting legislative functions to both alike, it would either destroy all respect for the Houses of Parliament, or injure the cause of Christianity in the minds of the people. Moreover, such conduct would depress and relax the energies of those devout Christians who were engaged, in foreign climes, in the propagation of the faith.(47)
- (5) The Jewish people, in fulfillment of of the scriptural prophecies, were undergoing a special punishment and dispersion, condemned to suffering by divine judgement. Therefore, their admission to political rights would be wilful disobedience to the will of God. The hostile pamphlets and newspapers of the day vehemently exploited this argument. Typical was this outburst: "....yet bold must he be, who, presuming to be more benevolent or merciful than his Maker, would clothe the 'rejected heir'(i.e., the Jewish people) with power, and place him among the rulers of the land, while as yet the sentence of his condemnation, that he should find 'no resting-place for the sole of his foot' remains uncanceled. The fact may be overlooked, but it cannot be controverted, that no people upon the earth stand in the awful light to all others as do the Jews. 'Scattered and peeled' among all nations for their rejection especially of Him on whom

our own highest hopes are fixed; separate from, and unconnected with any, they gleam in the darkness that surrounds them, as the bush burning with God's wrath yet consumed. Once the chosen lights of the world, they are now the appointed warning of the world, sifted into every land to teach that lesson by their woe and degradation, which they had been designed to teach by their happiness and prosperity; serving as beacons to point out... the rock on which the ark of their strength was wrecked, and to attest that no sin is so fatally, so deadly provocative of wrath as 'mercy scorned.'"(48)

- (6) Since the English Parliament legislates not only for the State but also for the Established Church, the Jews disqualified themselves by professing religious tenets hostile to Christianity. How could they, as Members in Parliament, vote fairly and impartially on measures having for their object the advancement of Christianity, and more particularly the Church Establishment?(49)

Such were the principal arguments advanced by the adversaries of Jewish emancipation. There was, however, a profusion of others of lesser importance.

C. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL

In some quarters the economic and social traits that characterized, or were believed to characterize, the Jews were stigmatized. The Jew, it was held, never labored or produced. He swarmed to trade and usury, followed sordid pursuits, as peddling and old clothes, and avoided all honorable employment. He was absorbed in the acquisition of wealth, and, lacking the finer sentiments, was devoid of culture and refinement.

It is a circumstance to be noted that only in rare instances(50) did we find these charges made directly by Jewish antagonists. Our attention was directed to them largely in consequence of replies questioning their justice or their accuracy.(51)

D. POLITICAL

Although he failed in 1829 against the Roman Catholics, Sir Robert Inglis continued to press his argument, now with the Jews as his object, that no man possesses an abstract right to political power. Every subject could justifiably claim protection for his person, property, and religion, but the governing authority alone was entitled to confer political power on those whom it chose to select. Such selection was based on expediency, and those excluded could not justly raise the cry of persecution. As for the Jews, expediency demanded that full political privileges be withheld from that people, who professed a religion of error.(52)

E. MINOR

It was maintained by some that the great body of truly religious Jews were opposed to all political ties with their neighbors. Sir Robert Inglis availed himself of every opportunity to quote from Rabbi Jacob Crool,(53) an unknown, self-appointed monitor of his people, in support of his contention that emancipation could not be accepted by the Jews without compromising their religious principles. His opposition and that of his colleagues, therefore, could be vindicated as an invaluable service to the Jews themselves.(54) Other opponents implied that the inconsiderable number of Jews in the kingdom (approximately 30,000) handicapped them in their struggle.(55)

The Archbishop of Canterbury did not hesitate to remark: "... in what way the Jews had shown any disposition to resist the continuance of this alleged grievance (as did the Catholics before 1829) he knew not. They had not, that he was aware, evinced any disposition to disturb the peace of the country. There was no danger which their lordships could avert by such concession, nor did he see anything that could be gained by it." (56)

Wild and exaggerated statements were legion. It was predicted that "mosaic gold" would convert the Parliament into a Jewish Sanhedrin. (57) It was calculated that, following their admission into the Legislature, twenty-five Jews would secure seats in the Commons. (58) Their entry to Parliament would doom the observance of Sunday. (59) Jewish members would doubtlessly abuse and revile Christianity in the House. (60) The complete emancipation of the Jews must signify the denial of Christ. (61) The principle of the Jew Bill undermined the very rock upon which the Church Establishment was built, and must sooner or later throw that Establishment down. (62) THE MORNING HERALD of November 8, 1847, insisted that "Baron Rothschild is prepared and anxious to uproot the institutions based on the Christian faith." (63) Most distorted was the utterance: "This, Sir, is what your Act (of emancipation) will produce: Pass it, and the Parliament is disgraced! Pass it, and England is fallen! Pass it, and Christianity is vanquished!" (64)

As during all previous attempts to maintain the principle of political exclusion, so now appeals were made to the ignorance and bigotry of the people. The Jew was constantly represented as the descendant of those who had crucified Jesus Christ and had invoked his blood upon themselves and their children. (65) His degradation was attributed to his stubborn refusal

to recognize the divine character of Jesus.(66) The charge was imputed to him that he scorned and despised Him who was acclaimed by all others as God, calling Him an imposter.(67) The Archbishop of Canterbury did not scruple to assert that "The profession of a Jew's faith included in it a declaration that the Saviour was a wicked imposter and one who justly suffered death--one who cast disgrace upon the Name and brought exile and servitude and persecution upon their nation."(68) And JOHN BULL commented editorially in 1849, "Belief in Christ stands in the way of Baron Lionel de Rothschild...the Saviour must give way that the Baron may enter the British House of Commons."(69)

Chapter VI

ARGUMENTS FOR EMANCIPATION

"Born in England of English parents, I acknowledge no other land as my country; no other nation as my nation. I avow the fullest and most devoted allegiance to her most gracious Majesty Queen Victoria; and I claim to be placed on a just equality with her other dutiful and affectionate subjects; and in this I express the feelings and sentiments of all persons professing the Jewish religion, who have had the good fortune to be born Britons." (70)

These words, written by a distinguished Jewish physician in 1847, express concisely the determined conviction in which were grounded the emancipatory claims of the Anglo-Jewish community. Jewish spokesmen, as Barnard Van Oven, Francis H. Goldsmid, and David Salomons, published forceful pamphlets, which eloquently sustained the justice of their people's struggle. Nor were Christian advocates wanting, who, in and out of Parliament, devotedly supported the Jewish cause. (71)

A. REFUTATIONS

Much time and space were spent by the champions of Jewish liberation in refuting the

objections of the opposition, objections which were described by Macauley as having "been employed to vindicate a system full of absurdity and injustice."(72)

- (1) The Jews, came the warning, formed a separate and distinct nation, the English members of which were more attached to their co-religionists the world over than to their fellow-countrymen. To this serious charge many vigorous replies were made. The nationhood of the Jewish people, it was asserted, had ceased long ago, with the destruction of their state in the year 70 by the Romans and their subsequent dispersion among the nations of the world. Though bound together into one spiritual community by a single faith, nevertheless, in political feeling, duty, and attachment, the Jews knew only an unquestioning loyalty to the land of their residence. Though they pointed to a common ancestry and a common history, yet their political allegiance belonged to their respective sovereign. Faithful to the injunction of Jeremiah, "Build ye houses and dwell therein and plant gardens and eat the fruit thereon..... Seek ye the peace of the city where ye dwell, and pray for it, for in the peace thereof he shall have peace."(29:5,7), the Jew, whenever permitted, always identified himself with his native land, entering into its varied activities, striving to advance its best interests, and eternally ready to sacrifice everything, even his life, in its defense. In a word, he constantly sought to become a good and useful citizen. No, there was no Jewish nation! But the English Jew did belong to a nation -- that nation which commanded the allegiance of the inhabitants of the British Empire.(73)

Numerous instances were cited as incontestable evidence of Jewish

allegiance and loyalty to their native lands. When, in 1745, Charles Edward, Pretender to the British Crown, was successfully advancing toward London, and the country was threatened with bankruptcy, the Jews freely placed their wealth at the disposal of the government, the only sacrifice permitted, for the ranks of the army were closed to them.(74) In the Wars of Liberation, from 1813 to 1815, hundreds of Jewish youths joyously enrolled in the armies of Austria and Prussia, eager to prove their patriotism with their lives, against Napoleon, the benefactor of their people but the enemy of their fatherland. During the siege of Antwerp by the French, in 1832, many Jews were in the defending Dutch army, who, by the testimony of their commanding officer, General Chasse, were unexcelled in their zeal and devotion.(75) The liberal countries, France, Holland, and the United States, were adverted to as examples attesting the competency of Jews to fulfill the duties of full citizens wherever admitted to full rights.(76) Frequent mention was made of the tribute paid the Jews in the French Chamber of Deputies, in 1830, by M. Merilhou, Minister of Public Instruction: "But since the Constituent Assembly placed the Israelites on a footing with other citizens, they have partaken of our glory and misfortunes, their blood has flowed in the same fields of battle as ours,-- their children have been brought up in the same schools with those of their Christian brethren,-- they have imbibed the same principles, adopted the same habits, and have become most deserving citizens."(77)

- (2) It was true as their foes claimed, that the Jews looked forward to their restoration in Palestine. But this hope and expectation did not render them incapable of becoming Englishmen. Their past history was a praiseworthy recital of love and

devotion to the various lands in which they had dwelt. Or examine the contemporary life of the English Jews - they bought and furnished homes; they entered into the business competition of the community as eagerly as their fellow-countrymen; they were quite sensitive to the fluctuations of the stock exchange; they filled, with pride, those public offices open to them; they regarded themselves, not as strangers or sojourners in the land, but as natives and loyal subjects of the Crown. The resettlement of the Jewish people in Palestine, by divine means at some indefinite time in the future, while anticipated by him, did not withdraw the Jew from the demands of daily life nor make him wanting in patriotism, and would not render him less capable to perform ably the functions with which political equality would invest him. It was not to be forgotten that the Christian too believed, like the Jew, in a future Messianic age, when national interests and differences would vanish, and the present world-order cease. Yet, in practice, this theological view had not the slightest influence upon his attachment to his country. So with the Jew. The truth of the matter was that the predictions of religion, whether of Judaism or Christianity, exercised no sway over the behavior of human beings by reason of the indeterminate nature of the time of their fulfillment.

With great eloquence Mr. Robert Grant supported the Jewish position in the Commons, in 1833. He alluded to the service of the Jews in the highest civil offices of the lands of their residence from earliest times on, with especial emphasis on their eminence in Moorish, and later in Christian, Spain. In conclusion, he quoted from two documents attesting an undivided allegiance to their

sovereign. The Great Sanhedrin, convened by Napoleon in 1807, reported to the emperor, "The Grand Sanhedrin declares that every Israelite, born and educated in France, and in the kingdom of Italy, and admitted to the rights of a citizen by the laws of these states, is bound by his religion to consider them as his country, to serve them, to defend them, to obey the laws, and to conform, in all his transactions, to the regulations of the civil code." In answer to the question, "whether allegiance is due to the sovereign and laws of the country in which they reside?" a "Catechism of the Elements of the Jewish Faith" for the instruction of Jewish youth declared, "Certainly; as long as the Messiah, our Redeemer, is not come, the king under whose protection we live must be esteemed as a king of Israel; and the country in which we live and are maintained, and under the shadow of whose government we enjoy security and comfort, must be considered in the same light as the land of our forefathers."(78)

- (3) With respect to the contention that a Christian country should have an exclusive Christian legislature, Francis H. Goldsmid pointed to the sophistry hidden in this argument of using the term "Christian" in two entirely different senses, meaning in the first case "composed chiefly", and in the second "composed wholly," of Christians. If one or the other of the two interpretations of the term were accepted, the argument collapsed. Assuming the word "Christian" to mean "composed chiefly" of Christians, the election of a mere handful of Jewish members to Parliament would not destroy the essentially Christian character of that body. If, on the other hand, by "Christian" was meant "composed wholly" of Christians, then England was not a Christian country, and could

not claim such title until she had expelled from her confines, not only every professing Jew, but, in addition, every Englishman who refused to avow the Christian faith. (79) Christian advocates maintained that the "existing Christian character" of Parliament would not be impaired by the admission of Jews. They pointed to precedents in various parts of the Empire, as well as in the liberal lands. "You are acting with the grossest inconsistency," the Marquis of Lansdowne informed the House of Lords in 1848, which had been, with persistency, thwarting all attempts to relieve the Jews of their restrictions. "In many parts of her Majesty's dominions Jews are at this moment sitting as members of the Legislature by the authority of the law. In Jamaica, or in Canada, a Jew may be a representative in the Legislature; and by this day's post I received a newspaper from Ceylon, which states that a Jew is a member of the Legislature of that island. Yet the bishops are safe in those colonies; and the religion of each colony is not affected by the fact that a Jew may be a member of the Legislature. Yet here it is thought by some that to admit the Jews would be to contaminate the character of the Christian assembly into which they entered. All who have a fair claim to political rights should be allowed to possess them; and Christianity does not preclude them." (80)

- (4) The admission of Jews to complete equality, it was objected, would destroy the Christian character of the Constitution. This character of the Constitution, argued Lord John Russel and others, if it ever had any reality at all, could have existed only since 1828 and 1829, for previous to those years many Christian sects were excluded from the blessings of that Constitution. (81) Similarly, others denounced this objection as a sophism dictated by

prejudice. Dr. Lushington, a learned and distinguished member of the House of Commons, illustrated its tenuous nature: "...in times of Popery, was Christianity the principle of the Constitution? No! The religion of the state was the religion of the pope for the time being, and up to the reign of William III, the principle of the Constitution and the religion of the State were direct intolerance, without the slightest regard to the religious opinions of others."(82)

- (5) In answer to the protestation that Christianity was part and parcel of the law of the land, it was pointed out that the Christianity thus protected was solely the Christianity of the Church of England by law established. As for the other sects--the Dissenters and the Roman Catholics--while their Christianity was not thus recognized by the law, every state and municipal office had been opened to them, and none could say that this latter justice had operated to the hurt of the Established Church. Similarly the removal of Jewish disabilities would not be a declaration of war against the Christianity of the Church of England nor remove it from the protection of the law.(83)
- (6) The fear that Jewish civil equality would destroy, or at least injure, Christianity was proved groundless. It was emphasized that, contrary to the conversional activities of other religions, the Jew was enjoined by his religion from interfering with that of others. He sought no proselytes to augment his numbers.(84) Was Christianity so frail and feeble, some asked, that the admission of a few Jews to Parliament would overthrow it? Had France, Holland, and the United States become less Christian since their Jewish subjects had been raised to an equal footing with the rest of the population?(85)

On the contrary! Neither Christianity nor the Church of England had anything to apprehend from the Jews. One writer revealed that the Jews had never "refused to pay their share towards the support of the Church, as some of their Christian neighbors have done, and continue to do..... The practice of the Jews in contributing to educational Christian establishments, as well as to the Church, does not prove such extraordinary hatred to Christianity and its professors; nor does the presentation of a piece of land by Sir I. L. Goldsmid, for the purpose of building a church, give us occasion to think that, if in Parliament, he would be animated with a desire to pull down the establishment." (86)

- (7) The fact that Parliament legislated for the Established Church as well as for the nation offered an obstacle to Jewish entry into that body, which their opponents were quick to seize upon. The Archbishop of Dublin, (Richard Whately, D. D.) however, in a memorable address in the House of Lords, in 1833, presented a most cogent argument to overcome this difficulty. "Whoever," he said, "is admitted to a seat in the Legislature, is admitted to a share in the government, not only of the State, but also of the Church; and that, not only in respect of its temporalities, but also of purely Ecclesiastical affairs. If, therefore, the question be asked, 'What right can a Jew have, under any circumstances, to legislate for a Christian Church?' I know of no answer that can be given to that question, except by asking another: What right has a Roman Catholic to legislate for a Protestant Church; or a Presbyterian for an Episcopal Church: What right, in short, has any man to legislate, in Ecclesiastical matters, for any church of which he is not a member? This anomaly appears to me to exist in all these cases alike. The Jews, it is true, are

much further removed from us than any sect of Christians; but it does not follow that they are more likely to make innovations in our religious institutions. They never attempt to make proselytes, nor to introduce into Christianity any admixture of Judaism; nor is it likely they would attempt, in any way to interfere with the doctrines or institutions of any description of Christians. Christians, on the contrary, of different persuasions, have often interfered in the most violent manner with each other's faith and worship. The Presbyterians did, we know, at one time, when they gained the ascendancy in this country, eject from every parish in England the Episcopalian clergy, and were in turn ejected by them; and I need not remind your Lordships of the many and violent struggles between Roman Catholics and Protestants in this and in many other countries. In fact, the nearer approach to each other in point of faith between different denominations of Christians than between Christians and Jews, instead of diminishing, increases the risk of their endeavouring to alter or to overthrow each other's religion. Although, therefore, I cannot, in the abstract, approve of Jews being admitted to legislate for a Christian Church, or of the Ecclesiastical concerns of any church being, in any degree, under the control of such as are not members of it, I cannot on that ground consent to withhold civil rights from the Jews, when Roman Catholics and Dissenters have been admitted into Parliament; since, in the case of the Jews, the anomaly is not greater, and the danger is even less. The nearer any class of men approach to ourselves in their faith, the more likely they are to interfere with ours.... We know that the Roman Catholics have persecuted the Protestants, and the Protestants, in their turn, the Roman Catholics-- in short, we know

that the various sects of Christians have done more, in molesting each other's faith and worship, than any Jews or Pagans have done against Christianity." (87) Mr. Gladstone, Lord John Russell, and other distinguished Members of Parliament concurred in this view. (88)

- (8) The absurdity of objecting to Jewish equality on the basis of the scriptural prophecies condemning the Jews to be "wanderers on the face of the earth" was revealed. A Jew, it was explained, could hold the office of magistrate, sheriff, or alderman, but not a seat in Parliament. Now, by what rule of reason or revelation did man arrogate authority to himself so to interpret divine prophecy as to draw a line between an alderman and the right to sit in Parliament? All Christians were admonished to leave the fulfillment of prophecy to its divine Author and concern themselves with the Christian precepts of love, mercy, and charity. (89)
- (9) The attack upon the social and moral condition of the English Jews was vigorously met by many Jewish and non-Jewish spokesmen. In a letter to THE TIMES Bernard Van Oyen ably defended his people. "The Jew," he wrote, "is accused of love of money, but it is forgotten that all other means of distinction are denied him; that he must rise by wealth, or not rise at all; and if, as he well knows, to ensure wealth be to ensure rank, respect, and attention in society, does the blame rest with him who endeavors to require wealth for the sake of the distinction it will purchase, or with the society which so readily bows down at the shrine of mammon? It is not pretended the Jew is a miser, that he desires to acquire wealth merely for the loathsome gratification of hoarding it.....The Jewish merchant is generally profuse in his expenditure: he has laboured to gain riches on account of the respect

which they will procure for him, and he is proud of expending them with the same view. But it is said that the Jews pursue degrading employment--that they are hawkers, pedlars, old clothesmen, etc., that there are not amongst them men of cultivated abilities, authors, artists, or patrons and protectors of the arts. All this is not literally true; there are amongst the Jews, even of the present day, very many of highly cultivated talents, and some who have greatly distinguished themselves; and if there be not more of them, the reason may be found in their exclusion from all the seminaries of learning, and their consequent devotion to the pursuits of commerce; and as to the degrading pursuits which they are accused of following, their accusers forget to inform us that they are driven into such pursuits by the laws or regulations of various municipalities, which, in large towns at least, allow them no others..... His (the Jew's) charity is universal, unbounded and unceasing: himself the child of misfortune and the object of oppression, his ear is never turned away, his land is never closed, when the piercing cry of sorrow or of want assails him, whencesoever it may arise."(90) The Christian partisans of Jewish liberation, with a unanimous voice, attributed the social and moral faults that marked the Jews to the discriminatory legislation which prevented their full participation in the life of the country.

- (10) One more important argument of the opposition requires attention, i.e., the oft-reiterated charge that the Jews characterized Jesus Christ as an impostor and Christianity a fable. Typical of the Christian dissent to this allegation was the following statement of a Member of Parliament,

Mr. C. Pearson: "He was acquainted with Jews for thirty-five years..... and declares that he never in his life heard fall from the lips of one of the Jewish people a single word or sentence, not only not resembling in the slightest degree the expression imputed to them--that of calling the Saviour a crucified impostor--but not even a single expression which the most delicate and fastidious Christian could be offended at."(91) In his reply to the attack of Dr. Croly, Mr. A. L. Green expressed the Jewish position on this subject-- "I defy you to quote an acknowledged classical standard Rabbinical authority, in support of your charge that we have any enmity against Christians, or revile Christ, -- why the whole system of morals in the New Testament, is but an echo of the Old, and in disparaging its moral doctrine we should be but finding fault with our own."(92)

B. AFFIRMATIONS

Let us now turn to the positive arguments and claims urged in behalf of the Jews.

- (1) The legislation of 1828 and 1829, admitting Dis enters and Roman Catholics to all rights of citizenship, had established the principle that religious differences must not be made a bar to civil liberties. A man's religion was a matter solely between his conscience and his God. Hence, his religious opinions, however they might dissent from those of the Established Church or even Christianity, were not to constitute grounds for civil disqualification, provided those opinions did not militate against the security of the state or the allegiance due its sovereign. Lord John Russell thus defended this principle: "Roman Catholics and Unitarians were allowed to sit

in Parliament, though the one considered the Church of England an apostasy, and the other a corruption. Those then who would exclude Jews argued on a false assumption, that none ought to be admitted to political power but those who were of the religion of the state. Religion no longer came into the question, when any man wished to be admitted to the privileges of the Constitution. It had been decided, over and over again, by majorities of that House, that no one was objectionable on the ground of his religion, but only on the ground of wanting loyalty to the king and fidelity to the state. The Jews had acquired property, bore their share of the burdens, and contributed to the exigencies of the nation; they paid the taxes and obeyed the laws, and the House ought to be glad to admit them as good and faithful subjects."((93)

Sir Robert Peel, who had left the exclusionist ranks by 1848, concurred with Russell. "If you (i.e., the opponents) can show," he declared in that year in the Commons, "that the maintenance of certain religious opinions by the Jews is a decisive proof of their civil unworthiness, you may have a right to exclude them from power; but the onus of showing this is imposed upon you. The presumption is in their favour. The presumption is, that a Jew, as a subject of the British Crown, is entitled to all the qualifications and privileges of a British subject."(94) Let us listen to Macaulay, as he derided the recourse to religious tests for political competency: "The points of difference between Christianity and Judaism have very much to do with a man's fitness to be a bishop or a rabbi. But they have no more to do with his fitness to be a magistrate, a legislator, or a minister of finance, than with his fitness to be a cobbler. Nobody

has ever thought of compelling cobblers to make any declaration on the true faith of a Christian. Any man would rather have his shoes mended by a heretical cobbler than by a person who had subscribed all the thirty-nine articles, but had never handled an awl. Men act thus, not because they are indifferent to religion, but because they do not see what religion has to do with the mending of their shoes. Yet religion has as much to do with the mending of shoes as with the budget and the army estimates. We have surely had several signal proofs within the last twenty years that a very good Christian may be a very bad Chancellor of the Exchequer."(95)

- (2) Justice and right demanded the complete emancipation of the Jews. Since they were subject to and bore their due share of all the burdens and duties of the state, they had a just claim to all its honors. With vehemence Sir Robert Peel berated his colleagues in the opposition: "In point of courage, of moral worth, of intellectual power, of mental attainments, they (the Jews) yield precedence to none. They have been faithful subjects of the crown: in the times of severe trial, at home and abroad, their loyalty has never wavered. On what ground, then, do you justify their exclusion from any privilege of a Protestant subject? Are they not so far entitled to our confidence, that they may be qualified for a trust, which they cannot exercise except through the good will of Christian constituencies (i.e., a seat in Parliament)?"(96) Such likewise was the conviction of Mr. Gladstone after 1847--"I am deliberately convinced that the civil and political claims of the Jews to the discharge of civil and political duties ought not, in justice, to be barred, and cannot beneficially be

barred, because of the difference between their religion and ours." (97)

- (3) The tenets of Christianity required that equal treatment be accorded the Jews. The admission of the Jewish people to full equality with the rest of the population would not be "an insult and affront to Christianity." On the contrary, it would betoken a vindication of that religion whose founder taught that each should "do unto others as you would they should do unto you." The imposition of disabilities upon a group, the religious views of whom did not conform to those of the majority was repugnant to the genuine spirit of Christianity, which taught tolerance, charity and universal benevolence. Such disabilities represented inexcusable persecution and Christian duty demanded their removal. (98)
- (4) The Oath of Abjuration, which was obligatory upon every Member of Parliament, and whose closing phrase, "upon the true faith of a Christian," served to bar the Jew from that body, was not originally framed to exclude him. (99) That oath, passed in the year 1701, was directed against the adherents of the Pretender, James III, and his descendants, and the words, "upon the true faith of a Christian," had been affixed to give greater binding force to the substance of the oath. Therefore, the Jewish exclusion effected by those words was wholly fortuitous. Had the framers of the oath consciously sought to disable the Jews politically, they would have resorted to more direct means clearly implying their intent. (100) In view of these observations and the fact that the substance of the oath contained nothing objectionable to the religious creed of the Jew, the form alone being unacceptable, it would be both reasonable and just so to revise the form of the oath

for persons professing the Jewish religion, as to make it most binding upon their conscience. The anomalous situation existed that no law or statute directly closed the parliamentary doors to Jews. No Jew returned by a constituency, who shamelessly took the Oath of Abjuration, including the words, "upon the true faith of a Christian," could be excluded from the House of Commons.(101) But no Jew was found ready to compromise his faith for the realization of his ambition. Consequently, "he (the Jew) must pay a penalty for his consistency; and that strict adherence to principle, which in other men is admired as a virtue, is in him visited as though it were a crime."(102)

- (5) While the words, "upon the true faith of a Christian," imposed burdensome disabilities upon the Jew, because he was devoid of hypocrisy, they offered no protection against those who had no faith whatsoever. "In the House," declared Mr. Roebuck to his colleagues, "they excluded the man of sensitive honor. Suppose a man was no Jew, no Christian, no religionist, they could not exclude him. Such a man laughed at their cobweb oaths."(103) With pointed candor a Christian clergyman described the situation: "We say to the Unitarian, to Romanist, to Jumper, to Irvingite, to Swedenborgian, the door of Parliament is open. Even the Hicksite and the Socialist, who avowedly thinks no more of the New Testament than the Jew does, and who has no counterbalancing belief in the Old, is admitted. There is no difficulty here; the Friend takes no oath; to the infidel the law merely says, only be a hypocrite--just lie a little; say, "On the true faith of a

Christian," when you avow in profession and in life, in your family and on the hustings that you are an atheist, and it will do; no further question will be asked. That theological Noah's Ark, the House of Commons, is open to all, clean and unclean, the loftiest and 'creeping things.' But stay one moment, let us examine the candidate to see whether he be a son of Abraham, for these, these only may not presume to help in making laws (even though their own lives and fortunes be interested) for a community of Gentiles."(104)

- (6) The condition and conduct of the Jews, when contrasted with that of the Catholics in the years preceding their emancipation should invite public and parliamentary favor in their behalf. There was, in the present instance, no priestly hierarchy swaying the minds of its adherents. No divided allegiance affrighted the country. No agitators were inflaming mobs, and no associations threatening the security of the kingdom. No attempt was being made to enforce demands by means of numerical strength. After many years of silence the Jews were seeking equality with their fellow country-men, but with decency and propriety.(105)
- (7) It was to be observed that in the liberal countries--France, Holland, Belgium, and the United States--where complete freedom prevailed, without distinction of creed, the Jews performed their duties with distinction to themselves and advantage to the state. The privileges conferred upon them invariably redounded to the profit of their country.(106) Some writers even envisioned a flight of Jewish capital and wealth from England to more hospitable shores, unless the legal degradation imposed upon the

Jews was removed. One asked, "Ought we to close our eyes to the impolicy of impoverishing the State to perpetuate the bigotry of the dark ages?"(106)

- (8) The opinion was expressed by many devout persons that the admission of the Jews to the full privileges of the Constitution might lead to their conversion to Christianity. Kindness and charity, it was urged, not persecution and exclusion, tended to dissipate religious error.(107)

I have deliberately abstained from any reference to Mr. Benjamin Disraeli (107) until this point because of the distinctiveness of his appeal in behalf of Jewish rights. In marked contrast to his colleagues in Parliament, who justified their advocacy of the Jewish cause on grounds of religious liberty or truth, political justice or expediency, Disraeli defended his conduct on the ground of Jewish merit and Jewish religious achievement.

"The Jews," he told the Commons in 1847, "are, humanly speaking, the authors of your religion. They are unquestionably those to whom you are indebted for no inconsiderable portion of your known religion, and for the whole of your divine knowledge..... What possible object can the Jew have to oppose the Christian Church? Is it not the first business of the Christian Church to make the population whose minds she attempts to form, and whose morals she seeks to guide, acquainted with the history

of the Jews? Has not the Church of Christ...made the history of the Jews the most celebrated history in the world? On every sacred day you read to the people the exploits of Jewish heroes, the proofs of Jewish devotion, the brilliant annals of past Jewish magnificence. The Christian Church has covered every kingdom with sacred buildings, and over every altar...we find the tables of the Jewish law. Every Sunday, if you wish to express feelings of praise and thanksgiving to the Most High, or if you wish to find expressions of solace in grief, you find both in the words of the Jewish poets. It is in the Christian Church, which you persist in believing it must be the desire of the Jew to oppose, that you must, if he be not persecuted, behold that divine corporation which teaches to all the nations of the civilized world the sublime morality, the beautiful and devotional poetry of the Jew, and the true faith he professes."(108a)

To the members of the opposition he said, "If one could suppose that the arguments which we have heard--the arguments actually put forth--are the only arguments that influence the decision of this question, it would be impossible to conceive what is the reason of the Jews not being admitted to a full participation in the rights and duties of a Christian Legislature. In exact proportion to your faith ought to be your wish to do this great act of national justice. If you had not forgotten what you owe to this people--if you were grateful for that literature which for thousands of years has brought so much instruction and so much consolation to the sons of men, you as Christians would be only too ready to seize the first opportunity of meeting the claims of those who profess this religion. But you are influenced

by the dark superstitions of the darkest ages that ever existed in this country. It is this feeling that has been kept out of this debate; indeed, that has been kept secret in yourselves--enlightened as you are--and this unknowingly influencing you as it is influencing others abroad."(108b)

Chapter VII

SUMMARY

After reflection upon the arguments and claims of both sides as surveyed in the foregoing pages, several interesting and significant things are to be noted. In the first place, all the arguments were based on the assumption that the Jews were politically disqualified upon religious grounds, i.e., because of their religious tenets. The adversaries of Jewish liberation saw the Jew as the bearer of a religion inimical to the state and to the Christianity of the land. The Archbishop of Canterbury, during the debate in the Lords on a Bill to admit Jews to corporate offices, insisted that "his objection was only to their (i.e., the Jews') religion, a religion which was decidedly hostile to the faith of Christ...."(109) As in the Middle Ages, baptism would have washed away all the existing inequalities.(110) Supporters of Jewish claims, on the other hand, dismissed these charges as groundless and successfully established the principle that religious differences must not constitute a ground for political disqualification. This religious

emphasis which characterized the entire struggle is in marked contrast to the racial anti-semitism of the present-day, nurtured and propagated by Nazi Germany. A pseudo-scientific theory of race has replaced the religious motif of the past. The Jewish people is stigmatized as a degenerate race, whose inferiority is inherent in its blood and whose survival is a constant threat to the permanence of civilization. No self-respecting Englishman of the nineteenth century, as none today, would have entertained for a moment such patently false notions as these.

Secondly, it is a notable tribute to the English Jews that, excepting a few isolated instances, (111) their adversaries in and outside both Houses of Parliament vied with one another in expressing an admiration for the Jewish moral character. The industry, morality, and loyalty of the Jews were admitted even by the most strenuous opponents.

Sir Robert Peel, while raising his voice against Mr. Grant's Bill in 1830, affirmed, "There is nothing in the conduct of the Jews themselves which ought to create the slightest prejudice against them. The upper classes of that people are eminent for charity and

sympathy with the suffering of their fellow-men, and the lower classes are not marked by any vices beyond what are common amongst persons in that rank of life. I cannot but feel the necessity of opposition as most painful...."(112)

Sir Robert Inglis was a relentless antagonist, yet he believed "that there was no portion of the community that furnished a smaller relative proportion of criminals, or that was better conducted than the Jews were...."(113) Even the Archbishop of Canterbury "said nothing against the character of the Jews as a nation- his objection was only to their religion...."(114)

Thirdly, the party of exclusion appealed solely to human passion and feeling rather than to human reason. It did not scruple to impute to the Jews opinions which they had either rejected or never avowed, especially the charge of alleged hostility to Christianity. Its gloomy prognostications echoed the superstitions of bygone centuries, untouched by the liberal and democratic movements of the contemporary age. The sincerity, however, of these adversaries cannot, on the whole, be impeached. They were certain of the truth of their position and never hesitated to risk the ridicule of their fellows that they might give utterance to their

convictions. Another comparison with the current wave of anti-semitism suggests itself. The struggle in England found demagogues and fanatical pamphleteers and virulent editors striving, as we have seen, to inflame popular passion and prejudice with wild and unwarranted statements. But no respectable layman, clergyman, or statesman resorted to such tactics. In both Houses of Parliament, where the controversy was largely fought and won, the debates were marked by serious preparation and a conscious effort to express the truth. Errors in fact were recognized and rectified; honesty of opinion led to changes from one side of the question to the other; vilification and calumny were conspicuously absent. Today, in a poisoned atmosphere, the Jews are subject to the foulest calumnies conceived by the mind of man. In Germany falsehood has been enthroned as a virtue, and truth exiled, together with her champions. Unrestrained by reason, conscience, or decency, the Nazi government victimizes and oppresses the Jewish people, denouncing them as responsible for all the ills of the world. Out of German pathology and Nazi falsification has risen a hideous caricature of the Jew, in

the likeness of which Jewish history is being re-written by German "research".

Fourth, it is to be observed that many of the objections to Jewish equality had been raised against the Catholics in 1829 and the years previous, when they had struggled for freedom. Mere change from the word "Protestant" to the word "Christian" sufficed. The implication thus looms that the Catholics were religiously idolatrous and politically dangerous when their degradation was the object sought, but they became "fellow-Christians" when the Jew was to be excluded.

Lastly, in studying the personalities who played varying roles in this historic struggle, one is struck by the fact that many Christian Members of Parliament worked in behalf of Jewish emancipation with superlative persistency and devotion. Moreover, the controversy never degenerated, in Parliament, into a party question. The claims of the Jews, throughout the thirty years of the struggle, were supported by the most distinguished statesmen^a of the country,

a. Included among these statesmen were Lord Melbourne and Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Holland and Mr. Macaulay, Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, Lord Bexley and Sir Thomas Baring, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli, Lord Stanley and Lord George Bentinck. Hansard's Parl. Debates, Series 3, for years 1830-1858.

of every party complexion, who suspended
all political differences in the common
effort to perform an act of justice.

Chapter VIII
AFTER EMANCIPATION

Thus did David Salomons plead in 1835:
"Remove, therefore, all Disabilities, and
freely open to British-born Jews those channels
in which other men, by assiduity, talent, and
good conduct, advance to honourable
distinction in life; then will They, who,
even in their now depressed condition, entertain
profound respect and veneration for their
native Country, its laws and institutions, be
doubly riveted and bound by the stronger ties
created by a spirit of gratitude."(115) England
removed the disabilities--and the Jews responded
with a fulfillment of Salomons' avowal.

For fifteen years Baron Lionel de Rothschild
sat in Parliament. Yet during that period of
time neither mosaic nor Rothschild gold
perverted the legislature. The Christian
character of the two Houses of Parliament
remained uninjured and the Church Establishment
unimpaired. In fact, the nation's business was
transacted as efficiently as before, with this
difference--that the talents, energies, and
devotion of a valuable class of people had
become bound to the country with chains of

gratitude that only freedom can weld. In 1866, eight years after their admission into Parliament, Sir George Grey, Secretary of State for the Home Department, paid honor to the Jewish Members sitting in the House of Commons in the following words: "...it would be absurd to ask if any danger had arisen to the Crown, the Church, or the Constitution, from Jews sitting in that House. They had taken part with credit to themselves, in the discussions in the House, and had performed their duty with integrity and ability." (116)

In 1885, Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, a son of Baron Lionel, was created the first Jewish peer and, as Lord Rothschild, duly took his seat in the House of Lords. (117) Others followed him, e.i., Baron Henry de Worms, who became Lord Perbriht, Mr. Sydney Stern as Lord Wandsworth, Sir Henry Samuel as Lord Swaythling, and Sir Rufus Isaacs as Lord Reading. Sir George Jessel has left an illustrious record as Gladstone's Solicitor-General for two years, followed by a ten-year service in the important judicial office of Master of the Rolls. Sir Julian Goldsmid was a Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons. Jews have been appointed to cabinet posts and the

privy Council. The War portfolio of the present Ministry is entrusted to a Jew, Leslie Hore-Belisha, who has successfully strengthened the army to meet the demands of the current crisis in world affairs.

The present century records the names of two Jews who occupy a distinguished niche in England's political life. Lord Reading (Rufus Daniel Isaacs, 1860-1935) represented in his life and character the vindication of Jewish emancipation. In 1913 he became the Lord Chief Justice, and in the performance of this office won the respect and affection of the country for his humanity. At the close of the World War, during which he rendered invaluable assistance to the government, he was appointed viceroy of India. For several months in 1931, he served in the cabinet as secretary of state for foreign affairs. Sir Herbert Samuel (1870-) is an astute statesman, having sat in many cabinets. In 1920 he was appointed as the first British High Commissioner to Palestine, and retained this office until 1925. During the years 1927-1929 he was chairman of the Liberal Party. He participated in the National Government in 1931, as home secretary, but resigned in 1932. Since then he has been a member of the Opposition.(118)

Not only have Jews participated with credit in the political life of England, but they have also distinguished themselves in other activities: in the liberal professions, in the university life, in science, art, and literature, and as patrons of the arts. Contributions to English literature have been made by such Jewish authors as Isaac Disraeli and his statesman-son Benjamin, Lewis Goldsmith, David Ricardo, the Compertz brothers, and Israel Zengwill. Jewish philanthropy has recognized all causes, irrespective of race or creed. Hospitals and orphanages have been established and supported, and educational institutions endowed. The name of Sir Moses Montefiore became synonymous with liberal munificence, and his example found expression in the generous benefactions of the Rothschilds, Harry Barnato, Lord Wandsworth, Sir Robert Mond, and Bernhard Bacon. Not least is the important role the Jews have played in British colonial expansion, several of their number having held high office in the colonies and dominions. During the World War the late Sir John Monash was commander-in-chief of the Australian forces, while Sir Isaac Isaacs served as Governor-General of Australia from 1931 to 1936.(119)

The loyalty of the Jewish community in times of crisis has been irreproachable. It responded, on each occasion, with all its wealth in money, intelligence, and youth. In the South African War, at the turn of this century, about two thousand British Jews served. During the World War it is estimated that fifty thousand Jews fought in the British Armies, five of whom were awarded the Victoria Cross. No less valuable services were performed behind the line of battle by Jewish scientists and public servants.(120)

We close with an appraisal of the fruits of Jewish emancipation by the influential TIMES of London, in 1897: "To the Anglo-Jewish community the century (1797-1897) has been fraught with blessings. They have received the full rights of citizenship. They sit in both Houses of Parliament. They have risen to high office in the state. In return they have enriched the public and private life of England....."(121)

NOTES TO CHAPTERS I - VIII

1. The recusancy laws of Elizabeth banned all religious professions contrary to the Church of England. See Henriques, "The Jews and the English Law," pp. 65-81.
2. Hyamson, "A History of the Jews in England," p. 201.
3. Op. cit., pp. 206-207 H. S. 2. Henriques disagrees, limiting Cromwell's protection to his connivance at the settlement of six Jewish families in his realm. See Henriques, "The Jews and the English Law," pp. 115-118.
4. A detailed account is found in L. Wolf's "Essays in Jewish History," pp. 117-136.
5. These Acts were (1) the Corporation Act (1661), by which all who held office in any city or town were obliged, in addition to subscribing to certain oaths and declarations, to receive the Sacrament of Communion according to the rites of the Church of England; (2) the Act of Uniformity (1662), which required the exclusive use of the Book of Common Prayer in all places of public worship; (3) the Conventicle Act (1664, re-enacted 1670), which declared illegal all meetings of five or more persons for any religious purpose not according to the liturgy of the Established Church; (4) the Five Mile Act (1665); (5) the Test Act (1673), by which all persons holding any office or place of trust under the Crown, whether civil or military, were required to take the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England and sign a declaration against Transubstantiation. The Corporation and Test Acts were rigidly enforced against the Jews, as well as against Roman Catholics and Dissenters.

6. The king claimed the power of granting dispensation from penal laws to be a prerogative inherent in the crown, and this particular exercise of the power was never disputed in Parliament.
7. Following his brother's precedent of 1674, James issued an Order in Council preventing a serious molestation of the Jews.
8. Henriques, "The Jews and the English Law," pp. 142-158.
9. Op. cit., p. 152.
10. Op. cit., pp. 164-171.
11. Op. cit., pp. 191-194.
12. Op. cit., pp. 229-246.
13. The Jews numbered, in 1830, approximately 30,000 in the United Kingdom, with about 20,000 residing in London.
14. See note 5.
15. See Appendix I and II
16. See Appendix IV
17. See Appendix III
18. Read Lord John Russell's brief account of the history of this phrase. Housard's parl. debates, Series 3, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1249.
19. Thomas B. Macaulay, later to distinguish himself as a statesman, historian, and author, delivered his maiden speech in support of this Bill. His advocacy of the Jewish claims was eloquent and a decisive factor in the final triumph.
20. Mr. Goldsmid was an able pamphleteer in the cause of his people's freedom. He was later created a baronet by Queen Victoria.
21. For greater details on the external facts of the emancipatory struggle, consult Henriques, "The Jews and the English Law," pp. 198-305.

22. By Reform Acts passed in 1854, 1856, and 1871, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were thrown open to Jews. The latter Act also admitted them to the teaching profession.
23. The word "corporation" as used in England designated the government of a town or city, or its governing council.
24. The Toleration Act of 1689, which gave to Protestant Dissenters the legal right to worship publicly, did not extend to the Roman Catholics.
25. Before the Act of Union (1800) legislation in Ireland was passed by the Irish Parliament, subject to the approval of the English Government.
26. John Morris, "Catholic England in Modern Times," pp. 23-33; Denis Gwynn, "The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation," Chap. III.
27. Op. cit., Chaps. IV-VII; John Morris, "Catholic England in Modern Times," pp. 34-44.
28. The Catholic population of Ireland numbered, at this time more than 6,000,000 people.
29. See note 5.
30. The offices of regent, lord chancellor of the United Kingdom, viceroy of Ireland, and royal commissioner of Scotland remained closed to Roman Catholics until 1871. See Hansard's Parl. Debates, Series 2, Vol. 20, pp. 727-730, pp. 942-952.
31. Denis Gwynn, "The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation," Chaps. VIII-XXI. John Morris, "Catholic England in Modern Times," pp. 44-53.
32. Hansard's Parl. Debates, Series 2, Vol. 20, pp. 727-802, 817-892, 1115-1293, 1393-1444, 1489-1633; *ibid*; *ibid*; Vol. 21, 1-131, 143-394, 619-694.
33. See Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England, Vol. IV, pp. 116-176.

34. "We do not mean aliens in the ordinary sense of the word, because every law student even knows that legally no Jew born in England is an alien..."
THE TIMES, May 3, 1830.
35. THE TIMES, May 3, 1830.
36. Hansard's Parl. Debates, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1303-1308. This is an instance, frequent among uncompromising adversaries, of citing unsubstantiated rumors or statements as historic fact. Regarding the expulsion of the Bohemian Jews in 1744 by Maria Theresa, documentary proof of the real reasons for the decree of banishment explodes the reason proclaimed by the Empress, that the Jews were guilty of aiding the Prussian invasion of that year. See Josef Bergl's "Die Answeisung der Juden aus Prag im Jahre 1744," in "Die Juden im Prag," Prague, 1927. Similarly, with respect to the complaint that English Jews had lent financial support to Napoleon, a contemporary pamphleteer, signing himself F. H. G., wrote: "The statement (of Inglis) itself appears to be wholly erroneous. An intimate acquaintance with the financial operations of the period, extending from the commencement of the war to the year 1810, enables me positively to assert, that no transaction then occurred which can justify the assertion made; and I have every reason to believe that the same thing may be said with respect to the five following years."--
"Two letters, in answer to the Objections urged against Mr. Grant's Bill for the Relief of the Jews, etc." 1830. The loyalty of the House of Rothschild to the anti-Napoleonic cause is unquestionable.--Corti, "The Rise of the House of Rothschild," Chaps. II and III. A similar unfounded charge is made by John T. Robinson, "Remarks, etc.," 1848, p. 34. For view of Jew as alien and member of a separate nation, see also Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336, Vol. 24, 784-814; *ibid*; Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 205-244, Vol. 35, pp. 865-874, Vol. 57, pp. 84-103, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1331, Vol. 104, pp. 1396-1449.
37. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 786-788.
38. See page 74, Note 53

39. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 13, pp. 47-51.
Other references on above argument are
ibid., Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1331;
"An Imaginary Speech in Parliament Against
the Jewish Disabilities," by D. R.,
1847, p. 14.
40. Peel later became a supporter of Jewish
emancipation.
41. A statement of error, apparently due to
an ignorance of the facts. C. F. Van Oven's
"An Appeal to the British Nation on Behalf
of the Jews," Appendix II, III; also
Godlsmid's "Remarks on The Civil Disabilities
of British Jews," Appendix VII, IX.
Sir Robert Inglis, although Peel's supporter,
was nearer the truth when he remarked, in 1833,
that "He corrected a mistake he had made on
a former occasion, to the effect that although
Jews were legally admissible to civil office
in France and the United States, yet the law
had never been carried into effect, and no
Jews had ever sat in the French Chambers or
in the American Congress. As for America,
Jews were members of some of the local
legislative assemblies, but it did not appear
that they ever sat in Congress. With respect
to France, he had been informed that five
Jews had sat in the Chamber of Deputies".--
Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, 1303-1308;
ibid., Series 3, Vol. 18, pp. 47-51.
42. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 802-807.
43. Ibid., Series 3, Vol. 24, pp. 724-730.
"A Few Words on the Proposed Admission of
Jews into Parliament." 1848, pp. 3, 6. See
also Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336,
Vol. 24, pp. 784-814; ibid., Series 3, Vol. 17,
pp. 205-244, Vol. 18, pp. 47-59, Vol. 19,
pp. 1075-1082, Vol. 20, pp. 221-225, Vol. 24,
pp. 720-731, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1331, Vol. 96,
pp. 220-283, Vol. 98, pp. 1330-1409, Vol. 104,
pp. 1396-1449; JOHN BULL, Dec. 11, 1847;
"A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell,
etc.," Rev. T. R. Birks, 1848, pp. 19-25;
"A Plea for the Maintenance of Our National
Christianity," Rev. R. B. Kennard, 1857, pp. 14-21.
44. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 784-814;
ibid., Series 3, Vol. 20, pp. 221-255, Vol. 95,
pp. 1234-1331.

45. Ibid., Series 3, Vol. 57, pp. 754-760.
46. Ibid., Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336;
ibid., Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 205-244,
Vol. 19, pp. 1075-1082, Vol. 20,
pp. 221-255, Vol. 98, pp. 1330-1409.
47. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336;
ibid., Series 3, Vol. 20, pp. 221-255,
Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1331, Vol. 104, pp. 1396-1449.
48. Op Cit., pp. 7-8. Also Hansard's, Series 3,
Vol. 24, pp. 720-731; editorials in
JOH N BULL, April 11 and 25, 1830, and
Feb. 12, 1849; "An Answer to the Speech
of the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Peel, etc.," by
A Barrister, 1848, p. 21; "The Claims of
the Jews, etc.," Rev. G. Croly, 1848,
pp. 6-8.
49. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 98, pp. 1330-1409;
"An Answer to the Speech of the Rt. Hon.
Sir Robert Peel," pp. 6-15; "Some Remarks
upon the 'Series of Anomalies' in the
Leading Article of THE TIMES newspaper,
etc.," by An Observer. Hansard's, Series 2,
Vol. 24, pp. 784-814.
50. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 16, p. 973;
ibid., ibid., Series 3, Vol. 24, pp. 720-731.
51. Van Oven's Letter in THE TIMES, Feb. 3, 1830;
"Judeaea Libera, etc.," Rev. T. Pyne, pp. 12-13;
"Emancipation of the Jews," 1833; "A Letter
to Henry Warburton, Esq., M. P., etc.,"
B. Montagu, 1833; "Emancipation of the Jews,"
A Christian, p. 4.
52. Ibid., ibid., Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336; ibid.,
Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 205-244, Vol. 95,
pp. 1234-1331, Vol. 98, pp. 1330-1409.
53. Previous reference to R. Crool on page 31.
One may question not only the authority of
this person but even his candor. An
anonymous writer of the period reported that
"On inquiry into the individual thus advanced
(by Sir R. Inglis) as authority for staying
the emancipation of the English Jews, it is
found that Rabbi Jacob is Mr. Joseph Crool,
a Polish Jew, who arrived in England some
years ago in a state of great destitution
and appears in the Cambridge Calendar as

holding the office of Hebrew teacher, understood to be at a salary of forty pounds a year. The University of Cambridge, or a part, petition against the emancipation of a sect of the British Community, and put forward their Polish usher as a guide for Parliament."--
"Emancipation of the Jews," 1833.

54. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 18, pp. 47-51, Vol. 35, pp. 865-871; JOHN BULL, May 27, 1848; "The Jewish Admission into Parliament, etc.," by A. Christian, 1849, pp. 6-7.
55. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336.
56. Ibid., Series 3, Vol. 24, pp. 724-730.
57. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1288-1336; Ibid., Series 3, Vol. 96, pp. 220-283; THE TIMES, May 3, 1830; "Jewish Disabilities," John Robertson, 1847, pp. 2-12.
58. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, p. 1314.
59. Ibid., Series 3, Vol. 96, pp. 220-283.
60. Ibid., Ibid., Vol. 104, pp. 1396-1449.
61. "A Word with the Earl of Winchilsen," by "One of the People," 1848, p. 3; "A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord John Russell on the Jewish Measure," Alfred Brandon, 1853, pp. 2-11, JOHN BULL, May 27, 1848.
62. "Maynooth and the Jew Bill, etc.," Dudley M. Perceval, 1845, p. 12.
63. Mentioned in "The Emancipation of the Jews indispensable, etc.," Col. George Gawler, 1847, p. 3.
64. "An Imaginary Speech in Parliament, etc.," by D. R., 1847, p. 15.
65. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 784-814.
66. Ibid., Series 3, Vol. 106, pp. 872-922; "Jewish Admission into Parliament, etc.," by A. Christian, 1849, pp. 7-8; "Remarks, etc.," Rev. J. T. Robinson, 1848, pp. 28-32; "A Few Words on the Proposed Admission of Jews into Parliament," by A Graduate of the

University of Cambridge, 1848, pp. 4-5;
"A Letter to the Parishioners of Great
Yarmouth," Rev. H. Mackenzie, 1847,
pp. 4-5; JOHN BULL, Feb. 12, 1849.

67. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 784-814;
ibid., Series 3, Vol. 16, pp. 10-17,
Vol. 24, pp. 729-731, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1331;
JOHN BULL, August 4, 1833; "Remarks on the
Proposed Bill for Admitting Jews into
Parliament, etc.," by Euphron, 1848, p. 13;
"The Claims of the Jews, etc.,"
Rev. G. Croly, 1848, p. 6.
68. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 20, pp. 222-226.
69. JOHN BULL, Feb. 12, 1849.
70. "Ought Baron De Rothschild to Sit in
Parliament?" Barnard Van Oven, 1847, pp. 7-8.
71. Deserving of special mention are Lord Holland,
Sir Robert Grant, Lord Macauley, and
Lord John Russell. See Hansard's parl.
Debates for the period; also, "Essay and
Speech on Jewish Disabilities,"
Lord Macauley, edited by Abrahams and Levy,
and Transactions of the Jewish Historical
Society of England, Vol. IV, pp. 116-176.
72. "Macauley on Jewish Disabilities," edited
by Abrahams and Levy, p. 19.
73. "Ought Baron De Rothschild to Sit in
Parliament?" by Barnard Van Oven, 1847,
pp. 7-13; "Macauley on Jewish Disabilities,"
edited by Abrahams and Levy, pp. 55-58;
Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1314-1323.
74. "An Appeal to the British Nation on Behalf
of the Jews," by Barnard Van Oven, 1830,
pp. 37-39.
75. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 205-244;
ibid., Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 784-814.
76. Ibid., Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 205-244;
ibid., ibid., Vol. 23, pp. 1158-1176.
77. Appendix, No. 1. From F. H. Goldsmid's "The
Arguments Advanced against the Enfranchisement
of the Jews, etc.," 1833. Alluded to by
Mr. Grant in 1833--Hansard's, Series 3,
Vol. 17, pp. 216. Other references on above

reply are Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336; *ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 19, pp. 1075-1082, Vol. 35, pp. 865-874, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1331, Vol. 98, pp. 606-670; "Judea Libera, etc.," Rev. T. Pyne, 1850, p. 14; "A Short Statement, etc.," David Salomons, Esq., 1835, p. 20; "The Arguments advanced against the Enfranchisement of the Jews, etc.," Francis H. Goldsmid, 1831, pp. 13-17; "A Few Words on the Jewish Disabilities, etc.," Henry Faudel, 1848, p. 21; "Reply to the Arguments Advanced against the Removal, etc.," F. H. Goldsmid, 1848, pp. 19-37; "Emancipation of the Jews," A Christian, pp. 4-5.

78. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 207-221. Also, *ibid.*, Series 2, pp. 784-814; "The Arguments Advanced, etc.," F. H. Goldsmid, 1831, pp. 6-12; "An Appeal to the British Nation, etc.," Barnard Van Oven, 1830, pp. 11-20; "Ought Baron De Rothschild to Sit in Parliament?" B. Van Oven, 1848, pp. 11-12; "Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities," pp. 36-38.
79. "The Arguments Advanced, etc.," 1833, pp. 3-5. Also, "Ought Baron De Rothschild, etc.," B. Van Oven, 1847, pp. 20-28; "Reply to the Arguments Advanced, etc.," F. H. Goldsmid, 1848, pp. 38-58.
80. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 98, pp. 1330-1340. Also, *ibid.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 16, pp. 10-17, Vol. 142, pp. 1772-1807. "Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities," pp. 23-24. "Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of British Jews," F. H. Goldsmid, 1830, pp. 29-35; "A Few Words on the Jewish Disabilities, etc.," H. Faudel, 1848, pp. 28-29; THE TIMES, May 26, 1848.
81. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1249.
82. *Ibid.*, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1325-1328.
83. *Ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 20, pp. 239-244; *ibid.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 17, pp. 207-221. Also, *ibid.*, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336; *ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 23, pp. 1158-1176, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1331; "The Arguments Advanced, etc.," F. H. Goldsmid, 1833, pp. 5-7; "An Appeal to the British Nation, etc.," B. Van Oven, 1830, pp. 22-24.

84. "Remarks, etc.," F. H. Goldsmid, 1830, pp. 26-28; "An Appeal, etc.," B. Van Oven, p. 25.
85. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336; *ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 18, pp. 47-52.
86. "A Few Words on the Jewish Disabilities, etc.," H. Faudel, 1848, p. 31. Also, Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 95, pp. 1356-1398; "A Short Statement, etc.," D. Salomons, 1835, pp. 24-26; "Dr. Croly, L.L. D. versus Civil and Religious Liberty," A. L. Green, 1850, p. 8; "A Letter to the Rt. Rev., the Lord Bishop of Chichester, etc.," Basil Montagu, 1834, pp. 5-18; THE TIMES, Feb. 10, 1848.
87. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 20, pp. 226-235.
88. *Ibid.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1331, Vol. 98, pp. 606-670, Vol. 142, pp. 1780-1781; "Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities," pp. 23-24.
89. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 95, p. 1246. *Ibid.*, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336; *ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 205-244; "Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities," pp. 38-41, 52-53.
90. THE TIMES, Feb. 3, 1830.
91. Appendix VI, 3. Also, Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336. "A Short Statement, etc.," D. Salomons, pp. 7-8; "Remarks, etc.," F. H. Goldsmid, pp. 19-22; "A Clergyman's Apology for favouring the Removal of Jewish Disabilities, etc.," 1847, pp. 25-26; "Emancipation of the Jews," A Christian, pp. 3-4; THE LIVERPOOL MAIL, March 29, 1845; THE ATLAS, April 21, 1833.
92. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 96, pp. 460-473. Also *ibid.*, *ibid.*, vol. 98, pp. 1330-1409.
93. "Dr. Croly, L.L. D., versus Civil and Religious Liberty," p. 13.
94. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 797-799.
95. *Ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 96, pp. 518-536.
96. "Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities," pp. 21-23. Also, Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336,

- Vol. 24, pp. 784-814; *ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 17, p. 200 (See Appendix VI, 4), Vol. 18, pp. 47-59, Vol. 20, pp. 221-255, Vol. 23, pp. 1158-1176; "An Appeal, etc.," B. Van Oven, p. 5; *THE TIMES*, May 8, 1849.
97. *Ibid.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 96, p. 532; *ibid.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 102, p. 925; also, *ibid.*, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 784-814; *ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 205-244, Vol. 24, pp. 730-731, Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1249, Vol. 102, pp. 906-936; "A Few Plain Thoughts, etc.," Rev. H. Hughes, 1849, pp. 6-7.
98. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 24, p. 730; Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 106, pp. 892-893. Also, *ibid.*, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 784-814; "Scriptural Reasonings in Support of the Jewish Claim, etc.," by Phoenix, 1850; "A Few Plain Thoughts, etc.," H. Hughes, pp. 6-7; *THE TIMES*, August 2, 1853.
99. Respecting the Declaration of 1828, which also concluded with the words, "on the true faith of a Christian," Lord Campbell declared in the House of Lords, in 1845, that those objectionable words had been inserted into the Declaration with the deliberate intent of excluding Jews from corporate offices. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 78, pp. 515-527.
100. While it is undeniably true that the Oath of Abjuration was not originally designed to exclude Jews from Parliament, nevertheless one must agree with the editor of *THE TIMES*, who wrote, on April 5, 1851, as follows: "It is perfectly true that there was no special intention on the part of the Legislature to exclude Jews from Parliament by leaving the oaths of admission as they now stand, but it must surely be acknowledged by all well-informed persons as equally true that if the possibility of such a question had ever occurred to the Legislature of those times, Jews would have been more directly excluded. An accidental expression may be thought to keep Jews out; an accidental omission may be quoted as letting them in...." Also, *THE TIMES*, March 14, 1853.
101. Henriques' "The Jews and the English Law," p. 300. "Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of the Jews," by a Conservative, p. 1. Also, Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1287-1336; *ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 95, pp. 1234-1331, Vol. 96, pp. 220-283, Vol. 125, pp. 1217-1291, Vol. 142, pp. 1165-1197; "A Short Statement, etc.,"

- D. Salomons, pp. 10-12; "Reply to the Arguments Advanced, etc.," F. H. Goldsmid, pp. 8-9; THE TIMES, August 2, 1850.
102. Hansard's Series 3, Vol. 116- pp. 382-387. Also, *ibid.*, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 784-814; "Reply to the Arguments Advanced, etc.," F. H. Goldsmid, pp. 8-9.
103. "Judaea Libera, etc.," Rev. T. Pyne, 1850, p. 15. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 23, pp. 1308-1314; *ibid.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 24, pp. 784-814; *ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 142, pp. 1772-1807; THE ATLAS, June 15, 1854.
104. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 78, p. 522; *ibid.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 146, pp. 1209-1278; "Judaea Libera, etc.," pp. 16-17; "A Short Statement, etc.," pp. 17-19; "Remarks, etc.," F. H. Goldsmid, pp. 33-34.
105. "Brief Memoir of The Jews, etc.," Apsley Pellatt, 1829, p. 22.
106. Hansard's Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 205-244, Vol. 96, pp. 460-540, Vol. 98, pp. 1330-1409; "A Letter to the Rt. Rev., the Lord Bishop of Chichester, etc.," B. Montagu, pp. 15-16; "An Appeal to the Humanity of the English Nation, etc.," 1812, pp. 14-24; "Brief Memoir of the Jews, etc.," A. Pellatt, p. 22.
107. Although converted to Christianity when thirteen years of age, Disraeli nevertheless remained devoted to the interests of his people thruout his life.
108. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 95,
a. pp. 1323-1328. Also *ibid.*, *ibid.*,
b. Vol. 113, p. 795, Vol. 133, pp. 961-962, Vol. 141, p. 754.
109. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 58, pp. 1048-1049.
110. JOHN BULL, London, May 27, 1848.
111. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 16, p. 973; *ibid.*, *ibid.*, Vol. 24, pp. 720-731.
112. Hansard's, Series 2, Vol. 24, pp. 802-807.
113. *Ibid.*, Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 221-227; also, Vol. 95, pp. 1249-1265.

114. Ibid., ibid., Vol. 58, pp. 1048-1049. For similar sentiments, see Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 17, pp. 205-244, Vol. 18, pp. 47-59, Vol. 20, pp. 221-255, Vol. 96, pp. 220-283; JOHN BULL, August 4, 1853.
115. Hansard's, Series 3, Vol. 181, p. 456.
116. Baron Lionel de Rothschild, whose nobiliary title was of Austrian origin, failed to secure a patent of English peerage because of Queen Victoria's irrational aversion to Jewish peers. Later, however, in the case of Sir Nathaniel, and under the influence of Gladstone, she changed her mind.-- THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, Vol. 145, pp. 600-607.
117. Hyamson, "A History of the Jews in England," pp. 341-342; Stokes, "A Short History of the Jews in England," pp. 25-26; Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. V, p. 172; Encyclopedia Britannica. (14th Edition), Vol. 19, pp. 4, 925; C. Roth, "The Jewish Contribution to Civilization," pp. 271-272, and "The Challenge to Jewish History," pp. 7-8.
118. Hyamson, "A History of the Jews in England," p. 342; Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 5, p. 173; Roth, "The Challenge to Jewish History," pp. 8-14.
119. Stokes, "A Short History of the Jews in England," p. 87; Roth, "The Challenge to Jewish History," pp. 14-20.
120. "A Short Statement, etc.," p. 26.
121. THE TIMES, Nov. 20, 1897.

APPENDIX

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

I

"I A. B. Do sincerely promise and swear,
That I will be faithful and bear true
allegiance to His Majesty King William."*

* From D. Salomons, "A Short Statement on
behalf of His Majesty's Subjects professing
the Jewish Religion," Appendix II.

OATH OF SUPREMACY

II

"I A. B. Do swear, That I do from my heart abjure as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their Subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare, That no foreign Prince, Persons, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this Realm."**

** Ibid., Appendix III

OATH OF ABJURATION

III

"I A. B. Do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify and declare, in my Conscience, before God and the World, That our Sovereign Lord King William is lawful and rightful King of this Realm, and all other His Majesty's Dominions and Countries thereunto belonging: And I do solemnly and sincerely declare, That I do believe in my conscience, that not any of the Descendants of the Person who pretended to be Prince of Wales during the life of the late King James the Second, and since his decease pretended to be and took upon himself the style and title of King of England, by the name of James the Third, or, of Scotland, by the name of James the Eighth, or the style and title of King of Great Britain, hath any right or title whatsoever to the Crown of this realm, or any other the Dominions thereunto belonging; and I do renounce, refuse, and abjure any Allegiance or Obedience to any of them: And I do swear, That I will bear faith and true allegiance to His Majesty King William, and him will defend to the utmost of my power against

all traitorous conspiracies and attempts whatsoever which shall be made against his Person, Crown, or Dignity: And I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to His Majesty and His Successors all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which I shall know to be against him or any of them: And I do faithfully promise, to the utmost of my power, to support, maintain, and defend the Succession of the Crown against the Descendants of the said James, and against all other persons whatsoever; which Succession, by an Act intituled 'An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject,' is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia Electress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and the Heirs of her body, being Protestants. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever: And I do make this

recognition, acknowledgement, abjuration,
renunciation, and promise, heartily,
willingly, and truly upon the true faith
of a Christian." *

* Ibid., Appendix V

FORM OF DECLARATION

IV

"I A. B. Do solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare, upon the true faith of a Christian, That I will never exercise any power, authority, or influence which I may possess by virtue of the office of _____ to injure or weaken the Protestant Church as it is by law established in England, or to disturb the said Church, or the Bishops and Clergy of the said Church, in the possession of any rights or privileges to which such Church or the said Bishops and Clergy are or may be by law entitled." *

* Ibid., Appendix IV