

ISRAEL FINESTEIN

Post-Emancipation  
Jewry:  
The Anglo-Jewish  
Experience

THE SEVENTH SACKS LECTURE

OXFORD CENTRE FOR  
POSTGRADUATE HEBREW STUDIES



**ISRAEL FINESTEIN**

**Post-Emancipation Jewry:  
The Anglo-Jewish Experience**

*The Seventh Sacks Lecture  
delivered on 8th June 1980*

**OXFORD CENTRE FOR  
POSTGRADUATE HEBREW STUDIES  
1980**

© *Israel Finestein*

*Published by  
The Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies  
45 St. Giles', Oxford, England*

*Printed in Great Britain  
by  
Parchment (Oxford) Ltd., 60 Hurst Street, Oxford.*

The modern world broke upon the Jews with remarkable suddenness. It came within the space of a lifetime. The new scene was set in the eighteenth century — still called the age of reason — and was advanced by those movements of opinion inside and outside Jewry which Moses Mendelssohn initiated or encouraged. It was also stimulated directly and indirectly by the Jewish new learning. Above all, and in more practical terms, the new system was thrust into the public life of the continent by the French Revolution and Napoleon. It was from that influence that Jewish emancipation sprang, or was further developed, over much of Europe in the early part of the nineteenth century. The continental reactions following the defeat of Napoleon did not and could not permanently stem that influence.

The responses of Jews to their new status were of course varied, and were sometimes anguished. The issues raised by the emancipation and by the Jewish new learning were not transitory or superficial. They touched upon Jewish identity, and upon the rationale for distinctive Jewish survival. They also concerned the techniques for sustaining that distinctiveness. All this was in the face of growing secularisation, waning faith, and the beckoning of life outside Jewish society.

The difference between the old and the new was between two Jewish world-outlooks. One was predominantly and essentially inward-looking, awaiting a grand *dénouement*, while living in a world in which, with or without a ghetto, the Jews were an enclave. The outside world was regarded, if not as hostile, then in any event as alien, whatever might at times be the extent of personal cordiality. This contrasted with the emergence of Jews into the wider society, with new types of opportunity for personal fulfilment; a society in which the inhibitions of centuries could readily fade for innumerable daily reasons. The pressure to identify oneself with other interests and causes seemed to belong to the natural order of things.

On 26th March 1823 and 1st July 1823 David Ricardo, the celebrated economist, addressed the House of Commons on the subject of freedom of conscience. Each occasion was in the course of a debate on the blasphemy laws. His language carried the argument beyond that immediate context. By implication he questioned the morality and public value of all penalties and disabilities consequent upon religious opinions. For him they were inconsistent with the spirit of the new age, self-evidently unjust and contrary to common sense. Ricardo, who married a Quaker, abandoned the Jewish faith and associated himself with the Unitarians. His death in 1823 deprived the emancipationist campaigns, including the campaign for Jewish emancipation, of an influential voice.

In his second speech, Ricardo contended that religion was not "the only obligation" but "was superadded to the general force of moral impressions..... There is not in ... polemics ... one unerring contention to which the common credence of mankind bowed...". Ricardo's general approach belonged to a stream of opinion which went beyond moral philosophy and comprised many interrelated ideas. There was the growing application of the scientific method to the study of social questions; Ricardo himself was a pioneer in the new science of economics. There was a steady

decline in the automatic respect accorded to prescriptive rights. The virtues of utility were gaining ground on the virtues of antiquity. In particular there was increasing pressure on the corporate idea of society. There was a widening acceptance of the notion that the State and the social order derive their authority from their individual components and not the reverse.

This body of thought was the background to the *self-evident* nature of the case made out by Jewish spokesmen. Later, in the wake of success, the Jewish emancipationists and their immediate successors often tended to yield to the conservative instinct, not necessarily in a party sense. Even in the earlier stages, the Jewish emancipationists had little, if any, inclination to stimulate any form of radicalism. As was natural, they availed themselves of the spirit of the day so far as it was conducive to their cause, which it increasingly was. A kind of analogy may be found in their drawing political support from leading conversionists, who had their own hopes in assisting the Jewish case, in addition to belief in its merits.

In 1828, Parliament repealed the antiquated and in practice inoperative requirement of the Anglican Sacrament upon membership of Parliament and of municipalities. But for the deliberate insertion in the Bill during its passage in the House of Lords of an obligatory Christian oath, the measure would have equally opened the way for professing Jews, although not yet for Roman Catholics.

The organised Jewish campaign for emancipation got under way following the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829. The idea that the Jews might be a special case did not enter their minds, or if it did, was quickly discounted. Any special Jewish features, such as particular vocations or attitudes, were treated by Jewish publicists as flowing from their past treatment and likely to go with the wind of pending change. Any question of Jewish nationality was not taken seriously by them, or was related to a messianism said to be as remote as the Second Coming in Christian belief. International Jewish kinship was deemed simply a matter of sympathy connected with a common religion and common historical background.

If the abolition of their disabilities was seen by Jews as their inherent right, the issues were not as clear-cut to everyone. Jews were confronted with arguments and attitudes which did not apply to the generality of groups to whom Ricardo had referred. What was presented to the public as being plainly fair towards the Jewish subjects of the Crown, was felt by others to be disturbingly novel and uniquely unsettling.

There are many glimpses in the Anglo-Jewry of the day of a deepening awareness of the emerging new world. It was sometimes accompanied by an inability or reluctance to acknowledge any major shift of context in Jewish life. Jacob Franklin, founder and editor of the *Voice of Jacob*, was the father of Anglo-Jewish journalism. On most issues he was a highly perceptive observer. In welcoming the Act of 1845, which opened municipal office to professing Jews, his newspaper praised it as a "practical" measure to remedy practical grievances. So it was. It expressed no large principle. It fell short of full citizenship. It did not adopt, commented the *Voice of Jacob* on 1st August 1845, the idea "that religious profession is no needful qualification for offices of trust and authority". The editorial added that the newspaper did not accept that principle either, and that nor did Judaism.

The refusal to compartmentalise the religious and secular sides of public life lay behind much of the opposition, in principle, to Jewish emancipation, especially among the Bishops in the House of Lords. Here was Franklin's newspaper associating itself with that refusal. I do not think this was some tactical exercise in public relations on Franklin's part, although that aspect of those observations would not have escaped his attention. Others soon saw the implications of the Act, including Gladstone. The Act carried with it, by definition, the essence of what we call the pluralist society. Once the old equation between Christianity and the institutions of society was dissolved, there was no reason — other than subjective dislike — against opening to professing Jews virtually any public office, including the House of Commons. To those who, as part of their case against Jewish entry into Parliament, pointed to the powers of the legislature in matters touching the Church and education, the reply was given that Parliament had long ceased to be an Anglican assembly and that in any event the Jews were hardly likely to play a contentious role in that area.

Franklin's eye was upon the more immediate effects of the measure. During the preceding twenty years, naturalisation was by statute permitted without Anglican ritual or Christian oath; likewise call to the Bar was permitted without the traditional Christian oath; and exercise of the parliamentary franchise was by statute likewise freed therefrom. Old restrictions on retail trading in the City of London had also been lifted from professing Jews. "We feel somewhat anxious", declared the same editorial upon the Act of 1845, "that the increasing prominence which these and similar events give us as a body should be accompanied by commensurate efforts to qualify us as a body to do credit to that prominence. .... A disproportionate number of Jews may be thrown to the surface ... [and this] requires extra devotion to the improvement of the mass." That particular concern, namely the improvement of the mass, remained a major communal impulse until at least the end of the century.

The development of Anglo-Jewry since the Resettlement differed from that of continental communities. There was never a physical ghetto. True the Jews lived in a kind of legal limbo. That was the result of the *de facto* nature both of their return and of their permitted residence in the seventeenth century. Yet from the start, there was an ever-widening legal recognition of the reality and consequence of their presence in one department after another of business and public life. From the outset, there was also considerable and continuously expanding social emancipation. Jews mingled socially in all strata of society. English libertarian traditions facilitated Jewish acculturation.

The emergence of a reformist Whig party in the nineteenth century and the growing influence of utilitarians and radicals, inevitably gave the cause of Jewish *civic and political* emancipation strong backing. So did the growing political power of the *bourgeoisie*, of which the Jews formed a notable segment. The Reform Act of 1832 favourably altered the climate in which the Jewish cause was debated in the House of Commons. The Jews were at all times ready to justify their developing public status, and their claims, by reference to their undoubted record of loyalty and service.

In 1946, the late Professor Namier wrote: "Of all men, the Jew alone has to account for his presence, and he who can be called upon to justify that, stands condemned before he is judged".<sup>1</sup> To the post-emancipation English Jews, that observation would have been incomprehensible. It echoed Namier's statement a few years earlier that "those who treat the Jewish problem as the sum-total of innumerable individual problems render it insoluble...".<sup>2</sup>

One associates this language with Leon Pinsker, the Jewish doctor of Odessa, whose *Auto-Emancipation* was written in 1882, after the onset of the pogroms in Russia. Upon this basis, emancipation was no solution, and could be an aggravation. But what was the problem to the emancipationists? It was nothing less than to achieve unreserved acceptance by their fellow-countrymen as Englishmen, while at the same time retaining a transmissible, worthwhile and historically recognisable Jewish character or identity. This was not easy to attain if religion withered, for then there would be no reason, other than irrational obduracy, against outright assimilation and merger — provided the Gentiles allowed it. Yet if the main religious traditions were retained, questions remained. Through those traditions, and in any case through common international Jewish concerns, the Jewish vision was thought by many a Gentile in England to lie elsewhere — far beyond the plains of Buckinghamshire, however agreeable the splendid hospitality of the Rothschilds and however genuine their county popularity.

To the later Jewish nationalist, the Jews would remain unassimilable, a spectre, what Pinsker called, in a well-known phrase, "a wandering corpse", which provoked in the Gentiles an "hereditary [and] incurable psychosis" and which acquired the name of anti-semitism. Only in national regeneration and the refounding of political nationhood was there safety, self-esteem and the guarantee of continuity. To most of the Jewish emancipationists and their successors, these views were offensively pessimistic, contrary to manifest destiny, and dangerous. To them, events in England, and indeed in the United States and elsewhere, belied this dark analysis. It was regarded as born of tragedy and panic counsel.

The self-confidence of Anglo-Jewry thrived on the historical sense. The age saw the inception of modern historical study. Jewish history was no exception. On 17th June 1887, the *Jewish Chronicle* published a review of the principal changes in Anglo-Jewry during the fifty years of the Queen's reign. "To feel oneself a Jew nowadays", declared the reviewer, "is more to feel the claims of Jewish history upon our lives than to perform the time-honoured Jewish rites. ... That revival of the historical sense in Anglo-Judaism is the most striking movement in its inner life...". This was a truth of increasing importance.

The intense welcome given to Heinrich Graetz, the leading Jewish historian of the day, on his London visit in 1887, was related to that state of mind. So too was the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition of that year at the Royal Albert Hall, principally organised by Isidore Spielmann. It was a state of mind which reinforced the conviction that Anglo-Jewry had arrived at a balance, an equipoise, and that this was a promise and a model for Jewries abroad.



Hermann Adler was the highly influential Crown Prince for many years until he succeeded his father as Chief Rabbi in 1891. He reigned in that office for twenty years. This Hanoverian-born gentleman of patrician demeanour was an English public figure. He was allied by blood and sentiment to the Anglo-Jewish pluto-aristocracy. Adler was always conscious that he and his community were being judged from without. From the 1870's, he was *par excellence* the spokesman for his generation of English Jews. He shared the widespread belief in the persuasive power of words, including the written word, to disabuse prejudiced minds. He, like the Italian-born Haham of the '70's, Benjamin Artom, considered a prime cause of current anti-Jewish sentiment to be a matter of religion. "Our real doctrines", wrote Artom in 1876, in his Preface to the second edition of his collected sermons, "are still imperfectly known by the followers of other creeds". He and Adler hoped that the publication of their addresses would, *inter alia*, remedy that imperfect knowledge and improve mutual understanding.

These optimistic and liberal ideas coincided, in the event, with the birth-years of modern pseudo-scientific anti-semitism, especially in Germany, which had little or nothing to do with religion. Meanwhile, English Jews enjoyed the reflected reputation of the Chief Rabbinate. There was about that office a distinct English flavour. Its centralism, the broadchurch nature of what lay within, the reasonableness of style and speech, the social stability which it seemed to represent — all this gave to the office in the late nineteenth century an unprecedented prestige.

Graetz's address of 16th June 1887 on the occasion of the Exhibition is a revealing panegyric of Anglo-Jewry. He regarded England and Anglo-Jewry as especially fitted to present what he called the "marvellous metamorphosis" of the Jewish people. He advocated the establishment here of a Jewish academy of international status with far-reaching aims in research. It would justify the past and present "isolation" of the Jews to themselves and the modern world by revealing the richness of their religious and literary heritage and the continuing value of their traditions. Graetz considered that such a scheme would be impracticable on the continent. There would be neither the mood nor the self-confidence. In an article in the *Jewish Chronicle* on 22nd July 1887 Graetz explained that in the Third Republic, it would be regarded critically by public opinion as "a kind of clericalism". In Germany, it would be held to be "a piece of Jewish impertinence".

The Jews of England, he declared in his lecture, wished to show that while they stoutly remained "English patriots", they also wanted "to preserve [their] connection and continuity with the long series of generations of Israel. ... I have no wish to pay you mere compliments. I desire only to establish the fact that a new birth, full of brilliant hope, has again come to despised and powerless Israel" and to demonstrate "that our people ... has renewed its youth for the third time". Such demonstration was to be the grand aim of the proposed academy. The spirit of the utterance and of the occasion may be gathered when it is realised that the other two periods of "renewal" to which Graetz referred were the exodus from Egypt and the return from the Babylonian Exile.<sup>3</sup>

There was a belief that, subject if you will to the messianic end of days, a culmination or fulfilment had already been achieved, and that it was

attainable elsewhere. There was a profound conviction that with increased knowledge and scientific progress, old prejudices would dissolve, and that in every land, given time and effort, favourable change would come. To put the balance here at risk could weaken prospects abroad. Accordingly the assimilation of the Eastern European Jewish immigrants around the closing decades of the century into English and Anglo-Jewish life was of prime importance. Upon the success of that operation was thought to depend the success of Anglo-Jewry and much else besides. Anglicisation thus became a moral imperative. Anglo-Jewish communal policy was dominated by considerations of public image.

In 1880, Anglo-Jewry was about 60,000 strong. During the next thirty-five years, about 120,000 Jewish immigrants, mainly from Eastern Europe, settled here. At the end of the century, the social pyramid of the Jewish community ranged from the bankers and substantial merchants to the large variety of shopkeepers and small tradesmen of all degrees of comfort, or lack of it, and a distinct Jewish proletariat. These latter categories were much expanded by the great immigration.

In 1897, Lucien Wolf, writing of the sharp religious divisions in the Jewish community earlier in the century, stated: "In all essentials the Anglo-Jewish community is absolutely united".<sup>4</sup> He could not have included the newer foreign element. His use of the term "Anglo-Jewish community" in the context is significant. The habits of English placidity and the English preference for undogmatic thought deeply affected the more leisured sections of the Jewish community and the very many who took their lead from them throughout that community. Family ties, a shared or comparable social milieu, and the sense of being English, drew together many whose predecessors were keenly divided in the '40's and '50's. Substantial differences remained between orthodoxy and reform, but the western orthodoxy of the Chief Rabbinate and the conservative style of English reform could live in amity.

In the intellectual *avant-garde*, it was beginning to be fashionable to equate dogmatic religion with unreason. It was equally fashionable in conventional society to conform to an undemanding religiosity. These considerations — not always consciously — rendered acceptable what in theory was a strange combination, namely the combination of public attachment to many of the forms of tradition with a free approach to many of the intellectually advanced standpoints of the day. It enabled some men to find in say the large-scale administration of the United Synagogue a congenial commitment to an inherited Judaism, sometimes irrespective of their personal views on the religious traditions enshrined in the organisation.

The idea of a secular Jew was anathema to the emancipationists, if indeed the category occurred to them. To the vast majority of them, it did not arise as an issue. From their point of view, Jewish separateness had either a religious sanction and purpose, or none at all. And even the religious purpose was regarded as having its ultimate end in the good of all mankind.

If there is to be a portrait of those times, even though it be critical in judgment, one must have some regard to their predicaments. Without that, there is left only an easy parody. Consider, for instance, the cultivated

journalist and publisher, Laurie Magnus. That talented man of letters was the son of Sir Philip Magnus, the noted educational reformer. In 1902, Laurie Magnus published under the title "Aspects of the Jewish Question", an expanded version of an article of his which had appeared that year in the *Quarterly Review*. The book is a veritable philosophy of Jewish life, on the part of a Jew anxious to deepen Jewish self-consciousness and retain Jewish distinctiveness, while decrying all ideas thought by him to corrode the public image and private fact of the Jewish Englishman.

In a crucial passage in his Preface, Magnus wrote as follows: "The Russian Pale will not be broken down till the Jews of Russia have succeeded, like the Jews of England before them, in asserting their civil and religious liberty. .... The real problem of the 20th century is the backwardness of the nations, not the forwardness of the Jews. Meanwhile the westernmost countries do well to protect themselves. Great Britain is bound to scrutinize her immigrants from time to time, and to see that they do not abuse her receptive capacity. ... The solution which would make Roumanian or Russian Jewry the type and standard of Jewish life and would drag down the Jews say of England to the level of a persecuted race, betraying the record of 19 centuries, is false, retrograde and impractical".

This was a view of history. In the light of the successes achieved in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries — albeit there were reverses — Magnus' view of history, the antithesis of that of the modern Jerusalem school, had for that generation every mark of moral legitimacy and academic respectability.

It was also related to the idea of the Jewish mission. There were always two sides to that doctrine. It served to explain, even justify, Jewish separateness. It also, so to speak, accounted for, even required, their dispersion. In the early 1880's, the former aspect was the more prominent. There was emphasis on the proposition that some limits had to be set to integration. By the end of the century, the idea of dispersion was the more talked of aspect. Concepts connected with separateness were underplayed. Although Adler, Claude Montefiore and Lucien Wolf presented differing formulations of the idea of the Jewish mission and the manner of its operation,<sup>5</sup> their *ad hoc* alliance against political Zionism thirty-five years later was in the making in the early '80's. Their own system was at its most robust. They had ample freedom to engage in their own polemics without later inhibitions.

Throughout, the doctrine of mission provided a genuinely-felt and high-minded justification for Jewish separateness, at a time when it was not called for on any grounds of nationality or by any material differences in the habits of every-day life. The Jews, declared Adler, ceased to be a nation with the destruction of the Second Temple. When Claude Montefiore and Israel Abrahams propounded Judaism as a "denationalised" creed, the conception gained all the greater authority from Adler's support. Israel Zangwill was prominent among those who could not reconcile the idea with the language of Simeon Singer's authorised daily prayer-book.

Meanwhile, the Jewish leadership, in the agony of the moment, had to take practical steps. The restrictionists on immigration had to be answered,<sup>6</sup> hostility to the Jews countered, the immigrants succoured and educated. Yet the wider issues, raised by Gentile and Jew, were momentous. The public

discussion on them had not ended by reason of the opening of the House of Commons to professing Jews in 1858. Twenty years later, Professor Goldwin Smith, historian and prominent Liberal, wrote in the newly-founded prestigious journal, *The Nineteenth Century*, that it was "beyond the legislature's powers" to make Jews patriots as long as they remained "genuine Jews".<sup>7</sup> The debate raised the question "What is an English Jew?", an issue which involved larger questions, including "What is a Jew?"

In 1869, in his pulpit at the Bayswater Synagogue, Adler delivered a series of twelve hard-hitting sermons repudiating the main alleged proofs of Christianity in the Old Testament. The addresses were at once published and were widely reviewed in the general press. It was as though he wanted at an early stage to clear the ground in readiness for an equally considered and robust projection of Judaism to the reading public. The Jewish community looked to him to allay any lingering concern over their complete emancipation.

To judge it all as simply the aspiration of hopeful Englishmen of the Jewish persuasion is a ready-to-hand over-simplification. It fails to do justice either to the English dimension or to the high providential character which English Jews read into their position.

There was no emancipation in the United States of the sort experienced here. The United States had no established church, and came into being as a kind of secular egalitarian utopia, save for the negroes. In revolutionary France, the compulsive force of the doctrine of the rights of man could in the end have no truck with enclaves or reservations. In the Germany of Brandenburg-Prussia there was the State, from which all derived their status and purpose. None of these systems found nourishment in England.

From the seventeenth century, long-standing political and constitutional struggles in England were interwoven with religious dissent. England's industrial and commercial expansion strengthened the Dissenters' influence, and was itself stimulated by the philosophy and outlook of dissent. Religious individualism and economic individualism nourished each other. By the mid-nineteenth century, England had long come to terms with the advantages of liberalism and the respectability and power of religious nonconformity. It was the triumph of Protestantism, which was part of the spirit and fabric of society.

The leaders of the movement for Jewish emancipation in England avidly presented themselves as no more than citizens out of conformity with the established church. They were one of the Nonconformist sections of society. That was the groundwork of their public relations. It was what they meant when they talked of themselves as Englishmen. It enabled them without artificiality or strain of logic, to develop Jewish distinctiveness at home and dwell on Jewish kinship abroad. At the conclusion of his Lord Mayoralty in 1856, Sir David Salomons made a significant public reference to this. In a City address, he expressed the hope that he might be regarded as one "who had done something for the Nonconformists ... I do not mean for any particular section of Nonconformists but for that large body ... some of whom are Christians and others not." It may have been a special kind of Nonconformity, but Nonconformity once acknowledged as the circle of their public being, any special features of the Jews mattered less, if at all.

This was especially the case as international Jewish kinship had a widely-discussed historical and biblical warrant. The Jewish future, and even the Jewish present, was thought by many to have a providential mystery about it. This did not obscure the fact that on the whole the Jews were the best of citizens. There was much truth in Hilaire Belloc's comment in his book *The Jews* (1922, p. 221) that to the Protestant middle classes of England the Jews "seemed the heroes of an epic".

When Arnold White, the notable publicist on the Jewish question, used the term "aloofness" to describe the outlook of the Jews, he did not restrict the description to the newcomers. This growing opinion about the Jews, which was related to their readiness to assimilate but not to merge, was a constant preoccupation on the part of leading Jews. The more the emancipationists declared their satisfaction with the civic, political and professional opportunities opened to them, the more intently did they seek to demote any "aloofness" to the rank of an incidental concomitant of their religious attachment and identity.

On 10th July 1857, one year prior to the opening of the House of Commons to the Jews, Lord Derby, the leader of the Tory Party, said of the Jews, in a speech in the House of Lords, that "though among us, they are not with us ... they retain their laws ... their peculiar customs ... they do not generally associate freely with their fellow-subjects ... they have interests wholly apart". He eloquently opposed their admission into "the legislature of this Christian country". John Delane, editor of the *Times*, might develop a close personal friendship with the Rothschilds and influentially advocate the removal of Jewish disabilities. The City might encouragingly elect and re-elect the head of that family to Parliament even though he could not legally take his seat without the Christian oath, to which it was known he would not subscribe. Yet Derby's sentiments were far from limited to Derby. Nor were they malevolent. Nor did they cease to find expression after 1858. Jews were only too well aware that the Act of that year, passed under a Government headed by Derby, was not a triumph for principle. It was a compromise forced upon the Party leaderships by political anxiety and weariness over the ceaseless tension between the two Houses of Parliament on the issue.

What was the complaint of the critics? In the 1860's most of Anglo-Jewry was native-born. What was there, for example, about the Goldsmids, long the leading Jewish emancipationists, which rendered them "not with us"? Or Salomons, who was Lord Mayor of London three years before Parliament opened its doors? Likewise what of all those middle-class Jews in the provinces who were prominent in the social, commercial and literary life of their localities? At the root of it, linking the Goldsmids and Salomons with the freshest new arrivals was what was called nationality. "I am not prepared to deny to them", said Derby, "that which I am sure they themselves would be the last to abjure, namely ... their character as a nation". An important ingredient in what was called the Jewish national character or identity was the restorationist belief and aspiration, whatever form it took. Whatever its formulation — it had many varieties — it was irretrievably distinctive. It was a distinct form of chosenness, however much the national identity of the Jews might be disavowed.

To present the Jews as no more than one denomination among many, somehow fell short of what, instinctively or otherwise, they were often held to be by their neighbours, and indeed among many of themselves. Loyalty to the Crown was not in issue. What was discussed was their refusal or inability truly to assimilate, their irretrievable apartness, their other interests. Even when Jews sought to abandon the metaphysical connotations of their separateness, those other interests showed no sign of abatement. The idea that upon the Jews had been placed, whether by divine providence or the forces of history, the burden of the moral enlightenment of mankind, involved an unmistakable particularity. No Gentile appreciated this more clearly, even upon Montefiore's premises, than Arnold White. The *noblesse oblige* character of these ideas did not detract from their particularity. White, generally regarded as anti-semitic, did not alter his conviction that, in the interests of themselves and of Europe, Jews should have a territory of their own, preferably in Palestine and under the aegis of the Great Powers.

In the same spirit Goldwin Smith was in a sense a publicly committed Zionist. In a public exchange with Lucien Wolf in 1881,<sup>8</sup> he stated that the nation which sponsored Jewish settlement in Palestine would find that the venture aroused considerable Jewish support. He referred to the "evidently pending" dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. "Nobody supposes", he observed, "that the Rothschilds would return to Jerusalem. But some of the intensely exclusive Jews might return, and their withdrawal might facilitate the fusion of the more liberal element within European society. At all events justice will have been done to the race, and its position as a separate nationality would be defined, as is that of the Greek".

Great importance was attached in Jewish thinking to England and all things English. British power in the world, the prestige of the Victorian monarchy at home and abroad, the stability and moderation of English public life, coloured everyone's thinking. It was part of the self-righteousness of the successful English Jew at the end of the nineteenth century. English Jew and English Gentile met on the common ground of their belief that they were participants, on merit, in works of enlightened self-interest. There was also felt to be a common stock of civilized opinion, untouched by differences of doctrine. This feeling was ever strengthening at the expense of Jewish public dogmatism. In 1911, Maurice Simon, Hebrew scholar and frank critic, wrote that "Anglo-Jewry will have to disabuse itself of the idea that it is or ever was the special favourite of Providence".<sup>9</sup> By that time, the old optimism wore thin.

There was one development upon which, perhaps even above political Zionism, Adler uttered his gravest public warnings, namely the secularisation of society. He tended to identify it with the advance of radicalism and socialism. He was anxious that the Jews should not be tarnished with involvement in atheistic culture or agnostic philosophy. He did not want them to be over-ready to deny the social value of established institutions. A powerful section of his lay entourage did not hesitate to come to the public support of the Church of England. The main spokesman of that group was Lionel Cohen, the banker and Conservative Member of Parliament who founded the United Synagogue. Adler wanted to let it be known that, as Disraeli proclaimed, Jews were in the main conservative by instinct, not necessarily in a party sense.

This concern was somewhat paradoxically related to the much-publicised Jewish advance in public life. The idea gained ground that such advance affected, by implication and in practice, the structure and nature of society. As early as 1847, Gladstone developed this point, in a famous debate in the House of Commons. It was on the resolution of the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, prefatory to the first of the new round of Bills to open Parliament to Jews.<sup>10</sup> Gladstone had never before spoken in favour of such a measure. He caused his speech to be published with a long explanatory introduction. The speech cost him his political credibility among the mainly Conservative heads of Colleges in his constituency of Oxford University. "The immediate question," he wrote, "contracted as at first sight it may appear to be, touches the whole range of topics connected with national religion and with the connection between Church and State". He added in highly significant language: "Now that the State has made itself in a certain degree external to the Church and her laws, it is time that we should consent to a certain degree to view the Church as a body external to the State". The point was not lost on the Nonconformists of Lancashire who were to provide him with a later power base, upon which he built the Liberal Party.

The Jews had no desire to be agents, catalysts or symbols for the transformation of society or changes in the political order. While Adler was engaged in the 1870's and 1880's in a long public debate with Goldwin Smith over such questions as Jewish nationality and whether a Jew can be a patriot, there was on the Jewish side the underlying concern that Jewish emancipation and Jewish success were seen as having wide implications for an old and dissolving English order of society.

The Jewish question in public policy and constitutional principle differed in nature from earlier questions concerning the disabilities of non-Anglican Christians. No movement was more charged, for some, with alarming implications of indifferentism than that of Jewish emancipation. To the old school, and to some branches of the new, it seemed to represent or presuppose a large shift in the very character of the social order. The emergence of the pluralist society was accompanied by a growing assault on the privileges of the Church of England at the Universities, and in the legal system and public life generally. It went hand-in-hand with many changes in public policy which affected all political parties. The changes were at every stage resisted. Linked with the resistance was the anxiety of some that the new approaches to public life, aided by the decline in the hold of the biblical text and by the incorporation into civic and political life of non-Christian elements, would indirectly enhance the respectability and influence of secularism. It was the ultimate fear. "It is not so much Dissent", wrote John Keble in the mid-century, "that I fear, nor even Rationalism". "It is", added that Anglican theologian and poet, "the complete secularisation of men's minds there".<sup>11</sup> He was referring to what he regarded as the increasing "worldliness" at Oxford, but his thoughts were not restricted to that direction.

All these considerations — added to ancient habits of mind towards the Jews — created a distinct atmosphere in the continuing public debate about the Jews and what they were. What came to be emphasized were those qualities thought to be inherent and ineradicable, especially those which were thought to point to separate nationality. This was not simply the anti-

semitism of Goldwin Smith. Still less was it the attitude of expendability towards the Jews exhibited by Edward Freeman, Regius Professor of Modern History at the University of Oxford. Writing privately to a friend at the time of the Guildhall meeting in 1890, which was called to protest against the treatment of the Jews in Russia, Freeman stated: "I don't want to wallop anybody, even Jews. The best thing is to kick them out altogether like King Edward of blessed memory".<sup>12</sup> Nor were the views to which I refer necessarily connected with that antipathy against Jewish commercial prominence, which was expressed by William Cobbett early in the century and by some trade union leaders, including John Burns, at the end of the century, and of which Henry Labouchere, Liberal politician and journalist, was spokesman around the '70's.

It was the combination of the charges of national separateness with being a social catalyst, which gave a sharp edge to the public exchanges. The noble Monte Christo-type figures presented by George Eliot and Disraeli did nothing to subvert the pejorative picture of the Jew promoted by the critics. Even among liberal-minded Conservatives and among some Liberals, the old view of Thomas Arnold<sup>13</sup> persisted that the Jews as non-Christians were no better than lodgers. In this view, they were sojourners who, while they adhered to their religion and did not abandon their special interests, were, strictly speaking, not entitled to enjoy nor even capable of properly exercising the rights of Englishmen. These ideas up to about 1880 had much to do with the desire to uphold, if no longer the Anglican, then at least the Christian test for a well-ordered society and a safe legislature, especially in connection with religious and educational matters. Thereafter the balance of the argument laid less emphasis on the catalyst theme — though it continued to be adumbrated — and ever more stress was placed on the national separateness point.

No sooner had the sense of equilibrium settled in as far as the Jewish emancipationists were concerned, than a new feeling of pressure was felt. Or was it the revival of old pressures, or perhaps a keener awareness of them in a new situation? The Jewish euphoria over emancipation was at its height in the 1870's. In 1871, a professing Jew, in the person of Sir George Jessel, became for the first time a member of the Government. He was Solicitor-General in Gladstone's first administration. Two years later, he was appointed Master of the Rolls. The Board of Deputies understandably described the appointment as "the culminating point in the advancement of the Jews in the service of the State". On 6th April 1883, the *Jewish Chronicle* described Jessel's remarkable career as having "solved the question — can Jews be patriots? — in such a way that it can never more be raised in England while his memory remains with the British public. His life is a justification of the Emancipation". These terms are an historical pointer to the state of mind of the English Jews. In the 1870's fresh or redesigned arguments against the Jews gained strength and confidence. Adler's addresses in the '70's and '80's reflected at times the long exhilaration over the new dawn and at times a sense of anxiety, which he retained in spite of himself to the end of his life.

The heirs of the emancipation wanted above all to uproot the concept that to profess the Jewish religion was to belong to a Jewish nation. When in February 1878, Goldwin Smith wrote of the Jews that "their only country is



their race, which is one with their religion”, the observation was regarded as the very pith both of his anti-Jewish creed and of what in their public relations the Jews had to contest.<sup>14</sup> In 1899 appeared Arnold White’s *The Modern Jew*, the classic of the immigration restrictionist literature. “For successive generations”, he wrote, “the Jews are tied to alien communities of their race and faith in other lands by closer bonds than any that unite them to the country of their adoption”. The last word carried a special sting. White added: “At the bottom of everything to which the nations of Christendom can legitimately object” in relation to the Jews is their “aloofness”. Among the ingredients of their aloofness, he included “the consciousness of consecration to the mission with which they have been entrusted”. White’s opinions about the Jews gained added authority not only from the studious and not always unfavourable character of his presentation, but also from the fact that in the early 1890’s as agent of Baron de Hirsch he had negotiated advantageous terms with the Czarist Government for the emigration of Russian Jews to Argentina.

The Jews were further faced with two contradictory sets of charges, which in one way or another were related to what has been set out. Anglican diehards in the Tory Party looked on them as heralds and beneficiaries of the new and restless age. Yet among some Liberals, especially on the radical wing of the Party, they were seen as a bulwark against desirable social and political change, by reason of their financial power and aristocratic associations. This latter opinion tended to be reinforced by the notion of the inward-looking character of Jewish concerns and by the alleged Jewishness of Disraeli’s foreign policy.

During the General Election of 1879, Robert Leake, President of the Manchester Liberal Association, sent Gladstone a request from a group of Manchester Jews. They wanted Gladstone to use his influence with the Christian peoples of Eastern Europe to obtain better treatment for the Jews in their territories. Gladstone replied that “there was a great difficulty in the way” of establishing civil equality for those Jews, which he had publicly advocated. He made the unsubstantiated charge that the Jews in the West mainly supported the denial of civil equality to the Christian subject races of the Ottoman Empire. This clearly reflected — and Gladstone said as much — his hostility to Disraeli’s general pro-Turkish policy.<sup>15</sup> Disraeli’s policy was essentially the containment of Russia. Prominent Liberals suspected a connection between that policy and Jewish resentment against the Czarist Government on account of the treatment of the Jews in Russia.

This public exchange precipitated a flow of correspondence in the national press, especially the *Times*, in whose columns there appeared an unprecedented debate on the Jewish motivation in politics. A large gallery of leading Jews joined in. The correspondence foreshadowed a new turn in public life as far as the Jews were concerned. It may fairly be said to mark the end of the long honeymoon of the emancipation. Note in particular the striking letter from Sir John Simon on 21st December. He was the leading lay member of the West London Synagogue of British Jews and a prominent Liberal Member of Parliament. “Is all sympathy”, he asked, “reserved for the subject races [of Turkey] and none to spare for the unhappy Jewish people?” That note of entreaty, bordering on despair, belongs to our own century. He

publicly warned Gladstone on a number of occasions that he might expect considerable Jewish defections from the party in certain circumstances. That language also belongs to a later age. One can understand how it was that the lay heads of the Jewish community turned to Hermann Adler to reassert the spirit of the emancipation.

It is no accident that those years saw a proliferation in the Jewish presentation and public discussion of the mission of the Jews as their distinctive purpose. In his denial of Goldwin Smith's allegation of "tribalism", Adler went so far as to contend that Judaism is a proselytising religion.<sup>16</sup> As early as 1873, in a published Bayswater sermon, Adler had expounded this idea in response to a lecture given in Westminster Abbey by Professor Max Muller which had been widely reported. That noted Oxford orientalist had declared that the days of Judaism were numbered because it was opposed to missionary work. Muller's theme was the purpose and efficacy of missions generally. His references to Judaism were incidental, but gave indirect support to the conception of Judaism as racialist. Adler's reply to Muller was now expanded and re-presented against Goldwin Smith. It is ironic that in his well-reasoned pamphlet entitled *The House of Lords and the Jews* in 1853, Arthur Cohen, Sir Moses Montefiore's nephew, included on the credit side of the Jewish case, the idea that Judaism "is not and by its nature cannot be a proselytising religion".

"I know of no law", wrote Adler, "obligatory upon an Englishman" which a Jew is barred by his creed from performing. There were no Jewish "separate interests". "Our interests", he declared, "are those of our country". If, he went on, Jews shun marriage outside their community, that was what he called in an interesting phrase "a self-denying ordinance". It was rendered necessary, he explained, by the need to preserve Judaism in the interests of its mission which was to teach true monotheism and the moral law by precept and example till all shall acknowledge the truth.<sup>17</sup>

The effect of the ceaseless public discussion about the Jews was threefold. It provided the anti-immigration movement with useful material for the agitation. It stimulated among elements of the younger Jewish generation a determination to cultivate more assiduously their own cultural garden. This was one of the factors, together with the European *haskalah*, the immigration and Zionism, which led to something of a renaissance of Jewish letters in England in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Thirdly, the public debate confirmed the Adlerian school of thought in their conviction that they should hold fast to their entire body of opinions and hopes. There is a touch of truth in Herzl's harsh note in his diary for 23rd November 1895 after dining with the Adler family. He wrote: "Everything English, with old Jewish customs breaking through".<sup>18</sup> It is a journalist's sharp caricature.

Adler urged his Ministers to avail themselves, as he did, of every opportunity to address Gentile audiences on Jewish themes. Jewish scholars regarded themselves as under an important duty to address learned and more popular Gentile societies on all manner of Jewish topics. It was part of a policy to present Judaism as a continuing civilizing force, in the van of progress now as of old.

There was a great demand for information about the Jews. From the 1860's there had been a growing literature in England about the Jews and Judaism. It was a constant theme in the newspapers and periodicals. There was a

mounting Christian curiosity. When Emanuel Deutsch's famous paper on the Talmud appeared in the *Quarterly Review* in October 1867, it burst upon a reading public already much intrigued by the Jews. It helps to explain the great impact of that paper. There was a boom in Spinoza studies. Matthew Arnold's philo-semitism had broadened the appeal of Jewish topics. There was also the enigma of Disraeli, talk of the Jewish Restoration, and a literature concerning a possible British interest in it. There was also the sheer survival of the Jews as people. And in the closing decades of the century, there was the unending issue of Jewish immigration in party politics, trade union resolutions and the press. It was difficult to be indifferent to the Jews. It was philo-semitism, anti-semitism, respect, distrust, or whatever it might be. They were under regular scrutiny by friend, foe and the plain curious. Accordingly and inevitably, the Jews were alert with increasing sensitiveness to their place in society.

In the Jewish communal scene, there was hardly an area unaffected by the vigorous guard set by the Adlerian system over the balance which the emancipation was believed to have achieved. The English Jew was presented as a member of a morally elevated, westernised denomination. The coming doctrinal clash over political Zionism was only the most dramatic of the contests in which the children of the emancipation became involved.<sup>19</sup> There was a long period of public discord, extending into the new century, over what should be the community's attitude towards certain branches of English matrimonial and divorce law.<sup>20</sup> There was also a heated dispute over the wisdom and propriety of creating a Jewish hospital in London, as distinct from using designated Jewish wards in some of the great hospitals. It was still a highly contentious issue at the turn of the century.

The question whether there should be any additional Jewish day-schools after the Education Act of 1870, was sharply contested. Samuel Montagu, the most powerful lay figure in the counsels of orthodoxy, and Simeon Singer, the most influential Jewish Minister next to the Adlers, were leading figures in opposition to any extension. In the mid-80's, this important issue was settled. It became established communal policy, with the firm public approval of Hermann Adler, to regard Jewish day-schools as appropriate only for the areas of the foreign Jewish poor. They looked on them there as valuable instruments for anglicisation. The declared aim of the new policy was the prevention of narrow-mindedness and the stimulation of mutual understanding between different sections of English society.

In the 1850's, Salomons had refused to support the elder Adler's Jewish day-school for "the middle class" in Finsbury Square. Salomons deemed the plan a retrograde measure. Nathan Adler's school was closed in 1879 and had no successor in that century. The steady movement of the Jewish population from the City was only part of the reason. When in the '80's, Herbert Bentwich tried to found a comparable school in the area of St. John's Wood and Hampstead, the reception was frosty, except in the East End, and nothing came of it. There were significant differences of outlook and emphasis between Nathan Adler and sections of the lay leadership. They reflected diverse reactions to the problems of a new era. His son was not afflicted by such embarrassments.

Contrasting attitudes to the training and character of the Jewish ministry were also fruitful subjects for dispute and are interwoven with our theme. In particular, there was in the established community a great, and sometimes over-riding, emphasis on the need for the Jewish clergy — as they were significantly called — to present Judaism to the Gentiles. Rabbinic qualification was not deemed essential.<sup>21</sup> English style also involved decorum in synagogue as a matter of self-respect and communal dignity; the ultimate control of the clergy by the lay leaders; and, consciously or otherwise, the use of the language of the English establishment. Adler would at times refer to the Jewish community as “our communion”. At the communal conference which appointed him Chief Rabbi, Benjamin Cohen, who was Lionel’s brother and a Conservative politician, in moving the key resolution referred to Adler as “the head of our Church”. The flavour and significance of such expressions may be assessed when one recalls that in the life-time of many at that conference the Jews in England were spoken of — and often among themselves — as “the Jewish nation”.

Adler did not quite live down his language about the immigrants in a much publicised Succot sermon in 1887 at the New West End Synagogue. It was necessary, he said, “to anglicise, humanise and civilize” them. The object, he added, was “to enable them to become absorbed in the intelligent, industrious, independent wage-earning classes of the country”. This, he declared, was “the duty of the hour”. “On the success of this task”, he concluded, “depended the future of the Anglo-Jewish community”. This was no mere oratorical flourish on his part. In a published address at Cambridge on 15th February 1895, he told the Jewish undergraduates that “the credit and honour of Anglo-Judaism are indissolubly bound up with the conduct and bearing of the industrial section of our population”. He urged the students to make time in due course, whatever their professions, to comfort the newcomers and bring their influence to bear upon them. An important element in his meaning was that they should foster an understanding of and an attachment to the aims and implications of the emancipation. The immigrants had next to no knowledge, if any, of such matters, and less interest.

It was in this general spirit that the whole movement for Jewish youth clubs and athletic societies took its inception. There was also of course the humanitarian motive, as well as the impact of social reformism and the natural desire to follow examples set in such fields in the wider society. But the overall purpose to westernise and anglicise was always evident.

In September 1897, Herzl wrote in the *Contemporary Review*<sup>22</sup> of “the resurrection of the [Jewish] nation”. He referred scathingly to “the moral pliancy of many Jewish priests, the efforts of amphibious-minded men to combine ancient tradition with an exaggerated imitation of national [by which he meant, English] customs”. No one doubted to whom he principally referred. On 16th October 1897 the Liberal newspaper, the *Daily Chronicle*, edited by Henry Massingham, lengthily called upon the Jews to eradicate what the editor described as their character as a “separate tribal or national element”. In his article, Herzl said of Adler that he was “the chief defender of the patriotic idea”. The political gist of Herzl’s article was his call to the

European Powers to support his movement out of self-interest. Political Zionism would, he stated, draw off the unwelcome proportion of Jews from the lands of their present residence. "The Gentile", he observed, "has never yet disputed our nationality — that role has been reserved for the Jews".

In the following issue of the *Contemporary Review* appeared an impressive paper by Arnold White which reinforced Herzl's plea for European support. White wrote: "Dr. Adler ably defends the patriotic idea for English Jews as though this were incompatible with the creation of a home secured by public rights for those Jews who either cannot or will not be assimilated in the country of their adoption". That approach of White's was in fact conceded twenty years later by Claude Montefiore and Lucien Wolf in their desire by all means to exclude recognition of the Jewish national idea. In practice, however, that idea was involved in the premises which they conceded. White fully appreciated that a home secured in Palestine by public rights would constitute a national home and would rest upon the conception of Jewish nationhood.<sup>23</sup>

In the month following Herzl's article Adler uttered the following memorable phrase in an address at the Central Synagogue in London. It catches his entire approach. After retailing grounds for considering political Zionism "impracticable", he turned to consider the plight of the Jewish masses in Eastern Europe, whose off-shoots were growing in the West. "Because", he declared, "the physician fails to discover a remedy for the patient's ills, is another justified in administering poison?"

Adler was called upon to pronounce on questions whose posing negated his whole outlook. Events outstripped him and his generation. In the new century, every nuance of the old arguments was suddenly alive and practical. The scene was now largely assessed in positivist and lay terms. It brings us deep into the twentieth century. It has rightly been said that all history is contemporary history. If much of the earlier debates began to acquire an outmoded sound, at the heart of them were perennial questions. Each generation has to make its own responses as best it can to the designs of inscrutable providence. Perhaps an occasional backward glance in the right spirit might assist, if only to give warning against excessive self-righteousness.

---

## Notes

1. *Facing East*, 1947, pp. 146-7.
2. *Conflicts*, 1942, p. 133.
3. The address was translated by Joseph Jacobs from the German and published in the volume of lectures read on the occasion of the Exhibition. It is included in Professor Ismar Schorsch's edited collection of Graetz's papers published by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in 1975. Graetz was disappointed at the lack of practical response to his proposal. There was an intermittent communal debate over the need and feasibility of the plan. Those who wielded power in Anglo-Jewry were gratified by his expressions, but their scale of institutional priorities inhibited action. In 1893, out of the enthusiasm engendered or represented by the Exhibition, arose the Jewish Historical Society of England, upon the initiative of Wolf and Jacobs.
4. *Essays in Jewish History*, 1934, ed. Cecil Roth, p. 362.
5. In an unsigned editorial in the *Jewish World* on 1st September 1882 Wolf took Claude Montefiore to task for drawing certain conclusions, in a recent paper in the *Contemporary Review*, from the proposition that the bond uniting Israel was a common religion. Adler, who also held that view, would, asserted Wolf, be "startled" by any idea that Judaism could "extend" beyond the Jews. To denationalise Judaism, urged Wolf, would be "to lose it, and with it the work of 50 centuries". See also Wolf's striking and widely noted article in the *Fortnightly Review* in August 1884 entitled "What is Judaism?: A Question for Today". His own ideas for what he would have called the modernising of Judaism were out of accord with the rabbinic tradition represented by Adler. His particular historical sense and his somewhat existentialist approach to Jewish life separated him from Montefiore.
6. On 21st July 1892, N.S. Joseph wrote in the *Jewish Chronicle* that "sooner or later legislation will come.... We need not initiate [it] but as Jews and as British citizens it will be our duty not to resist it". This influential social worker — he was the honorary secretary of the Russo-Jewish Committee — was not alone among communal leaders in holding that opinion.
7. February 1878.
8. *Nineteenth Century*: February 1881, "A Jewish View of the Anti-Jewish Agitation" by Lucien Wolf; October 1881, "The Jewish Question" by Goldwin Smith.
9. *Jewish Review* (eds. Norman Bentwich and Joseph Hochman), Vol. 2, "Anti-Semitism in England", pp. 294-307.
10. In this debate, on 16th December, there occurred the following passages which reveal something of the spirit in which these questions were discussed. "If", declared Russell, whose Bill it was, the Jews "are aliens, to which country do they belong?" An alien, he added, is one "who has another king and country ... and it is obvious that their attachment is to England ...". Spencer Walpole, the Tory lawyer and future Home Secretary, commented: "The Jew is not a citizen of this

country but of the world; he has no land which he can call his own save the land of Palestine.”

11. Letter to his close friend Sir John Coleridge, cited in Georgina Battiscombe, *John Keble: A Study in Limitations*, 1936, p. 312.
12. *Life and Letters of E. A. Freeman, 1895*, ed. W. R. W. Stephens, pp. 427-8. Freeman thought the campaign had been “got up” in order to divert attention from the treatment of Christians under Ottoman suzerainty, and that in any event Great Britain had neither right nor obligation to intervene. The protection of the Turk’s Christian subjects was on the other hand a matter of international treaty.
13. See letters dated 12th May 1834 and 27th April 1836 in *Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold*, A.P. Stanley, 1844.
14. See Note 7. Adler replied in the same journal in April 1878 by a paper entitled “Can Jews be Patriots?”, which was received by the Jewish lay leadership as a definitive statement on a needless and embarrassingly vexed question. The title of Adler’s paper is significant. It was easier for him to deal with the question posed thereby, than with some of the more particular assertions made by Goldwin Smith. In 1853, John Mills, the Welsh Calvinist preacher and conversionist and a consistent supporter of Jewish emancipation, wrote in *The British Jews*: “The Jewish idea of religion is national, that is in the estimation [of the Jew] his faith and his nation are synonymous. To profess the one is to belong to the other; and to change the former is to deny the latter”. Twenty-five years later, such comments carried pejorative implications.
15. On 6th October 1876, Gladstone wrote to Leopold Gluckstein of Bayswater: “I have always had occasion to admire the conduct of the English Jews in the discharge of their civil duties; but I deeply deplore the manner in which what I may call Judaic sympathies beyond as well as within the circle of professed Judaism, are now acting on the question of the East, while I am aware that as regards the Jews themselves there may be much to account for it”. The letter was published in the *Jewish Chronicle* on 13th October and in the national press. The circumlocution was a reference to Disraeli. Despite Gladstone’s public denial on 6th February 1874 that he believed the Jews acted as a body in politics, his suspicion to that effect stayed. It was part of Jewish communal policy to declare and to make manifest that it was not so.
16. *Nineteenth Century*, July 1878. Goldwin Smith had enquired in that journal in May: “If Judaism is universal, why is it not proselytising?”
17. *Ibid.*
18. *The Diaries of Theodore Herzl*, Trans. and ed. M. Lowenthal, 1956.
19. On these differences, see the lecturer’s following papers: “The New Community 1880-1918”, *Three Centuries of Anglo-Jewish History*, Ed. V. D. Lipman (1961); “Anglo-Jewish Opinion during the Struggle for Emancipation” Vol. XX, *Trans. of J.H.S.E.* (1964); and “The Anglo-Jewish Revolt of 1853”, *Jewish Quarterly*, Vol. 26 (1979).

20. See the lecturer's "An Aspect of the Jews and English Marriage Law during the Emancipation", *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, June 1965. On 1st March 1911, at a meeting of the Council of the United Synagogue, Lord Rothschild severely rebuked the critics of Adler's recommendations to the recent Royal Commission on Divorce. Among other matters, the Chief Rabbi, with the support of the leadership of the Board of Deputies, had urged that "foreign rabbis" responsible for "irregular divorces" should be liable to prosecution. The Board had periodically warned against irregular marriage and divorce. Rothschild related the issue directly to the spirit and terms of the emancipation. The fathers of emancipation, he said, had worked on the "maxim" that if Jews came here and became "Englishmen" they would "never agitate for *imperium in imperio* or violate the law", and only because of that, he added, did they gain civil rights.
21. In an address on 5th November 1905 Adler frankly referred to the changing times and to the need, at least in principle, for the introduction of the rabbinical diploma at Jews' College towards the end of the 19th century. The speech was published in 1906 in the *Jews' College Jubilee Volume*, ed. Isidore Harris.
22. Under the editorship (1882-1911) of P. W. Bunting, a prominent Methodist and social reformer, the journal opened its columns to a wide assortment of writers and themes. Professor Chimen Abramsky thinks Herzl's article was probably translated into its impressive English by Moses Gaster.
23. On 23rd October 1897, White, writing of the Jews in the Pale, Galicia and Roumania, stated: "...the aristocracy of the human race is both multiplying and degenerating". He called for a European conference on the Jewish question, and upon the rich Jews to assist in relief and resettlement. Two years later, his confidence over a Palestine solution had lessened. In view of the difficulties and objections, he concluded that "the political Zionist movement is irretrievably doomed". But he maintained his belief in the need for some territory for the Jews, as "they have persistently refused to unite with other nations". The territory should be, he added, "at no great distance from Europe and associated if possible directly or indirectly with Palestine". He suggested an area in "Turkish Armenia... between the Tigris and Euphrates": *The Modern Jew*, pp. 213-20, 274.









