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Abstract
This paper brings together issues of social quality and citizenship in relation to minority communities. The notions of community social quality and community citizenship are introduced and discussed in relation to the strategies adopted by the Jewish community in England at the turn of the twentieth century. Community citizenship refers to a situation where distinct communities take control of some rights and responsibilities which otherwise would have been administered by national or local government agencies. It can be defined as: the possession by members of a community of a range of social and cultural (and to a lesser extent civil and political) rights and responsibilities as a distinct element of their national citizenship rights. Community social quality can be defined as: the extent to which communities can ensure that their members can participate in community social, political and economic life under conditions which enhance both individual and community well-being. It is argued that the Anglo-Jewish community embraced community citizenship policies to safeguard the community’s social quality at a time of mass immigration. It did this by taking responsibility for a range of functions normally undertaken by national or local government bodies, including: immigration control; social security; civil law; and public health. It is concluded that the community citizenship and community social quality constructs are useful in appraising the social situations of minority communities in contemporary multicultural societies
Introduction

Issues of loyalty, membership and belonging are pertinent to all multicultural societies and are particularly crucial for recent migrants and members of other minority communities in that they are faced with a variety of choices in organising and representing themselves vis-a-vis the majority community. Many of these issues have been discussed in the context of debates on citizenship and particularly in relation to forms of differentiated citizenship. This paper develops and exemplifies the notion of community citizenship in analysing the strategies taken by members of migrant and other minority communities in dealing with these issues. It is argued here that in some circumstances - particularly in times of large-scale immigration - minority communities can optimise their social quality by undertaking activities normally performed by government agencies. An example is presented in relation to the way the British Jewish community dealt with the influx of Russian and east European Jews at the turn of the twentieth century. Some possible lessons for contemporary analysis of minority communities are then briefly discussed.

Social quality

Social quality is a recently developed standard for assessing the economic and social progress of groups, communities and societies. It is different from traditional quality-of-life constructs in that as well as being a measurement tool, it also has a potentially radical policy dimension. It came into being in 1997 as a result of the frustration of a group of social scientists and policy analysts with the prevailing domination of economic measures of quality of life within societies. Instruments such as national income and gross domestic product lead to the downgrading of social and cultural elements which are of central importance to individual and collective well-being. Social quality, on the other hand places a high value on social justice, human dignity and participation and it requires attention to social policies as well as economic policies (Beck, van der Maesen et al., 1997).

Over the past five years there have been several substantial publications on social quality, mostly focusing on the European or at national level (see, for example, Beck, van der Maesen et al., 2001) and recent issues of the European Journal of Social Quality). There have also been some studies at the meso level
(de Leonardis, 1999; Berting and Villain-Gandossi, 2001; Evers, 2001; Phillips and Berman, 2001). The social quality construct has not yet been fully operationalised but some first steps have been taken in constructing domains and indicators both at a macro level (Beck, van der Maesen et al., 2001; Phillips and Berman, 2001) and, more tentatively and partially, at meso level (Berman and Phillips, 2000; Phillips and Berman, 2000).

Social quality at meso level refers to Ethnos or cultural community, which manifests itself most clearly in minority ethnic and/or religious groups, normally originating in one country but living in another. Following Berman and Phillips (2001), who discuss this topic in detail, social quality at Ethnos level is here referred to as Community Social Quality. This can be defined as: ‘the extent to which communities are able to ensure that their members can participate in community social, political and economic life under conditions which enhance both individual and community well-being’. As with societal social quality, community social quality has four elements: socio-economic security; inclusion; cohesion; and empowerment. Members of a community will also be members of the larger society (or Demos) so two facets of social quality impinge upon community members: that deriving from their community membership; and that from their membership of society.

This community - society duality is present in all four community social quality elements. Its manifestation is most complex in relation to social inclusion where three factors are at play, the most important of which relates to the community itself and is the community’s inclusion in society in its own right. The other two relate to the inclusion of individuals: an individual’s inclusion in their community; and an individual’s inclusion in society irrespective of their community membership. Two factors are relevant to cohesion: the first, of course, is the social cohesion of the community itself, without which there is no prospect of community social quality; the second is the nature of societal social cohesion, whether it is homogeneous or pluralistic in nature. Only if the latter is the case can there be an opportunity for effective community empowerment, which is also contingent upon internal community institutions and motivation. Community socio-economic-security is the most straightforward of the social quality elements, and the level of community socio-economic security gives a useful indication of whether it is in the community’s interests to strive for community citizenship.
Community citizenship

There is a large and growing literature on differentiated citizenship in relation to age, gender, class, ethnicity and other forms of difference (Kymlicka, 1995; Lister, 1997; Delanty, 2000). In virtually all of this literature it is national citizenship that is the focus of attention. Here, following Phillips and Berman (2001), the emphasis is rather different: it is upon the extent to which citizenship responsibility can be shared between the nation and the community or, put another way, the extent to which the community can be a channel for bestowing citizenship upon its members. This sort of citizenship, hereafter called community citizenship, refers to a situation where distinct communities take control of some rights and responsibilities which otherwise would have been administered by national or local government agencies.

Thus we can say that community citizenship refers to the possession by members of a community of a range of social and cultural (and to a lesser extent civil and political) rights and responsibilities as a distinct element of their national citizenship rights (Phillips and Berman, 2001: 24-5). Community citizenship as presented here is thus distinctive in comparison to other sorts of differentiated citizenship in that it is a part of national citizenship (and is aimed at strengthening citizenship) and not an alternative to - or a dilution of - national citizenship.

Maximising community social quality does not necessarily entail striving to achieve full community citizenship. Indeed, under some circumstances community citizenship may not be appropriate at all. The ideal - if almost entirely imaginary - model is that of the American Dream of a society where there is equality of citizenship status both formally and substantively. Here, living side-by-side, are a number of distinct communities, each with its own strong identity, and because there are no socially determined group disadvantages there will be - more-or-less - parity of socio-economic security between communities.

At the other extreme, full or complete community citizenship is an appropriate situation in nation states comprising entirely distinct ethnos communities where citizens’ identities relate more to the communities comprising the nation than to the nation itself. Therefore these communities wish to retain as strong a community identity as possible while sharing membership of a nation state. The closest example to complete community citizenship is in Belgium where
Walloons and Flemings speak different languages, have separate education, social welfare, local government etc. but share Belgian nationality.

There are many intermediate stages between full community citizenship and no community citizenship at all. In most Western nations, members of minority communities in principle have full formal citizenship but are often in practice systematically socially excluded by institutional and individual discrimination and have low socio-economic security compared with the majority community. Achieving a measure of community citizenship here is an appropriate endeavour for minority communities in that community control of some elements of citizenship rights is likely to be a useful way of enhancing community social quality.

**The British Jewish community**

The British Jewish population was tiny before the beginning of the eighteenth century but it grew steadily through the nineteenth century until it reached 60,000 by the 1870s, around 46,000 of whom were living in London (Lipman, 1954: 82). At this time the community was stable, well-established and integrated into British upper-class society. Indeed it was so well-integrated that it was known as 'Anglo-Jewry'. It was also socially powerful and very wealthy: over half of the Jewish population in London was either upper class or middle class. Socially and culturally it was close-knit but it was not inward-looking. Anglo-Jewry perceived itself to be wholeheartedly English, and the quality of life of its members was tied in more with national than with community institutions (Lipman, 1954; Feldman, 1994).

Over the next twenty years or so, all this changed dramatically. The Anglo-Jewish community was overwhelmed by a mass of arrivals of very un-English, Yiddish-speaking, poverty-stricken, Russian and eastern European Jews fleeing from persecution. Between 1880 and 1906 the British Jewish population increased five-fold, to 300,000, of whom around 180,000 were living in London (Alderman, 1992: 119; Feldman, 1994: 24). There was a very high concentration of Jews in a small part of the East End of London covering less than a square mile - called 'Jew-town' (Feldman, 1994: 167). Combined with this large and rapid increase in population there was a huge number of transients - around 800,000 - who were transmigrating via England to the New World, mostly New York (Gainer, 1972: 2).
Most of the immigrants arrived virtually penniless, certainly poorer than any other previous migrant group. The average migrant arrived with less than £2 - around the average monthly wage in the tailoring trade which was where most of them would work\(^2\). In 1901, 60 percent of Jewish immigrants were directly employed in the clothing trades and a further 10 percent in associated trades (Godley, 1996: 114). A high proportion too were self-employed or ran small businesses, a trend that has continued up to the present (Feldman, 1994: 151). In general the immigrants worked hard, were very resourceful and thrived remarkably well, so well indeed that social investigators deemed them to be worthy of special study. They continued - and still continue - to thrive.\(^3\)

**Reactions to the immigrants**

It would be an understatement to say that the newcomers were unwelcome: even their Anglo-Jewish brethren were 'dismayed and, at times, terrified' by their arrival and were embarrassed by their uncouth behaviour and their highly visible difference (Alderman, 1992: 120). Even the Headmaster of the Jews Free School was caustic: 'Their parents were the refuse population of the worst parts of Europe' and many of the children 'were ignorant even of the elements of sound ... many of them scarcely knew their own names' (Gartner, 1960: 223).

If Anglo-Jewry was so unenthusiastic towards immigrant Jews, then it is no surprise that the Gentile Londoners who they came to live amongst were even less enthusiastic. They saw the immigrants as dirty, rough, noisy and - perhaps most damagingly - disrespectful of the Christian Sabbath (Gartner, 1960: 157). The immigrants were also often seen as devious and dishonest (Feldman, 1994: 360).

Not all their traits were perceived negatively: indeed many contemporary commentators praised their commitment to family home life, self-sufficiency and sobriety. In particular the respect given by husbands to wives and the sacrifices parents made for their children were often noted by the police officers and school inspectors who dealt with Jewish immigrants on a day-to-day basis (Englander, 1989: 563-567). Jewish families were also perceived to be very keen on education - unlike English families from similar areas. Their children were seen as hard-working and brighter than their non-Jewish peers (Gartner, 1960: 177). More than anything else, though they were seen as *different* and essentially un-English.
Explanations for the immigrants' success

All-in-all the migrant community thrived remarkably well financially and did not pose a burden on the government in terms of poor relief. In the literature there are two sets of explanations for their financial success: first, racial, cultural, dispositional - they worked incredibly hard for tiny amounts of money as their own bosses; and secondly, institutional, including the extraordinarily pervasive influence on immigrants of Anglo-Jewish communal organisations. Contemporary accounts virtually universally stressed the first set of explanations, and most gave pride of place to the Jews' purported 'love of profit'. Many influential subsequent accounts emphasise institutional factors, and the most recent studies have stressed the role of 'soft loans' uniquely provided to Jewish immigrants.

Contemporary accounts

The period of mass Jewish immigration coincided with a time of unprecedented social inquiry by both social investigators and public and parliamentary agencies. Many of these inquiries took an active interest in the immigrants so there is a uniquely rich source of data on the Jewish community. The general consensus of these investigators was of 'cultural exceptionality': that there was a specific Jewish 'racial type' (Englander, 1989: 555; Feldman, 1994: 141). Broadly speaking, commentators agreed that Jewish characteristics were associated with: entrepreneurial acumen and profit-seeking; an extraordinary capacity for hard work, often coupled with superior innate ability; and religious and cultural discipline.

The first of these elements, purportedly common to all Jews, but particularly among immigrant Jews - was what commentators generally called love of profit (Feldman, 1994: 141). There was one exception, David Schloss, who stressed the desire for self-improvement rather than profit (Englander, 1989: 554). It must be noted at this point that this was not necessarily seen as a bad thing. For example, one of the leading contemporary researchers, Beatrice Potter, saw immigrant embourgeoisement 'as proof of the essentially progressive character of the Jewish race' (Englander, 1989: 556).

Secondly, contemporary commentators and researchers agreed that the Jews worked extremely hard and for very long hours and that they were more self disciplined than gentile workers (Black, 1988: 73). Among many commentators,
motivation and self denial was often connected with superior intellect which, along with a commitment to education, 'made the Jew a formidable figure as an industrial competitor' (Englander, 1989: 556). Beatrice Potter (1888: 177), in a comment reminiscent of the parable of the talents, summarised these traits thus:

All alike try to supplement the income made in actual labour by the turnover of money by the wise use of the talents entrusted to their care. It is this dominant race impulse that has peopled our Stock Exchange with Israelites; it is the same instinct that has made the Rothschilds the leaders of European finance and the bankers of emperors and kings.

Finally, religious observance was seen as an extremely important factor in determining the Jewish 'racial identity'. Dietary regimes, sanitary observances and family-centred values were seen as promoting physical health and mental stability among Jews (Englander, 1989: 556). On the other hand, Judaism itself was seen as inward-looking and self-regarding, demanding strong obligations among Jews (including injunctions against usury) but not between Jews and Gentiles (Potter, 1892: 182; Godley, 1996: 111).

Subsequent explanations

Subsequent analysts have often given short shrift to contemporary explanations, claiming that they were based on preconceptions and prejudice. Englander (1989: 558) lays much of the blame on 'the intellectual baggage of the period' whereas Feldman (1994: 187-90), in effect, accuses the investigators of inventing a racial stereotype to paper over the cracks in their incorrect economic theories. Englander sees Jewish immigrants and 'the native working class' as mirror images; the 'Jewish worker', he says, is a fiction. His analysis emphasises the social and industrial situation and the position of the Jews as a minority-immigrant group' (Englander, 1989: 568).

Feldman accepts that with hindsight the perception of Jews as single-minded economic individualists seems very attractive, particularly as there is only a very small Jewish working class now (Prais and Schmool, 1975); but this conclusion 'runs the risk of confusing the immigrants' aims with their grandchildren's achievements and, in doing so, of presenting a misleading picture of both' (Feldman, 1994: 144). He also criticises as being too sweeping, an opposing view from more recent analysis which claims them to be much more
integrated into trade unionism and working class consciousness than previously thought (see, for example, Buckman (1980) and Williams (1980)). Feldman's explanation for the economic behaviour of the immigrants is based on their status as a marginalised group in the labour market: 'It stemmed from their predicament as workers rather than their identity as Jews' (Feldman, 1994: 250-1).

Other commentators do not entirely deny the notion of 'cultural exceptionality' among the immigrant Jewish community. Sowell, for example, reminds us that about half the Jews in nineteenth century Russia were literate and that they were also urbanised; around 30 percent were in commerce and 40 percent in manufacture. Almost half worked in some aspect of clothes production before migrating (Sowell, 1981: 79). This put them on a much stronger footing than, for example, rural Irish immigrants. Aris (1970: 234-6) claims that the urban origins, long-standing persecution and cultural values of the migrants are important in explaining their entrepreneurial activities and success. Godley (1996: 101) agrees there may have been a cultural bias towards self-employment after centuries of persecution.

Indeed Godley concurs that cultural exceptionality should not be dismissed out-of-hand, but he nevertheless insists that more important economic factors were at work. He seeks to understand the high levels of self-employment among Jewish immigrants by concentrating on the economic conditions of the principal immigrant trade (the clothing industry) and analysing the impact of innovative financial institutions - the 'soft loan' societies which subsidised immigrant entry costs (Godley, 1996: 101). His analysis is particularly helpful in that it comprises a detailed comparison of the immigrant Jewish communities in London and New York. He concludes that similar factors were at work in both cities.

Firstly, the clothing industry was very labour intensive and did not depend on expensive machinery: in other words it was relatively easy for individuals to set up in business on their own behalf so long as they were skilled and had access to small sums of capital. Secondly, argues Godley, Jewish immigrants were in a uniquely beneficial situation: a high proportion of them had already worked in the clothing industry and they had access to interest-free 'soft loans' exclusively provided by Jewish charitable associations (Godley, 1996: 104). Their purpose was to set up the recipients in business so that they would both become independent and be able to repay the loan to replenish the loan fund. A loan of £1
was just about enough to get someone started up in trade but £5 was easily sufficient (Godley, 1996: 104). In London it was the Jewish Board of Guardians that provided these loans and in the 25 years after 1880 it made over 30,000 loans averaging around £5 (Feldman, 1994: 246). This is an astonishingly number of loans given that the total immigrant population was around 150,000. Even assuming an average family size as low as four, this still meant an average of nearly one £5 loan from the Jewish Board of Guardians for every immigrant family.

In addition to forces pulling immigrants into self-employment, there were other forces pushing them away from being employees, at least in factories and workshops run by Gentiles where there were problems associated with religious observance, including the insistence on Saturday working (Sowell, 1981: 83; Feldman, 1994: 251). Moreover, whole trades and industries such as dock work and the building trade were closed to them because of recruitment in public houses and via informal Irish networks. So most of those who were employed were concentrated in a small number of trades and many of them worked for companies run by other Jews.

Feldman gives two additional explanations for their upward economic mobility: the first was that Jewish philanthropy, mostly through the charitable efforts of the Jewish Board of Guardians, was an obstacle to downward mobility; and the second was that any potential members of an incipient Jewish underclass were ruthlessly dealt with by being unceremoniously repatriated by the Jewish community itself (Feldman, 1994: 299).

Community social quality

This section explores the transformation of the Jewish community with reference to the community social quality construct. All of the elements of community social quality are relevant here, and two are of central importance - social inclusion and socio-economic security.

Social inclusion

The Anglo-Jewish community’s continued inclusion in British society depended on the size and nature of the reconstituted community: it needed to be kept as small as possible, as self-sufficient as possible, as respectable as possible and as ‘English’ as possible. The nightmare for the Anglo-Jewish community was of
England becoming swamped by 'dangerous aliens', leading to civil unrest turning against *all* Jews threatening the community's exclusion from mainstream society. It was vital therefore to control the numbers of incomers - to control the number to be included. The major role undertaken by the Anglo-Jewry community was that of *exclusion* - keeping out as many eastern European Jews as possible.

The Anglo-Jewish community was caught in a cruel predicament. Its fellow Jews were suffering from brutal persecution in the Russian empire from the late 1870s and they had to get out in order to survive. Anglo-Jewry could not ignore their plight. Yet there were so many of them (around two and a half million migrated in all) that it was impossible for them all to come to England (Godley, 1996: 101). Community leaders had to choose between allowing as many as possible to stay in England, and thus engendering large-scale ethnic tensions, or else to minimise ethnic tensions by being heavily restrictive on entry and in addition stringently policing those who were allowed in. It chose the latter (Black, 1988: 390). It had two specific strategies: first, discouraging potential migrants before they left eastern Europe; and secondly repatriating or otherwise sending away as many as possible of those who did arrive.

It is difficult to overestimate the lengths Anglo-Jewry went to in order to try to dissuade migrants from coming to England (Lipman, 1959: 100; Gartner, 1960: 49). In 1888 the Chief Rabbi wrote to European Rabbis begging them to tell their congregations not to come to England, and the Jewish Board of Guardians placed similar strongly worded warnings in the European Jewish press and stressed it would give no relief to economic migrants during their first 6 months in England (Gartner, 1960: 24-5; Feldman, 1994: 300-3). Similarly it even begged international relief agencies in 1900 to stop Roumanian Jews from coming to Britain (Feldman, 1994: 304). Yet at the same time Anglo-Jewry was opposed to legislation restricting immigration - it wanted to be in control itself of who came (Black, 1988: 390). This apparent paradox is relevant to community citizenship and will be discussed below.

Once migrants had arrived the biggest threat to them staying in England was not the state officials, the police, or Anti-Semitic or anti-immigrant groups. It came from the Anglo-Jewish community itself, through the auspices of the Jewish Board of Guardians which repatriated about 50,000 immigrants and assisted a further 25,000 to transmigrate, mostly, to New York (Feldman, 1994: 299).
Migrants who found themselves without means of support stood a strong chance of being pressurised to leave the country. Indeed, the President of the Jewish Board of Guardians stated publically that the Board 'starved them out' of England (Feldman, 1994: 303). In 1901, 61 percent of 'new cases' applying to Jewish Board of Guardians were repatriated and the annual figure was never lower than 30 percent (Lipman, 1959: 94; Black, 1988: 96-100).

So around a third of all putative immigrants had a short stay in England indeed. In effect, all newcomers were offered a chance to stand on their own two feet but the Jewish Board of Guardians was very reluctant to do anything to help them when they arrived, for fear of being accused of encouraging immigration. Such rigorous policing of community inclusion by community leaders is unique in the history of British immigration (Gainer, 1972: 8).

The paramount responsibilities for those immigrants who were permitted by the Jewish Board of Guardians to remain in England were twofold: to be good Jews and respectable English citizens. To achieve the latter, the Anglo-Jewish community initiated a process of anglicisation of immigrant Jews in order to instil in them English values. Anglicisation was undertaken through the synagogues, Jewish Friendly Societies and, most importantly as will be seen below, through the Jewish education system. Anglicisation was seen as the means for retaining the status, respectability and acceptability of the Jewish community.

**Socio-economic security**

The socio-economic security of the Anglo-Jewish community went through a near-inversion in the 1880s: from wealth to near-penury. The archetypal English Jew of the 1870s was a merchant banker or captain of business whereas ten years later it was of a near-penniless, newly arrived foreigner. But the new members of the Jewish community became economically independent remarkably quickly. Their socio-economic security was almost entirely created and maintained within the community itself: virtually none asked for financial assistance from the local government Poor Law authorities whose role was to provide relief for the destitute. Much of their socio-economic-security, of course, came from the industriousness and initiative of the newcomers themselves, but they were greatly assisted by one of the most extraordinary initiatives in charitable assistance - the Jewish Board of
Guardians which was funded for the most part by a small number of very rich Anglo-Jewish families.

The Jewish Board of Guardians played both a negative and positive role in the community's socio-economic-security. The negative role was fulfilled by ensuring that potential members of the underclass either never came to England in the first place or, once arrived, were either sent back or sent on. Its positive role was performed most effectively and innovatively through the provision of loans, as noted above. These loans which took up over half of its average annual expenditure, were crucial to the strategy to cure rather than merely to relieve poverty. Self-sufficiency was further encouraged by the provision of crèche and kindergarten places (2,000 in 1902, rising to 6,500 in 1908) and apprenticeships (400 a year by 1908) (Black, 1988: 122-33). These provisions, along with grants and residential accommodation for the frail and indigent, ensured that virtually no English Jews became paupers by having to resort to the Poor Law (Potter, 1892: 175; Lipman, 1959: 136; Gartner, 1960: 164).

The innovative approach of the Jewish Board of Guardians to community socio-economic security was of benefit both to the social quality of the established Anglo-Jewish community and to the immigrant Jewish community in the East End of London: 'in accelerating alien enterprise and self-help [this] was one area in which Anglo-Jewish aspiration and immigrant ambition reached a happy meeting of the minds (Black, 1988: 94). It should also be noted that the achievements of the Jewish Board of Guardians were immense, as well as extraordinarily successful: no other single Victorian philanthropic organisation outside the field of education operated on so vast a scale for so many people (Black, 1988: 78).

**Community cohesion**

The 'happy meeting of minds' noted above was not always evident in relation to issues of cohesion within the community. There was, of course, huge pressure from Anglo-Jewry upon the immigrants to become anglicised and to conform to Anglo-Jewish identity but the immigrants were not passive by any means and they had two strong purposes in relation to community cohesion. The first concerned treatment of newly-arrived migrants and the second was to do with the identity of the immigrant community vis-a-vis Anglo-Jewry.
As noted above, Anglo-Jewry made a strategic policy decision not to be welcoming to new arrivals, in order to discourage others from coming. It is unsurprising, therefore, that the members of the immigrant community were dissatisfied with both their own treatment on arrival and that meted out to their newly arrived compatriots. This issue came to a head in 1885 when the Jewish Board of Guardians closed down the Poor Jews Temporary Shelter which had been run by an informal voluntary group (Gartner, 1960: 52) and it re-emerged in 1900 when East End immigrant Jews supported the cause of the Roumanian refugees who Anglo-Jewry wanted to repatriate (Feldman, 1994: 321).

Immigrant Jews also wanted to retain the customs and traditions that made up their unique identities. They were not heavily involved in the Anglo-Jewish organisations, and seldom attended the established synagogues, but instead formed Chevrot, multi-purpose religious, social and charitable associations normally named after the town or village from which its members have migrated (Potter, 1892: 172). But there were also grass-roots organisations with membership encompassing immigrants and members of Anglo-Jewry. The most numerous of these were the Jewish Friendly Societies, mutual aid organisations which provided a range of financial benefits to their members (Feldman, 1994: 313-4). These societies were normally run by Anglo-Jewry and were unashamedly used to promote anglicisation.

The pressure from Anglo-Jewry upon immigrants to anglicise was intense but it was not just a pressure to become 'English' and there was never even a hint of 'de-Judaisation' or 'assimilation' Anglo-Jewry sought to preserve their Judaism as represented by Jewish history, traditional beliefs, practice and instruction' (Lipman, 1954: 149; Black, 1988: ix). There is some disagreement amongst commentators, however, over the extent to which the reconstituted English Jewish community fully cohered, either at the time or 50 years later.

**Empowerment**

The long-standing empowerment of the leaders of Anglo-Jewry at the highest levels of British society was the key to the English Jewish community's social quality. It was Anglo-Jewry's existing high level of empowerment that enabled it to have some control over inclusion and an impact on the socio-economic-security of
the new migrants. This in turn enabled it to work towards rebuilding social cohesion and empowerment in the reconstituted and much enlarged community. Given the interaction between community and society in empowerment, there were two main thrusts to achieving an empowered English Jewish community at the turn of the twentieth century. The first was to develop and nurture a thriving, well-ordered, cohesive and socio-economically secure Jewish community whose members could keep their identity secure, maintain their religious observances and hand down their culture to succeeding generations. and the second was to integrate its members into mainstream British society - hence the great stress on anglicisation.

**Community citizenship and the Jewish community**

In striving to maximise its community social quality, Anglo-Jewry from the 1880s to the end of the first decade of the twentieth century was determined to ensure three things: first, that the size of the community was kept within manageable proportions; secondly, that English Jews would not be a burden on the state; and third, that community members both preserved their Jewish culture and became patriotic Britons. The strategy that in fact it chose in doing this was to become actively engaged in immigration control and repatriation, civil law administration, and provision of large scale educational, public health and social security services. In doing all this it was taking to itself functions normally undertaken by central or local government or their agencies and therefore it was engaged the active provision of *community citizenship*. Each of these areas of engagement in community citizenship are now briefly introduced, with the exception of social security which has already been discussed above.

**Immigration control and repatriation**

There was in effect no immigration control in England at the end of the nineteenth century. Neither ministers nor government officials had the power to stop immigrants from coming to Britain nor to deport any who had arrived (Gainer, 1972: 8). In effect the Jewish community itself took control of formulating, financing and executing national immigration policy concerning Russian and east European migrants and refugees for a period of twenty-five years up to the passage of the Aliens Act 1905 (Feldman, 1994: 299).
The cost to the Jewish Board of Guardians of immigration control (with 75,000 assisted passages) and financial help to migrants (with over £150,000 in loans) was immense and in 1902 Anglo-Jewry started to move away from taking full responsibility for Jewish immigration (Black, 1988: 95-100). The Jewish Board of Guardians was in favour of legislation to prevent immigration by 'undesirables'- i.e. those with physical incapacity, criminals and those involved in immoral trades, but it wanted to retain control over 'failures', those unable to be economically independent. It therefore claimed there was no need for wider restrictive legislation (Feldman, 1994: 305). Anglo-Jewry - at least in its public utterances - strongly opposed the Aliens Act of 1905, but privately recognised it as being potentially in its own best interests (Black, 1988:100).

**Civil Law**

Anglo-Jewry has always had the ear of law-makers and used this to good effect to look after the interests of Jewish immigrants in Parliament. But the Jewish community also has its own communal legal system. From time immemorial the religious life of Jews has been overseen and controlled by the ecclesiastical court, the *Beth Din*. In England since 1835 it has administered and policed Jewish marriages and divorces on behalf of the state (Black, 1988: 295). It has also traditionally settled civil law disputes among Jews, which has 'obviated the scandal of Jew fighting Jew in the Gentile courts of law' (Potter, 1892: 167). Its remit includes: breach of promise; inheritance; commission; compensation; slander and libel.

The *Beth Din* was - and still is - the epitome of Anglo-Jewish community citizenship. On behalf of the state it undertakes the job of administering family and civil law relating to Jewish British citizens and in so doing also plays a central role in policing its own community. And it has done this with great determination: 'No subculture within British society was more orderly ... Nor was any subculture more conscious of its public image and prepared to act against social deviants within its ranks' (Black, 1988: 390).

**Education**

In the early 1880s, nearly two-thirds of the 7,000 Jewish children in London attended the Jews Free School or one of the other Jewish voluntary schools. One
main aim of the schools was to anglicise their pupils. A Board of Trade Report in 1894 commented 'They enter the school Russians and Poles and emerge from it almost indistinguishable from English children' (Lipman, 1954: 147). Pupils were also taught 'civics' in the hope it would raise their own and their parents' consciousness of their 'Britishness' and the schools also hosted English language classes for adults (Black, 1988: 106).

This arrangement was an excellent mechanism for anglicisation but it was very expensive for the Anglo-Jewish community to fund the schooling for the majority of its children when state education was available to all free of charge. It became increasingly costly with the rapid increase in immigration: the number of Jewish school pupils doubling to 16,000 in 1894 and more than doubling again to 37,500 in 1911, by which time only 25 percent were being educated in Jewish-funded schools (Gartner, 1960: 227).

Subsequently Anglo-Jewry was no longer able to fund education on behalf of the state for its children, but it was able to maintain its community citizenship role through the combination of the influence of its community leadership in government circles and the particular nature of British educational legislation. The 1870 Education Act enabled, in effect, state schools to be "distinctly set aside for Jewish children" (Gartner, 1960: 229) and the 1902 Education Act, which made provision for 'denominational' education, safeguarded the future of the Jewish voluntary schools. By 1902, sixteen State schools in the East End with 15,000 children on their rolls were 'practically run as Jewish schools' and many had Jewish head-teachers (Black, 1988: 106). Even in 1930 there were 24 London schools where more than half the pupils and these plus a further nine (with close to a half of Jewish pupils) had no teaching on Jewish festivals and closed early on Fridays in winter to allow the children to get home before dusk on the eve of the Sabbath (Adler, 1935: 275).

Public health
The Jewish Board of Guardians went to extraordinary lengths in performing functions relating to: preventing epidemics; health promotion; ameliorating bad housing and overcrowding. Local government departments had statutory powers, and sometimes duties, to undertake this work but they were often over-stretched and unable or unwilling to perform these tasks (Lipman, 1959: 127). In the 1880s
the Jewish Board of Guardians sanitary inspectors had a major impact in response to the scourge of cholera by improving sanitation. Even though they had no statutory powers they coerced both landlords and tenants into undertaking improvements (Black, 1988: 87). The Sanitary Committee concentrated its work on water supplies sewage disposal, drains and overcrowding (Lipman, 1959: 127). There is no doubt that the consequences of these activities were highly beneficial to the East End Jewish community but even from a pro-active community citizenship stance that seemed to go beyond the call of duty. Black's explanation is revealing in the context of Anglo-Jewry's struggle to retain the community's social inclusion: it had to do as much as it could to fight 'the image of 'the dirty, foreign Jew' - and even worse of ‘the dirty Jew' (Black, 1988: 84).

Community citizenship in transition
It is important to point out that Anglo-Jewry was not forced to undertake these activities, and indeed that it gradually disengaged itself from them from around 1905 onwards. Once the influx had stopped and the newcomers had become anglicised, then the pressure to retain such extensive community citizenship eased and the process of integration - but not assimilation - which had been ongoing up till the late 1870s for the Anglo-Jewish community, was resumed in the reconstituted British Jewish community.

From this perspective, the strategy of community citizenship was used to deal with the special and unique problems associated with the massive influx of migrants but subsequently community social quality was maximised - at least for the large majority of British Jews - by a more integrative policy relating to national rather than community citizenship, while retaining strong religious and communal institutions.\textsuperscript{15}

Conclusion
The British Jewish community can thus be seen as a powerful exemplification of community citizenship. It took a major role, not only in religious and cultural activities, which is only to be expected, but also in relation to social security, family support, civil law, education, sanitation and even, and very forcefully, immigration control and repatriation - all aspects of life normally under state control. This extraordinary proactive stance by the community resulted from a carefully thought-
through and articulated strategy by community leaders. Its goal was to maximise the quality of life of the long-established Anglo-Jewish core of the expanded and reconstituted British Jewish community by maximising the 'Englishness' of the newcomers through a strategy of anglicisation, while retaining their Jewish identity.

Anglo-Jewish community citizenship was a response to extreme stress and pressure over twenty-five years from mass immigration arising from the pogroms in the Russian empire. The passage of the *Aliens Act* in 1905 immediately obviated the need for immigration control by the community and led to a gradual reduction in pressure on the Jewish Board of Guardians to provide extensive financial support to immigrants. Over time too there was a reduction in Jewish educational provision - though, even now, at the turn of the twenty-first century there are still 22 Jewish denominational state-funded schools (Judd, 1992). Other elements of Anglo-Jewish community citizenship still exist too, particularly in relation to civil law. Nevertheless, Anglo-Jewish community citizenship is now much more residual than it was and the British Jewish community has, to a large extent, merged back unobtrusively into mainstream British society.

An important question that needs to be faced concerns the uniqueness of the Anglo-Jewish community citizenship and community social quality experience: is it so exceptional that it is not appropriate to use it as an example of community citizenship but is instead a singular aberration? A first response is that it not unique: it has many similarities with the much larger, and even more pressurised, Jewish community in New York, which also undertook community citizenship policies (Sowell, 1981: 80; Godley, 1996: 101). This is, however, rather a specialised comparitor - the same Ethnos group at the same time, from the same region.

A hundred years later much has changed. There is now extensive and rigorously policed state immigration control and there is now a much more extensive state social policy apparatus both in Britain and across Europe. So the *specificities* of the Anglo-Jewish example certainly no longer hold true. But there are many aspects of this example which are more generally applicable in contemporary European societies and which illuminate the conceptual frameworks of community citizenship and community social quality, both individually and in relation to each other.
Perhaps the most telling aspects of this example relate to the links between community and society: no form of community citizenship is possible without strong inclusion, cohesion and empowerment within the community; and only weak community citizenship is possible unless societal social cohesion takes an appropriate form (in that the infrastructures that can facilitate community citizenship are in place). In addition, effective community citizenship is facilitated by strong links between the community and society - if the community itself is included and empowered within society; and it is a definite bonus if the community has high levels of socio-economic security to help to resource community citizenship activities.

The key element in facilitating strong community citizenship relates to the nature of societal social cohesion - whether it is based on homogeneity and those where it is based on pluralism. The former are not at all amenable to strong community citizenship because social institutions are centralised and emphasises similarities. In these societies - such as France - education, in particular is seen as a unifying force (Limage, 2000). On the other hand, societies where social cohesion is pluralist in nature, enable the establishment of social institutions that facilitate community citizenship.

In England, state-funded denominational education is an apt example. Not only did it provide a sound financial basis for Jewish schools a hundred years ago, but it is now being used to provide for Muslim education. Recently three out of around 80 community-financed and private Muslim schools in England have been awarded state funding (Adil, 2000). It is likely that more will soon gain this status as the Government is planning a major increase in state-funded ‘faith-based’ schools (Department for Education and Employment, 2001). This is perhaps the beginning of British Muslim community citizenship in the twenty-first century.

It is interesting to note, however, that even though the British Muslim community has been well-established for over a quarter of a century, it has found it far more difficult than did the Jewish community to establish state-funded denominational schools. It is certainly the case that the British Muslim community is comparatively poorer than was Anglo-Jewry and it certainly does not have similar levels of control over community socio-economic security. Recent studies too show that the levels of Muslim community cohesion and inclusion are relatively low (Dwyer, 1993; Zokaei and Phillips, 2000). There seems, therefore, that there
is a strong *prima face* case a community social quality analysis of the contemporary British Muslim community would be as fruitful as has been the above analysis of Anglo-Jewry.
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Notes

1 Around 15 percent were very rich indeed, with average annual earnings in 1882 of over £375. A further 42 percent were earning on average £54 per annum. This compares with average lower class earnings of £26 per year. The poverty line was about £12 per annum (Alderman, 1992: 104). In 1868, Benjamin Disraeli became the first Prime Minister of Jewish extraction and by 1880 there were several Jewish MPs. Leading Jewish families, too were closely socially connected to the Prince of Wales - the heir to the British Throne (Lipman, 1954: 162).

2 Based on Beatrice Potter's estimate of the hourly rates of a plain machinist in a stock or common tailor's shop of around 21/2d per hour. Derived from Potter (1888: table p 170).

3 So much so that Black (1988: 390) claims that no subculture in Britain has been so upwardly mobile and Prais and Schmool (1975: 8) estimate that in 1961, 38 percent of British Jews were in social classes I and II, more than double the national average of 16 percent.

4 The largest single source is Charles Booth's massive survey *Life and Labour of the People of London*, in 17 volumes, published by Macmillan, 1889-1903. Many quotes in this paper are from the voluminous unpublished interview data from this study. Additional material was gathered for: the *Royal Commission on Housing of the Working Classes*, 1884-5; *Board of Trade (Alien Immigration) Reports on the Volume and Effects of Recent Immigration from Eastern Europe into
the United Kingdom, 1894; Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the Sweating System, 1888; Royal Commission on Alien Immigration, 1903.

5 Loans were interest-free and were repaid at 5 percent per week. Bad debts were very low, at around 2.5 percent. Initially many loans had been provided for the purchase of sewing machines but this had become so successful that it was taken on by the Singer Sewing Machine Company as a commercial enterprise (Black, 1988: 80).

6 Even this is probably an underestimate. Lipman (1954: 98) reported 17,500 repatriation 'cases' comprising 50,000 people. This would imply a family size of only around three, but Feldman (1994: 303) states that the majority of those repatriated were single.

7 In 1897 about 9 percent of Jews were employers, 20 percent self employed and about 71 percent wage earners (Feldman, 1994: 164). This pattern was still in evidence in the 1930s and 1940s, as was high rate of self-employment and company ownership (Adler, 1935: 273-4, 287; Barou, 1946: 7). High levels of self-employment are still the norm among recent immigrants. In the 1990s a quarter of Indian and a fifth of Pakistanis in England were self-employed (Metcalf, Modood et al., 1996: 2).

8 The Jewish Board of Guardians honorary secretary stated that it was the 'useless and helpless' who got repatriated and those who seemed to be able to fend for themselves were given onward passages (Feldman, 1994: 303).

9 A report in the Jewish Chronicle 27 Oct 1911 stated 'It is in these societies that the foreigner learns order and discipline, respect for the chair and the mode of conducting public business. the proceedings are always in English.' reported in (Lipman, 1954: 148).

10 Lipman (1954: 162-3) talks of 'the older body and the immigrants interacting yet not dividing off into two or more separate communities'. Gartner (1968: 273), on the other hand refers to distant personal relationships, mutual disdain, friction and occasional eruptions. between the two elements of the community. Both however, agreed that there was enough fellow-feeling for it to have a sense of being a single community and Gartner (1968: 273) stated that Anglo-Jewry 'slowly made peace with the immigrant element whose children largely assumed control in the 1930's and 1940's'. This is apparently in marked contrast to the situation in New York where Sowell (1981: 82) reports 'caste-like' divisions between the German and Russian Jews as late as in the 1940s. .

11 Feldman (1994: 299) reminds us that Anglo-Jewry used this power not only in its external relations: 'The ability of the Anglo-Jewish notables to approach the government as members of the same governing class and to obtain concessions for the Jewish community was one basis of their communal rule. In this way the politics of the Jewish question not only dealt with the interaction of Englishmen and Jews: it also concerned the articulation and distribution of power within the Jewish community.'

12 According to Feldman (1994: 299): 'The ability of the Anglo-Jewish notables to approach the government as members of the same governing class and to obtain concessions for the Jewish community was one basis of their communal rule.' For example, Jewish legal representation ensured legal rights for Jews resident in England for five years who had not yet attained formal citizenship status. Against strong governmental opposition Jews fought for - and got - 'citizenship' recognition under the 1911 National Insurance Act for such Jewish aliens to get full benefits even though the government was initially adamantly against it: 'In 1911 the aliens and their benefit societies won a signal victory. .. It was due to their appropriation of an image of the national community which suggested that aliens were, de facto, citizens and as such were entitled to receive support from the state. The image, and its bearing on the alien's position, received such widespread assent that the government was persuaded to withdraw' (Feldman, 1994: 377).

13 Even as late as 1930 when the East End Jewish population had greatly diminished, the local Beth Din met daily and dealt with 8,000 cases annually, many of which were referred from English magistrates (Adler, 1935: 278-9).

14 Ironically, the purpose of this legislation was to enable the existing Church of England and other Christian schools to be incorporated within mainstream compulsory state education. But it was also the financial saviour of Jewish education: 'For Anglo-Jewry, national educational policy ... taught a lesson repeated many times over. Jews could transfer costly social welfare to the state while still appearing to care for their own community' (Black, 1988: 107).
Nevertheless, in some small areas in London, community citizenship is retained even now to some extent by the small core of ultra-orthodox Jews - most of whom are descendants of the Russian and eastern European immigrants (Barry, 1998).