

Integration of Jewish immigrants in Glasgow, 1880-1939

Thesis submitted by Ben Braber
for the degree of PhD. at
the Department of Modern History
and the Department of Scottish History,
University of Glasgow

ProQuest Number: 11007903

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 11007903

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Thesis
9869
Copy 1

Abstract

This thesis analyses the process of integration of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe in Glasgow between 1880 and 1939. At the turn of the 20th century several thousand Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe settled in Glasgow, where they joined a Jewish population of several hundred people who had come to the city or had been born there before 1880. The central question in this thesis is how integration developed. This is answered by adopting a traditional broad historical approach to the subject by examining, in turn, various aspects which played a crucial part in the immigrants' lives. The main areas dealt with here, to provide a picture of the immigrants' experience, were the development of the religious congregations, religious habits and lifestyle, the education of immigrant children, Jewish occupations and welfare, the participation of Jews in Glasgow's public life and the reaction of the non-Jewish population to the influx of immigrants. Throughout the thesis, integration of Jewish immigrants is reviewed within the wider context of the changes in Scottish society and the development of British Jewry. A wide range of primary and secondary sources, much of it from Glasgow Jewry and some of it used for the first time, is utilised.

In general, it is found that the role of religion in Jewish life in Glasgow changed and was being supplemented as time went on by more secular ideologies in the post-1918 era, consequently religious habits and lifestyles were transformed. Immigrant children in Glasgow were educated in state schools, a development which provided a ready bridge into Scottish society. Jews found new occupations, notably in the professions. Some were very successful in business, manufacturing and in the professions. But not all immigrants were successful, many worked hard all their life while remaining poor. Jewish immigrants shared the urban experience of Glaswegians in general - the constant struggle to make ends meet, to get on. Jews were increasingly able to take part in general public life in Glasgow despite a rather ambivalent attitude towards Jews in general society.

This thesis shows that during the period 1880-1939 there were various ways in which the Jewish immigrants integrated into Scottish society, but that in general they managed to integrate without losing their Jewishness.

Contents

List of tables and map	page 4
List of abbreviations	5
Introduction	6
Chapter 1. Development of Glasgow Jewry 1880-1939	15
Chapter 2. Rise and decline of religious congregations	55
Chapter 3. Changes in religious ritual and lifestyle	96
Chapter 4. Education of immigrant children	138
Chapter 5. Occupations and welfare activity	181
Chapter 6. Public activity : politics, Zionism and art	231
Conclusion	292
Appendix	297
Glossary	304
Sources	305

List of tables and map

Page 297: Table 1.1: Estimated numbers of Jews in British cities 1901-1939

Page 298: Table 1.2: Jews on Glasgow valuation rolls 1881-1911

Page 299: Table 2: Number of seatholders in United Synagogue of Glasgow synagogues
1902-1914

Page 300: Table 4.1: The estimated number of Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow, and
Talmud Torah and cheder pupils 1908-1963

Page 301: Table 4.2: Jewish pupils at Gorbals Public School 1913-1914, and table 4.3:
Estimated percentage of Jewish children of total number of pupils at Gorbals Public
School 1905-1937

Page 302: Table 4.4: Choice of subjects of students at Glasgow University in 1936-1937

Page 303: Table 6: Parliamentary election results in Gorbals 1918-1948

Following page 318: Map of Glasgow: Synagogues and congregations

List of abbreviations

CP Communist Party of Great Britain

JC Jewish Chronicle

JE Jewish Echo

GH Glasgow Herald

GZO Glasgow Zionist Organisation

ILP Independent Labour Party

JIA Joint Israel Appeal

JNF Jewish National Fund

JP Justice of the Peace

MBG Minute Book Garnethill

MBGHC Minute Book Glasgow Hebrew Congregation

MBGHPHS Minute Book Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society

MBGLZO Minute Book Glasgow Ladies Zionist Organisation

MBGJEB Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Education Board

MBGJRC Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Representative Council

MBGJVA Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Volunteer Association

MBP Minute Book Pollokshields Congregation

MBSPS Minute Book South Portland Street

MBUJYM Minute Book United Jewish Youth Movement

MBUSG Minute Book United Synagogue of Glasgow

MP Member of Parliament

NBDM North British Daily Mail

OHP Oral History Project

SJAC Scottish Jewish Archives Centre

SRA Strathclyde Regional Archives

SRO Scottish Record Office (WRH West Register House)

WIZO Women Zionist organisation

Introduction

Shortly before the First World War a young man from Estonia arrived in Glasgow. Inevitably he went to the cinema, a novelty which had recently conquered the city¹. He was dismayed by the unfamiliar rowdy behaviour of the audience in a Gorbals cinema, about which he made a derogatory remark. He was immediately rebuked by his brother: "These are the people who rule the world."² This young man was Benno Schotz. Like his brother he felt an outsider, but some twenty years later he seemed to have found his place in Scottish society. Schotz had become a professional sculptor with a growing reputation and on Hogmanay he would watch the crowds at Glasgow Cross with, in the words of his 1981 autobiography, "their good natured, slightly inebriated jollification", and he felt "at one with them and as happy."³ The autobiography of Benno Schotz is an example of how many Jews from Eastern Europe who came to Glasgow at the turn of the 20th century later in life looked back, reflecting upon their settlement in the city. The integration of these people and their children is the subject of this thesis.

As will be reviewed below, the history of the Jews in Glasgow has been the subject of historical research, but previous studies have not paid much attention to the integration of the Eastern European immigrants. When integration of Jewish immigrants in Glasgow is mentioned, authors offer different and often opposing opinions. Collins writes, for example, that by "the later 1930s the integration of Scottish Jewry was gaining momentum. Scottish Jews had become an established part of the Scottish scene (...)"⁴ But Kölmel argues that the Jews in Glasgow during this period showed a "relatively low degree of integration"⁵. These contrasting opinions may stem from a different interpretation of what integration is. In this thesis integration is seen as a social process in which a population group, in this case Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, becomes part of a larger whole, in this case Scottish society, without necessarily losing

¹ D. Daiches, Glasgow, London, 1977, p. 212; compare B. Morron, "Dancing Down Memory Lane", in The Scots Magazine, volume 136, number 6 (March 1992), pp. 593-596. Glasgow provided much popular entertainment. Daiches writes that Glasgow in 1917 boasted of having no less than a hundred cinemas which was said to have been the highest number in Britain in proportion to the population of the city. Morron claims that later Glasgow would have more dance halls and ballrooms per head of population than any other city in the country.

² B. Schotz, Bronze in my Blood. The Memoirs of Benno Schotz, Edinburgh, 1981, p. 53.

³ B. Schotz, Bronze in my Blood, p. 55.

⁴ K.E. Collins, "The Growth and Development of Scottish Jewry 1880-1940", in K.E. Collins (ed.), Aspects of Scottish Jewry, Glasgow, 1987, pp. 1-53, p. 53; compare K.E. Collins, Second City Jewry: the Jews of Glasgow in the age of expansion, 1790-1919, Glasgow, 1990, pp. 101, 221. In Second City Jewry Collins writes that by the end of the 19th century the Jewish community in Glasgow was recognised as an "integral part" of the life of the city but also that during the years between the First and the Second World War "major steps towards integration" were taken.

⁵ R. Kölmel, "German-Jewish Refugees in Scotland", in Collins, Aspects of Scottish Jewry, pp. 55-84, p. 60.

its communal identity. The main question in this thesis is how historically integration developed, in what ways the members of the Jewish group developed a sense of belonging to Glasgow, and how, conversely, Glasgow society accepted them as part of its life.

Apart from the interpretation of what integration is, the subject of this thesis offers several problems with definitions and concepts. There is the question of who should be regarded as a Jew. There is no consensus about who should be regarded as such. According to traditional Jewish law, somebody is a Jew when this person is born from a Jewish mother or when this person is converted to Judaism, conform certain religious regulations. There is, however, even among Jews no unanimity on this. Van Arkel⁶ has formulated a definition, which includes members of religious congregations and their descendants, whether they regarded themselves as Jewish or not, but his definition raises several objections. Orthodox Jews, for example, would not regard children from a marriage where only the father is a Jew as Jewish.

Smith⁷ argues that Jews should be regarded as a Diaspora ethnic unit, which he defines as a population with shared ancestry myths, history and culture, associated with a specific territory from which they have been dispersed and a sense of solidarity. Such a unit has certain boundaries, often marked by religion and other characteristics like economic occupations. This concept seems more useful, but the cohesion of the Jewish population group should, however, not be overestimated. In the modern era, that is after their resettlement in Western Europe, from which they had been largely expelled during the Middle Ages, the Jewish group began to lose its cohesion. At first slowly⁸, but faster after their formal emancipation, Jews adopted the cultural patterns of the majority of the people among whom they lived. The speed of this process differed from place to place and country to country, leading to differences between Jewish population groups.

In Eastern Europe the speed of this process was slower than in Western Europe and even between Jewish groups in Eastern Europe there were sharp divisions along social, religious and general cultural lines. Such divisions still influenced the immigrants as they settled in Glasgow. The idea that they shared Lithuanian origins, for example, played an important part in the folklore of Jewish immigrants in Glasgow. The Jewish author Chaim Bermant, who came as a young boy to Glasgow, gives an example of this when he writes about Lithuanian Jews or "Litvaks, as they are generally called, a term which refers not only to immigrants from the small Lithuanian republic of the inter-war years, but of the greater Lithuania which had included in its time large parts of Russia, Poland and Latvia. The Litvak was looked upon, and certainly looked upon himself, as more

⁶ D. van Arkel, Antisemitism in Austria, University of Leiden, 1966, p. XVI.

⁷ A. D. Smith, The Ethnic Origins of Nations, Oxford, 1986, p. 32; compare M. Banton, Racial Theories, Cambridge, 1987, pp. 122-135.

⁸ J.I. Israel, European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism 1550-1750, Oxford, 1985, p. 1.

enlightened and progressive than his other East European brethren, and possessor of a sharper mind. He was more worldly and easy-going and least affected by Chassidic influences.”⁹ The Jews who left their homes in Eastern Europe during the 19th century encountered not only unknown cultures, but also other Jews with unfamiliar religious habits and lifestyles.

Despite such differences, during the period 1880-1939 there was little discussion about a definition of Jewishness. A Jew who had converted to Christianity and became a Christian missionary in Glasgow, for example, was no longer regarded as a member of the Jewish group by the Jews themselves. Religion provided the main source of identification of somebody's Jewishness at the start of this period. However, after the First World War, ideologies like Jewish Socialism and Zionism began to replace religion. This led to an even greater variety of experiences of Jewishness, but for most contemporaries it was still quite clear who should be regarded as a Jew and who not.

Jews were becoming part of modern society, while maintaining some of their characteristics and adapting to local circumstances. They received civic rights and gained social acceptance. This process is described by Katz¹⁰ as integration. The term integration is used in this study, rather than terms such as assimilation or acculturation. Whereas acculturation indicates the adoption of or adaptation to a different culture and does not seem to indicate that a group becomes part of a larger body, assimilation is often used in a negative way¹¹. Banton¹² defines assimilation as a process by which the major society absorbs a minority without itself undergoing any significant change. The Jews influenced the society in which they settled and this makes the term assimilation as defined by Banton not very applicable.

Integration in general cannot be regarded as a one-sided process¹³ and integration of

⁹ C. Berman, Troubled Eden. An Anatomy of British Jewry, London, 1969, pp. 221-222; compare Collins, Aspects of Scottish Jewry, pp. 3-4.

¹⁰ J. Katz, Jews and Freemasons in Europe 1723-1939, Cambridge Massachusetts, 1970, p. 213; see also his works Exclusiveness and Tolerance. Studies in Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times, Oxford, 1961; Out of the Ghetto. The social background of Jewish emancipation 1770-1870, Cambridge Massachusetts, 1973; "The Concept of Social History and its Possible Application in Jewish Historical Research", in Scripta Hierosolymitana, III, 1956, pp. 292-312; "Vom Ghetto zum Zionismus. Gegenseitige Beeinflussung von Ost und West", in Leo Baeck Institute Bulletin, 64, 1983, pp. 3-14.

¹¹ Encyclopedia Judaica, Jerusalem, 1971, III, pp. 770-783; compare M.H. Gans, Het Nederlandse Jodendom - de sfeer waarin wij leefden. Karakter, traditie en sociale omstandigheden van het Nederlandse Jodendom voor de Tweede Wereldoorlog, Baarn, 1985, p. 20; M.H. Gans, Memorboek. Platenatlas van het leven der joden in Nederland van de middeleeuwen tot 1940, Baarn, 1971, p. 837; M. Marrus, "European Jewry and The Politics of Assimilation: Assessment and Reassessment", in Journal of Modern History, volume 49, number 1 (1977), pp. 89-109.

¹² Banton, Racial Theories, p. IX.

¹³ J. Cahen, "De wens om assimilatie probleemloos te interpreteren", in De Gids, vol. 153 (1990), number 2, pp. 126-130; A. van der Heide, "Joodse Historiografie", in Theoretische Geschiedenis, volume 34, 1986, number 3, pp. 405-408; K. Lunn, Hosts Immigrants and Minorities. Historical Responses to Newcomers in British Society 1870-1914, Folkstone, 1980, p. 9.

Jewish immigrants in Glasgow was not a linear process either. Not all Jews arrived, for example, in Glasgow at the same time. Some settled for good, others left. The Jewish population in Glasgow constantly changed in size. As a result of a lack of statistical sources, it is very difficult to estimate the size of the Jewish population of Glasgow in the period between 1880 and 1939. During the 20th century annual estimates were made and published in the British Jewish Year Book (see table 1.1. in the appendix), but the question is how reliable these estimates are. It was believed, for example, that during the early 1920s there were about 14,000 Jews in Glasgow and that this number rose to about 15,000 in 1939, at which level it remained until the 1950s¹⁴, but Vincent argues that there were probably not more than 11,700 Jews in Glasgow in 1938¹⁵. In any case, there was a high rate of mobility among the Jews in Glasgow. Especially, during the early years, a changing group of transmigrants was present in the city. These left Glasgow as soon as circumstances allowed them to travel, while others returned to the Continent or decided to settle elsewhere after living in Glasgow for a while. The integration of such a fluctuating group necessarily cannot be a simple process.

The city of Glasgow was to a certain extent a city of immigrants. Apart from Jews, people from the surrounding countryside, from the Highlands, Ireland, Germany, Italy and Asia came to the city¹⁶. Like other population groups, the Jewish immigrants had to find their place in a changing Scottish society. Economy and culture were transformed. At the time of the settlement of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe Glasgow was going through a period of expansion, incorporating areas which had previously been independent burghs. Slums in the old city centre were cleared and new neighbourhoods were built. Its population increased with the arrival of many newcomers, to drop again after the First World War. Although Glasgow had a mixed population with a large Roman Catholic minority, it was predominantly a Protestant city. Thus, these circumstances and as will be shown below, the material available for this study do not lend themselves to the use of narrow definitions. For this reason, a traditional broad historical approach of the subject has been chosen.

One approach to the question of how the process of integration of Jewish immigrants in Glasgow developed between 1880 and 1939 can be formulated as follows. First, the general development of the Jewish population in the city during this period will be reviewed. Secondly, the role of religion, of Glasgow's Jewish religious institutions and customs, will be examined. Thirdly, the education of immigrant children will be studied.

¹⁴ J. Cunnison, and J.B.S. Gilfillan (ed.), The Third Statistical Account of Scotland. Glasgow, Glasgow, 1958, p. 744; The Jewish Voice, number 1, July 1921; Jewish Year Book 1939, *idem* 1952.

¹⁵ P. Vincent, "Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", in The Jewish Journal of Sociology, volume VI, number 2, December 1964, pp. 220-231, p. 230.

¹⁶ A. Gibb, Glasgow. The Making of a City, London 1983, p. 106, 125-127; A. Slaven, The Development of the West of Scotland: 1750-1960, London/Boston, 1975, pp. 143-144, 147, 233. In 1851, 56% of the total population of Glasgow had not been born in the city.

And finally, the way in which Jews operated in general economic, political and cultural life will be investigated. Within the chapters adopted in this thesis - a general survey of the development of the Jewish population of Glasgow during the period between 1880 and 1939; the development of the religious congregations; changes in religious habits and lifestyle; education of immigrant children; Jewish occupations and welfare; and Jewish activity in public life by means of politics and art, the relation between the different Jewish groups and their dealings with the non-Jewish population are investigated, with special attention to the reaction of the non-Jews to the influx and settlement of the immigrants and its results.

There is an idea that Scotland has been practically free of anti-Semitism¹⁷. It is not always clear what people mean when using the term¹⁸. Katz defines anti-Semitism as prejudice toward Jews¹⁹ and Holmes, Kushner and Lebzelter describe anti-Semitism as hostility toward Jews as such²⁰. The problem with these descriptions is that they cover very many phenomena. Hostility towards Jews as such has changed throughout history and has taken many shapes and sizes²¹. The Holocaust has also changed the thinking about prejudice and hostility towards Jews. What might have seemed innocent teasing by children before the Second World War is now often regarded as unacceptable behaviour. It is important to stress, therefore, that it would not be correct to put all historical occurrences of prejudice or hostility towards Jews into one category. Rather than applying a definition of anti-Semitism to the situation in Glasgow, this thesis will look at the reaction of non-Jews to the influx of Jewish immigrants. Remarks and actions following, for example, the appearance of Jewish immigrants on the labour market where they competed with non-Jewish labour will be scrutinised and assessed. Certain remarks and actions were felt by Jews to be derogatory and as will be discussed, this had certain

¹⁷ The Observer 12/2/1989.

¹⁸ Anti-Semitism is the specific subject of a thesis by H. Maitles, Anti-Semitism in Scotland 1914-1945 (University of Strathclyde, 1992), but unfortunately, this thesis came too late to be included in this study.

¹⁹ J. Katz, From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700-1933, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1980, p. V.

²⁰ C. Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 1876-1939, London, 1979, p. 1; T. Kushner, The Persistence of Prejudice: Antisemitism in British Society during the Second World War, Manchester 1987, p. 2; G.C. Lebzelter, Political Anti-Semitism in England 1918-1939, Oxford, 1978, pp. 1-2.

²¹ For this and the background of anti-Semitism see among others Van Arkel, Antisemitism in Austria, p. II; N. Cohn, The Pursuit of the Millennium. Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages, London, 1957; N. Cohn, Warrant for Genocide. The Myth of the Jewish World-Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, London, 1967, pp. 15-19; I. Fetscher, "Zur Entstehung des politischen Antisemitismus in Deutschland", in H. Huss, A. Schröder, Antisemitismus. Zur Pathologie der bürgerliche Gesellschaft, Frankfurt a/M, 1965, pp. 9-34; G.L. Mosse, "German Jews and Liberalism in Retrospect", in Leo Baeck Institute Year Book, volume XXXII (1987), pp. XIII-XXV; W. Treue, "Zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland", in Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, volume 75 (1988), pp. 360-370; S. Volkov, "Antisemitism as a Cultural Code. Reflections on the History and Historiography of Antisemitism in Imperial Germany", in Leo Baeck Institute Year Book, volume XXIII (1978), pp. 25-46; R. Wistrich, Antisemitism. The Longest Hatred, London, 1992 (paperback edition), pp. XV-XXVI.

repercussions for Jewish behaviour.

The period covered by this study starts in 1880 and ends in 1939. This period was chosen for the following reasons. During the 1880s Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe began to arrive in significant numbers in Glasgow. As will be shown, there had been Jewish immigrants in the city before the 1880s, but in this decade their settlement took shape, for example, in the form of organisations and institutions. Although some developments after 1939 are discussed, this study ends with the outbreak of the Second World War. This period almost covers the lifespan of the first generation of immigrants and includes the growing up of a second generation. The results of the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel added new dimensions to Jewish identity and the history of Jews in Scottish society after these events, therefore, requires separate treatment in its own right.

The integration of the Jewish refugees who arrived in Glasgow from Germany after 1933 lies within the scope of this thesis, but will only be mentioned where relevant to the process of integration of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe. The position of the German refugees has been described by Kölmel²². According to Kölmel²³ about a thousand of these people came to Glasgow. In the period before 1939 they found it difficult to adjust to their new environment and they largely remained outsiders. The relation between the refugees and the existing Jewish community in Glasgow was at that time very strained. There were important religious and cultural differences. The Jews in Glasgow at first did not seem to have been prepared to assist the refugees. There is a well documented anecdote²⁴ about an approach which was made in 1934 to the Jewish orphanage in Glasgow to take in a group of refugee children. The approach met local opposition. Glasgow Jewish leaders felt that the children should be looked after in London and they objected to the financial side of the project. In private they also worried about adding to growing anti-Jewish feelings. Although eventually Glasgow Jewry took part in all relief efforts to help the refugees, such reactions show that the local Jewish leadership felt the position of the Jews in Glasgow to be not yet stable enough to accommodate large numbers of refugees. This aspect of Glasgow Jewry will be discussed in chapter 1.

A wide range of sources has been utilised in this thesis. These sources have of course their own particular limitations. Some of the primary sources deal with society as a whole and include the Jewish population only as a part of the general picture. Other primary sources are specifically Jewish. The Jewish sources include, for example, minute books of various institutions and religious congregations, Zionist and friendly

²² R. Kölmel, *Die Geschichte deutsch-jüdischer Refugees in Schottland*, Heidelberg, 1979 (PhD thesis); R. Kölmel, "German-Jewish Refugees in Scotland", in Collins, *Aspects of Scottish Jewry*, pp. 55-84.

²³ Kölmel, *Die Geschichte deutsch-jüdischer Refugees in Schottland*, pp. 285-309.

²⁴ Kölmel, "German-Jewish Refugees in Scotland", p. 59, footnote 16; compare Private Collection, Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Representative Council (cited hereafter as MBGJRC) 27/8/1934.

society material, and personal correspondence and memorabilia. In addition there are numerous publications, ranging from pamphlets, brochures and year books to magazines and newspapers like the British Der Poylisher Yidl and the Jewish Chronicle, and the locally produced Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine, Hadardar, Magazine of the Glasgow Jewish Student Society, The Jewish Voice and Jewish Echo, which offer a kaleidoscope of attitudes and opinions expressed in contemporary debate. Most of the Jewish sources are institutional and thus give a picture of life as seen by the establishment of the Jewish population, but it is not all of a piece: there are contrasts and different views are expressed in it. This material can be supplemented by digging into, for example, Census Enumerators' books, in order to build up a picture of ordinary Jews who tended, from their position, not to leave records or have the time to compile diaries or reflections. Thus, another perspective is provided by compiling occupational and social profiles from these latter sources. There is no reliable data on the occupations of Jews in Glasgow or the daily life of Jewish workers, but by inference and deduction some information on such subjects can be provided²⁵. The use of some 19th-century sources such as Census returns and Valuation Rolls has particular problems - for instance, the difficulty of getting returns of occupational and industrial categories which are consistent²⁶. This information therefore has to be treated with great care. In order to construct a profile of Glasgow Jews, a sample of 800 Jewish family names has been taken from two communal records, namely the Communal Register of the Garnethill Hebrew Congregation (1911) and the Financial Statement of the Glasgow Hebrew Public Burial Society (1912-1913)²⁷. If a person in, for example, a Census Enumerator's book or on a Valuation Roll had a name which appears in this sample and his or her birthplace was in Eastern Europe we may presume that this person was a Jewish immigrant. In doubtful cases, first names like Noah, Joseph, Solomon, Moses, Rachel, can also be an indication that somebody is Jewish.

There are many secondary sources on Glasgow Jewry, including autobiographical work like Benno Schotz's Bronze in my Blood, which has been mentioned before. These autobiographies are briefly discussed in chapter 6. Some of this work was written as literature. It does not lie in the scope of this study to discuss the literary quality of this work or Jewish influence in general literary works by Scottish authors like John

²⁵ The only Census of Scotland which recorded religion was the Census of 1851, which does not lie within the scope of this thesis. Other material, like parish poor relief applications and evidence presented to the Municipal Commission on the Housing of the Poor (1902-1905), contains some relevant information (see for example chapter 1). D.E. Lindsay, Report upon a Study of the Diet of the Labouring Classes in the City of Glasgow 1911-1912, Glasgow, 1913, includes some Jewish families, but unfortunately Lindsay's method of selection of these families is unknown and it is therefore impossible to say whether they were representative for the Jewish population as a whole.

²⁶ E.A. Wrigley (ed.), Nineteenth Century Society, Cambridge, 1972, pp. 15-19, 82-133, 191-195.

²⁷ Both in Scottish Jewish Archives Centre (cited hereafter as SJAC).

Burrowes and Robert McLeish²⁸. The Jewish autobiographies can be used as sources if treated with care. These sources are useful in as far as they show how in retrospect people look back and reflect on the past. But, as they were all written after the Second World War, people's reflections of the past were also influenced by the Holocaust, the establishment of Israel, and the coming of old age. Similar considerations concern a collection of interviews, conducted during the Oral History Project of the Scottish Jewish Archives Centre²⁹. Like all sources, if used objectively and with discrimination, this material can be utilised to provide a picture of the past. Fortunately for the study of the history of Scottish Jewry more sources are constantly becoming available and future research may add new information.

Some works on the history of the Jews in Glasgow have been compiled by Levy³⁰ and Collins³¹. There are major differences between these works and this thesis. Levy's pioneer work concentrates on the Jews in Glasgow before 1880 and is mostly concerned with the establishment of the Jewish population. Collins' Go and Learn concentrates on Jews and Medicine. The first attempts to review the period until 1939 were made in Tova Benski's paper on Glasgow during a conference of the Jewish Historical Society of England³² and in Collins' Aspects of Scottish Jewry, which were followed by Collins' major work Second City Jewry. In this book Collins covers the period until 1919. None of these works pay special attention to the process of integration of immigrants. In this thesis more effort is made than in Levy's and Collins's work to compare the position of the Jews in Glasgow

²⁸ J. Burrowes, Incomers, Edinburgh, 1987; J. Burrowes, Jamesie's People, Edinburgh, 1984; J. Burrowes, Mother Glasgow, Edinburgh, 1991; R. McLeish, The Gorbals Story, Edinburgh, 1985. In McLeish's play, first staged in 1946, the central character is an Indian hawk; in the screen version (1950) this role was played by the Jewish actor Lothar Lewinsohn.

²⁹ SJAC, Oral History Project (cited hereafter as SJAC, OHP). For a discussion of the use of oral history sources see S. Leydesdorff, Wij hebben als mens geleefd. Het Joodse proletariaat van Amsterdam 1900-1940, Amsterdam, 1987, pp. 26-58; L. Niethammer (ed.), Lebenserfahrung und kollektives Gedächtnis. Die Praxis der 'Oral History', Frankfurt a/M., 1983; P. Thompson, The Voice of the Past, Oxford, 1988 (revised paperback edition).

³⁰ A. Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry 1812-1895, Glasgow, 1949; A. Levy, The Origins of Scottish Jewry, a paper for the Jewish Historical Society of England 13/1/1958.

³¹ K.E. Collins (ed.), Aspects of Scottish Jewry, Glasgow, 1987; K.E. Collins, Go and Learn. The international story of Jews and Medicine in Scotland, Aberdeen, 1988; K.E. Collins, Second City Jewry: the Jews of Glasgow in the age of expansion, 1790-1919, Glasgow, 1990; K.E. Collins, "The Jews of Glasgow: Aspects of Health and Welfare 1790-1920", in History Teaching Review Year Book, volume 5, 1991, pp. 31-37.

³² Benski, T., "Glasgow" in A. Newman (ed.), Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain, papers for a conference of the Jewish Historical Society of England, 1975, unpublished, pp. 4-12.

with other groups in the city like the Roman Catholics³³ and with Jews in other British cities at this time.

The Jews in Scotland have been somewhat neglected in Jewish historiography. This is regrettable. Glasgow still has a significant number of Jewish inhabitants. Within the European context, where so much was destroyed during the Holocaust, the history of the Jews in Glasgow offers the possibility to study the uninterrupted development of a Jewish community. This thesis does try to review Jewish history in Glasgow in the wider context of Jewish history in Great Britain. The traditional historians of British Jewry tended to emphasise the role of Anglo-Jewry's central institutions, its elites, the Jewish contribution to general society and the social progress of the Jews. A new generation of historians is presently paying more attention to questions about the interaction between social-economic and institutional change, social relations within the Jewish population, working class culture, women and children, family and neighbourhood life, leisure, trade union and left-wing activity, nonconformity and anti-Semitism³⁴. Not all these aspects could be included here but this thesis does lean more towards that latter historiographical approach; and in thus examining the question of how the integration of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe developed in Glasgow between 1880 and 1939, makes its own contribution to Jewish historiography in Britain.

³³ See for example C.G. Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland since 1730, London, 1987, pp. 161-165, 234-238, on the position of the Roman Catholic Irish immigrants. For a wider perspective see J.E. Handley, The Irish in Modern Scotland, Cork, 1947; J.E. Handley, The Irish in Scotland, Glasgow, 1964; J. Zubrzycki, Polish Immigrants in Britain. A Study of Adjustment, The Hague, 1956. It does not lie within the scope of this dissertation to discuss other immigrant groups in Glasgow, like the people who came from the Highlands, Germany, Italy, Poland and Asia. Recent studies on the history of such groups include, for example, B. Maan, The New Scots. The Story of Asians in Scotland, Edinburgh, 1992.

³⁴ For a discussion of this see D. Cesarani (ed.), The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry, Oxford, 1990, pp. 1-11; B. Williams, "Anglo-Jewish History", in Scottish Economic and Social History, volume 11 (1991), pp. 74-77.

Chapter 1: Development of Glasgow Jewry 1880-1939

On 17th October 1875 21 members of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation met to adopt the following proposal:

“In view of the recent and rapid increase of the Hebrew Community in Glasgow and the consequent present inadequate Synagogue accommodation the providing of a new and suitable place of worship has become a necessity and (...) this meeting considers the erection of such a Synagogue with school accommodation, etc., attached an imperative duty deserving the most earnest support of the entire community.”¹

The execution of this resolution took almost four years. In September 1879 a “new and very handsome Synagogue” was consecrated at Garnethill providing room for 580 persons - the “area of the building set apart for males will accommodate 362 worshippers; the gallery set apart for ladies 218”².

It was for the first time in the relatively short history of the Jews in Glasgow that the congregation owned a purpose-built place of worship. Among the 21 members present at the 1875 meeting was Emanuel Cohen, a lithographic printer, engraver and wholesale stationer, who was a grandson of Isaac Cohen, a hatmaker and the first Jew to be admitted as a Freeman of the City in 1812³. Although Jews as travelling salesmen and doctors had visited Glasgow prior to the Napoleonic Wars and there had been relations between the Scottish royal court and Jewish financiers in England going back to the 12th century, none had settled in the city permanently before Isaac Cohen⁴. Eleven years after his admission, a sufficient number of Jews lived in Glasgow to form a congregation. They worshipped in two rooms on the first floor of 43 High Street. The remainder of the house near Trongate was occupied by Moses Lisenheim, who acted as Reader and shochet (ritual killer) for the newly formed congregation⁵. It took more than fifty years after the establishment of the congregation before a purpose-built synagogue could be opened.

The Garnethill synagogue symbolises several developments in Glasgow Jewry, but

¹ SJAC, Minute Book Glasgow Hebrew Congregation (hereafter cited as SJAC, MBGHC) 17/10/1875.

² Jewish Chronicle (cited hereafter as JC) 12/9/1879.

³ The Burgess Certificate of Isaac Cohen is reproduced in A. Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry 1812-1895, Glasgow, 1949; compare G. Alderman, London Jewry and London Politics 1889-1986, London, 1989, p. 2. In London Jews were allowed to become Freemen of the City in 1830. Emanuel Cohen was born in 1817 in London, he married in 1852 in Manchester (his wife was a hatter's daughter from Manchester) and died in 1890 in Glasgow. His father was Henry Cohen, a clothier.

⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 15-17; C. Roth, A History of the Jews in England, Oxford, 1964 (3rd edition), pp. 16, 92.

⁵ Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, p.11; compare Jewish Echo (cited hereafter as JE) 23/7/1937. Lisenheim seems to have left Glasgow after a few years to go to England.

also raises some questions. The opening of the synagogue shows the growth of the Jewish population in the city, which by 1879 needed a synagogue where 580 persons could worship. How did this growth come about? Why did these people come to Glasgow? The building of a synagogue required finances which were well out of reach of a simple hatter like Isaac Cohen and Garnethill was therefore also an indication of social mobility and financial stability among the Jews in Glasgow. Had they all been so successful? In having a synagogue built, the Jews in Glasgow showed the wider society that they had found a place in Scottish society and were going to stay here. The decision to have a “very handsome” place of worship built betrays a striving for respectability and dignity. What caused this ambition? The general development of Glasgow Jewry in the period until 1939 provides some answers to these questions.

According to Cleland⁶, 47 Jews resided in Glasgow in 1831: 28 males and 19 females. 28 persons out of the total of 47 were above 20 years of age. Roughly half of the 47 individuals originated from the German states (including Prussian Poland), and 5 had been born in London. Two families had come from Sheerness. During the next year conditions for a settled Jewish population were met: in addition to a place of worship and the provision of kosher meat, the congregation acquired a part of the Necropolis for the burial of their dead⁷.

Most of the early Jewish settlers had previously stayed in England. Isaac Cohen, for example, had arrived in Manchester from London in 1799 with Jacob Cohen⁸ before he decided in the early 19th century that Glasgow offered better opportunities for his hatmaking business. Cohen may have had other reasons for leaving England, but during the decades following his arrival in Scotland the idea that Glasgow was becoming a good place for business could have been a good reason for Jewish families to settle here, while as a result of improved transport facilities it progressively became easier to travel to the city from England.

Glasgow's industrial growth attracted many persons to the city. From the 1830s

⁶ J. Cleland, Examination of the Inhabitants of the City of Glasgow and the County of Lanark for the Government Census of 1831, Glasgow 1831, pp. 72-73, 188.

⁷ Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, pp. 28, 30. The quill merchant Joseph Levi, who according to Levy, died of cholera in September 1832, aged 62, was the first to be buried in this part of the cemetery and the first person to be interred in the Necropolis as a whole. Compare G. Blair, Biographic and Descriptive Sketches of Glasgow Necropolis, Glasgow, 1857, pp. 337-339; Strathclyde Regional Archives (cited hereafter as SRA), T-MH 52, Merchants House Records, “Diary of the Dead interred in the Cemetery of the Merchant House of Glasgow, 1833”, which states the cause of his death as dysentery. Blair notes that Levi died of cholera (in which he was probably later followed by other authors). He also writes that the congregation in 1830 bought the piece of land in the Necropolis for 100 guineas, but that when several years later the plot was full, no agreement could be reached on the acquisition of additional space. The Jewish congregation then moved its burial place to Janefield. Blair offers no explanation for the lack of agreement. The disagreement might have been a financial matter (see also SRA, T-MH 52/4/2).

⁸ B. Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740-1875, Manchester, 1985, p. 17.

onwards the opportunities to establish retail firms rose further, following the development of trade, industrial expansion and urban growth⁹. The Jews, traditionally settling as retailers and small manufacturers, like Cohen, provided for the growing need of the urban middle classes, who profited from the economic development and acquired a taste for luxury clothing and goods. Among the early Jewish settlers were opticians, instrument-makers, quill merchants and stationers, while on the more luxurious side jewellers, furriers, cabinet-makers and an artificial flower maker could also be found¹⁰.

The early Jewish settlers lived in the city centre, near their synagogue, which by 1842 had moved to the Post Office Court in Candleriggs and from there to 204 George Street, following the westward movement of the urban middle classes in general. Growing, but still numbering less than fifty adult male members (the total Jewish population of Glasgow consisted probably of less than one hundred persons), the congregation then moved on to a flat in Howard Street, at the corner of Jamaica Street, and from there in 1857 to 240 George Street. This new place, consisting of two adjoining flats, was bought for a considerable sum of money, altered and decorated¹¹.

The synagogue in 240 George Street, from where eventually the move to Garnethill would be made, was more handsome than its predecessors, with large stained windows, ornamental work and a canopy in front of the ark supported by columns bearing images of the Two Tablets. Its establishment was a sign of growing wealth within the congregation. Some of the members were able to provide guarantees for loans, while in general the growing income of the members allowed for larger contributions towards the expenses of the congregation. The Jews in Glasgow had on the whole moved successfully into larger manufacturing, retail and wholesale, due to the growing demand for consumer goods. This growing demand heralded the general rise in the standard of living among the middle and working classes during the second part of the 19th century, from which the Jewish traders would further benefit. They had recently been joined by a number of commercial agents and merchants, who became the trustees of the synagogue. These trustees were, for example, Abraham Harris, a wholesale

⁹ For a broad outline of Glasgow's development in general see D. Daiches, Glasgow, London, 1977; A. Gibb, Glasgow: The Making of a City, London 1983; History Today, volume XL (1990, special issue: "Glasgow: City of Cultures, 1630-1990. Urban History through a Scottish Mirror"); A. Slaven, The Development of the West of Scotland: 1750-1960, London/Boston, 1975; T.C. Smout, A Century of the Scottish People 1830-1950, London, 1988 (paperback edition, 2nd impression), pp. 32-57. For the economic development of the city and the position of Glasgow Jewry see further chapter 5.

¹⁰ Blair, Biographic and Descriptive Sketches of Glasgow Necropolis pp. 336-349; Glasgow Chronicle 28/1/1817; Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, pp. 16-18, 54-55; Post Office Glasgow Directories, see for example an entry in 1822 for J. & H. Michael under "Agents, Auctioneers and Furniture Warehouse", 12 Candleriggs.

¹¹ A. Newman, A., "A Short History of Garnethill", in Garnethill Synagogue Centenary Souvenir Brochure, Glasgow, 1979, pp. 55-60. p. 56; SJAC, MBGHC 17/9/1858; JC 12/9/1879 The place cost between £1,000 and £1,500. The alterations were about £800.

watch manufacturer; Benjamin Simons, a fruitbroker; Samuel Morris, a commission merchant; Henry Levy, owner of the Shakespeare Saloon in Saltmarket, also described as “wine merchant”; Joseph Nathan, a shoemaker; and Samuel Levenston, son of a commercial agent who studied medicine¹².

Accumulated wealth enabled the members of the congregation to carry out the 1875 decision. Ground was bought and a synagogue erected, involving an expenditure of some £22,000. The synagogue was described in the Jewish Chronicle as “one of the most beautiful places of worship” in the city and Glasgow Jews were said to “feel no little pride in their synagogue.”¹³ The correspondent of the Glasgow Herald was equally impressed¹⁴.

There had been some controversy in the congregation about the site which had been chosen for the new synagogue¹⁵. Not all the members lived in the fashionable and more luxurious middle-class areas of Glasgow’s West End and some felt that the new synagogue would be too far away from the many Jews who still stayed near the old city centre and the Clyde. The opposition against the site perhaps delayed the construction of the synagogue, but failed to stop it. The new building at Garnethill can be seen as a product of the middle-class aspirations of the Jewish establishment. In its pretentiousness there is a striking similarity with other public constructions of this period, symbolising the growing self-confidence and civic pride of Glasgow’s middle classes. The synagogue at Garnethill likewise embodied the social progress and integration of Jews into Glasgow society, with an intention of showing that they had been firmly established in the city, were here to stay permanently, and could make a valuable contribution to Scottish life.

On several occasions and in different ways, the Jewish establishment displayed their achievements. Isaac Cohen, the first Jewish resident in Glasgow for example, was credited with the introduction of the silk hat to Scotland¹⁶. His grandson Emanuel advertised himself on the labels of his firm to be the “Inventor & Original Manufacturer of the Triple Numbered Drapers Cheque Book”¹⁷. This may have been done to attract customers, but there was more to it. Relations with non-Jews in

¹² SJAC, MBGHC 17/9/1858; compare JE 18/3/1932. The Jewish Echo in an obituary described A. Harris as a cigar importer and cigarette manufacturer and founder of the George Street synagogue. The cigar importer, however, was the son of the synagogue trustee Abraham Harris.

¹³ JC 12/9/1879; SJAC, Cash Book Building of New Synagogue. Compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 40. Collins writes that the synagogue cost £13,000 when the price of ground is included. The building is more fully discussed in chapter 2.

¹⁴ Glasgow Herald (cited hereafter as GH) 10/9/1879.

¹⁵ SJAC, MBGHC 22/4/1877; November 1875. Compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 38. About a fifth of the fifty members involved in the discussion opposed the site at Garnethill.

¹⁶ Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, p. 15.

¹⁷ See SJAC, inside cover Minute Book Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBGHPHS).

general were proudly displayed. In 1878 the correspondent of the Jewish Chronicle reported, for example, that the majority of the guests at a ball of the Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society had been Christians¹⁸. Individual achievements were also exhibited. In 1898 the executive of the Garnethill congregation decided to bring the “gallant” behaviour of a Jewish youth who was said to have risked his life to save a man drowning in the Clyde to the notice of the “Royal Humane Society”. Noticing with satisfaction that the youth’s action had been “witnessed by a large concourse of persons”¹⁹, the executive presented him with a suitably inscribed watch. When Dr. Noah Morris was appointed to the Regius Chair of Materia Medica at the University of Glasgow in 1937, the first Jew to occupy this position, a dinner was organised to mark this honour²⁰. An honour bestowed on an individual Jew was felt as an honour for the whole Jewish group. Similarly, a crime committed by one Jew was felt to be jeopardising the position of whole Jewish group. When a Jewish boy was detained in Mossbank Industrial School on a charge of theft, the executive sought to have the boy moved to a Jewish institution in London or the boy’s family in Holland²¹. Negative publicity about Jews and doubts about their patriotism during the First World War led to the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council organising several parades of Jewish soldiers through the streets of Glasgow to demonstrate their loyalty²².

The reason for this striving for respectability and civic acceptability was an ambivalent attitude in general towards Jews in Scottish society. During the early 19th century, circumstances in Glasgow had been favourable for the settling of Jews and their social progress was stimulated by a tradition, of which Smout writes: “all men of ability, irrespective of where they came from, who their fathers were, or how they had been trained” were accepted into Glasgow’s business, and “it was exceptionally easy for an outsider or a man of humble parentage to advance in Glasgow.”²³ In 1812 Isaac Cohen was granted his Burgess Certificate without the obligation to swear the Christian oath. Similar tolerance was shown at institutions of higher education. Jewish medical students in Scotland were not obliged to swear a Christian oath on entering university or medical school when this was still a normal procedure in England and

¹⁸ JC 8/3/1878.

¹⁹ SJAC, Minute Book Garnethill (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBG) 6/3/1898; compare SJAC, Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Volunteer Association (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBGJVA) 28/2/1898, 19/2/1899.

²⁰ Jewish Echo (cited hereafter as JE) 8/7/1937; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 85-86.

²¹ SJAC, MBG 23/1/1898, 3/4/1898; compare SJAC, MBG 7/11/1920, 8/11/1925, 15/11/1925, for similar incidents.

²² See for example JC 13/10/1916. See also below.

²³ T.C. Smout, A History of the Scottish People 1560-1830, London, 1972 (paperback edition), p.363. Smout calls this one of Glasgow’s strong points. The substance of guild restrictions in Glasgow’s trades and crafts, which to a certain extent could have prevented the influx of newcomers, had vanished during the 18th century.

prevented their entry into such institutions²⁴.

Not only Jews came to Glasgow. During the 19th century, the city attracted high numbers of people from its surroundings, the Scottish Highlands, Ireland and other countries. In 1851, 18% of the population of the city had been born in Ireland and during the last quarter of the century more than half of its inhabitants originated elsewhere²⁵. In this climate the early Jewish settlers were accepted. The nature of trade and the sheer pace of industrial growth facilitated social mobility for ambitious newcomers who had the right connections and financial support.

Success in business was publicly rewarded. In 1880, for example, Glasgow's weekly magazine The Bailie portrayed Benjamin Simons, one of the trustees of the synagogue. Simons had been born in 1817 and came to Glasgow from London in the 1840s. On his way north he had spent some time in Edinburgh, which was said not to have appealed to him because "grass grew in the market place! 'No, no,' said sagacious Benjamin, 'the grass sha'n't grow under my feet;' and he certainly kept his word."²⁶ In Glasgow Simons established a firm handling the wholesale and retail of fruit, profiting from the easy access to business, and he managed to expand his trade enormously. His imports and sales increased especially after the reduction of railway freight charges, the shortening of journeytimes for steamships from the Continent and America in particular (due to improvement in ship design and engine performance), while he implemented the new technology of refrigerating in large warehouses. In a true Glasgow middle-class spirit Simons was credited as follows:

"Fruit now is no longer a luxury to our city - it is a daily article of food within the reach of all, and it is to Mr. Simons we are indebted for this. These are a few of the things which have been accomplished by a gentleman who, living unobtrusively among us, has fought his fight, and now relinquishes his command to those of his own name, in whose hands there is little fear of any falling off in this industry, which gives a new means of livelihood to thousands."²⁷

This reflected an attitude to newcomers in general, but what about Jews in particular? Blair in 1857²⁸, while writing very sympathetically about the Jews,

²⁴ K. E. Collins, Go and Learn. The International Story of Jews and Medicine in Scotland, Aberdeen, 1988, pp. 12-13. Compare A.J.P. Taylor, English History 1914-1945, Oxford, 1976 (reprint), p. 169; B. Wasserstein, Herbert Samuel. A Political Life, Oxford, 1992, p. 9. The University College School in London was established in 1830 to accommodate Jews and other non-Anglicans who were barred from the universities in Oxford and Cambridge because of this oath. Although the situation changed later, there were in England during the 1920s still unacknowledged exclusions of Jews and to a lesser extent of Roman Catholics.

²⁵ K.G. Robbins, "The Imperial City", in History Today, XL, 1990, pp. 48-54.

²⁶ The Bailie 29/12/1880.

²⁷ The Bailie 29/12/1880. Compare Glasgow Herald 2/10/1992 for a leading article remarking that "Scotland never enjoyed a great affinity for fresh fruit."

²⁸ Blair, Biographic and Descriptive Sketches of Glasgow Necropolis, pp. 337, 348, 339.

mentions the fact that some prejudices existed. He notes that Jews had a separate burial place in a corner of the Necropolis and that this was equally satisfactory to Jews and Christians. Jews remained strangers and sojourners in Britain, but Blair added that the Jews should arouse interest and admiration because they had been the founders of monotheism. A similar attitude can be found with Renwick and Lindsay when they write in their History of Glasgow, published in 1921, about a “curious prohibition” in the 12th century diocese of Glasgow “against Churchmen pledging their benefices for money borrowed from the Jews or other usurers”²⁹. At the same time, Lindsay called Jews an “undesirable” class³⁰.

This ambivalence about Jews was the result of a long tradition. The prohibition described by Renwick and Lindsay was probably a result of the Third Lateran Council's attempts to restrict Jewish “usury”³¹. Although it is unknown what effect such prohibitions had, there is some evidence of medieval anti-Jewish feelings in Scotland³². In England such feelings formed the background to the expulsion of the Jews. After the Reformation the attitude towards Jews somewhat changed. Scottish Protestants, who put great emphasis on the Old Testament, regarded Jews in general as the Biblical people of the old Covenant but not with a living nation, they had disappeared from the scene with the destruction of the Temple. The Protestants identified themselves as the people of the new Covenant³³. While elsewhere Protestants did not take kindly to the people of the old Covenant, British Calvinists on the whole were rather benevolent towards Jews³⁴ and there was a Scottish minister among those who advocated the readmission of the Jews to Britain in the 17th century. This was John Weemse who wrote in 1636 that “the lewes have a loathsome and stinky smell, and (...) a stinking breath” but nevertheless should be allowed back into the country³⁵. Men like Weemse advocated readmission in the hope that the Jews could be converted to Christianity. A similar attitude still existed in the 19th century and may have formed the foundation

²⁹ R. Renwick, J. Lindsay, History of Glasgow. Volume I, Pre-Reformation Period, Glasgow, 1921, pp. 80-81. Their source is Cosmo Innes (ed.), Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis. Munimenta Ecclesie Metropolitane Glasguensis a sede restaurata seculo ineunte xii as Reformatam Religionem, Maitland Club, 1843, numbers 54, 58-65.

³⁰ See G.R. Rubin, “Race, retailing and Wartime Regulation: The Retail Business (Licensing) Order 1918”, in Immigrants & Minorities, vol. 7, nr. 2, July 1988, pp. 184-205. Lindsay wrote this about aliens, which included Jews, when he was Town Clerk in Glasgow in a letter to the Scottish office about applications for licenses for refreshments shops. See further chapter 5.

³¹ Compare Roth, A History of the Jews in England, p. 40. Roth writes that these restrictions were not followed in England.

³² Roth, A History of the Jews in England, pp. 56-57, 89. This concerned the influence of ritual murder accusations in England.

³³ D. Daiches, “The Bible in English Culture”, in JC 27/1/1956, shows how strong such feelings were.

³⁴ L. Poliakov, The History of Anti-Semitism, London, 1974, 3 volumes, I, p. 204.

³⁵ D.S. Katz, Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603-1655, Oxford, 1982, p. 17, see also pp. 136, 167.

of the mission to the Jews organised by the Church of Scotland. At the same time, 1847, the Church petitioned Parliament not to remove remaining Jewish disabilities³⁶, but there was little openly expressed hostility.

The Scottish Enlightenment, unlike its French counterpart, displayed little or no anti-Jewish feelings³⁷. This might have been due to the fact that no Jews lived in Scotland until the end of the 18th century and they had only been encountered abroad by individual Scottish travellers, like William Lithgow who visited the Holy Land in the 17th century or James Bruce of Kinnaird who discovered the black Jews of Ethiopia some hundred years later, or by the readers of English literature. The image of Jews as portrayed by Shakespeare's Shylock and Dickens' Fagin as cunning money-loving scoundrels can also be found in Sir Walter Scott's work. It is hard to say whether Scott wrote from experience, but he noted in his Journal in 1825: "After all it is hard that the vagabond Stock-jobbing Jews should for their own purposes make such a shame of credit (...) It is just like a set of pickpockets who raise a mob in which honest folks are knockd (!) and plundered that they may pillage safely in the midst of the confusion they have excited."³⁸

This rather ambivalent attitude towards Jews existed when they began to settle in Glasgow. Later, it was reflected in the observations about the civic character of the Jews made in connection with public meetings in Glasgow to protest against the persecution of the Jews in Czarist Russia. Jews were said to be known as honorable and industrious people. In 1891 Sir John Neilson Cuthbertson declared: "We had now come to know the law-abiding character of our Jewish fellow- citizens,"³⁹ while ex-Bailie Dickson proclaimed that he "loved the Jews"⁴⁰. Such statements may also have been the

³⁶ J.R. Fleming, A History of the Church in Scotland, 1843-1874, Edinburgh, 1927, pp. 16, 58, 61; compare Encyclopedia Britannica, XIII, pp. 684-684; Jewish Leader 6/6/1930; Post Office Glasgow Directory 1882-1883, p. 97. The encyclopedia presents a favourable picture of the Jewish struggle for emancipation in Britain. Later in the 19th century some missionary work in Glasgow, embodied for example in a "Christadelphia Synagogue", hoped for the union of all religions. During the 1930s there were some Glasgow ministers who supported Zionism for similar reasons.

³⁷ Poliakov, The History of Anti-Semitism, I, p. 202, III, pp. 59-69. Poliakov writes that John Toland ascribed the Scottish aversion to pork and black pudding to the fact that the Scots had Jewish blood in their veins.

³⁸ W.E.K. Anderson (ed.), The Journal of Sir Walter Scott, Oxford, 1972, p. 14; compare Poliakov, The History of Anti-Semitism, III, pp. 325-327. The entry was dated 25/11/1825 and came amidst complaints about his financial situation. Poliakov discussed Scott's work but does not mention the entry in the Journal.

³⁹ GH 11/6/1891, see also GH 23/1/1892. The Roman Catholic Archbishop Eyre voiced similar sentiments.

⁴⁰ North British Daily Mail (cited hereafter as NBDM) 20/6/1891; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 101. The Rev. A.R. MacEwan, a Church historian and leading United Presbyterian, stayed on a more down to earth level, which was probably representative for the Presbyterian attitude towards Jews during the 1890s when he spoke of "simply (a) fellow-man who lived an honourable life". Collins writes about the Lord Provost at the turn of the 20th century being "touched to tears" about the plight of the Jews.

result of compassion with the fate of the refugees from Czarist Russia⁴¹, but they could hardly disguise some uneasiness about Jews.

The ambition of gaining respectability and civic acceptability was a result of this ambivalent attitude towards Jews. Michael Simons, the son of Benjamin who took over the management of the fruit trade, for example, entered public life in 1883 as a Councillor of Glasgow Corporation and was a member of Glasgow's civic elite, which had been acknowledged seven years earlier when he joined the freemasons' lodge Kilwinning⁴². The lodges were places where men could socially meet their equals and some of them allowed in Jews. In 1887, however, Simons was also among twelve Jewish masons who met in the synagogue chambers to resolve that it was "highly desirable to constitute" a lodge under Jewish auspices⁴³. Although Lodge Montefiore, as the new lodge was called, was open to non-Jews (Simons' business associate Malcolm Campbell became Master in 1904), there could have been several reasons to form what was in effect a Jewish lodge. In general freemasons practised traditional rituals of Christian origin, which prevented Jews from taking part. Furthermore, the constitution of Lodge Montefiore can be seen as an indication of both a willingness on the Jewish side to show their accomplishments by having their own lodge where they could receive non-Jewish guests, and the continuing separateness between Jews and Christians. While successful Jewish businessmen were accepted in the wider middle-class society, the ambivalent attitude towards Jews in general did not change much.

One other reason for constituting a Jewish lodge was most certainly to stimulate philanthropy. The 1875 resolution had spoken of a "recent and rapid increase" of the Jewish population in Glasgow. During the 1840s and 1850s the number of Jews in Glasgow had slowly risen with the arrival of new families, and although immigration might have dropped slightly during the next decade, gradually more Eastern European Jews followed in their wake. The presence of destitute Jews in the city evoked Jewish fears about growing bias against Jews in general and the new arrivals, often on their way to America, became the subject of personal and congregational charity. In March 1866, for example, the congregation paid 10 shillings towards the costs of matzoth (unleavened bread eaten during the Passover festival) for "some Polish immigrants (who) arrived here and went to America", and five years later financial support was

⁴¹ See also Post office Glasgow Directory 1906-1907, p. 140, when such feelings were repeated by the Glasgow Jewish Evangelical Mission after the 1905 pogroms.

⁴² C. Winston, The History of Lodge Montefiore, Glasgow No. 753, 1888-1988, Glasgow, 1987, p. 5. Winston calls this lodge "Mother Lodge Kilwinning No. 0" because it was for a while regarded as the first lodge or mother lodge in Scotland. The fact that Simons joined a lodge which was situated in Kilwinning or joined a branch of the Kilwinning lodge is interesting. The Kilwinning lodge consisted of several men who were engaged in the fruit trade, which might have been a reason for Simons to join them or might have enabled Simons to become a freemason.

⁴³ Winston, The History of Lodge Montefiore, p. 7.

given to a woman with two children to send her to the United States to join her husband there⁴⁴.

With the improvement of railways, the deepening of the Clyde and the growing importance of the Clyde as a port, the city became an attractive port of embarkation for the United States (especially after the American Civil War, 1861-1865), and the British colonies. In general Jews who embarked here, came from the Jewish Pale of Settlement in Russia. Since the beginning of the century Jews had started to leave the Pale, with emigration levels reaching an appreciable level in the 1870s - 250,000 Jews had left since 1800 - and culminating in a wave of 2.75 million Jews emigrating between 1880 and 1914. By the end of the century some 5 million still lived in the Pale. The migration of Jews from this area was part of the great upheaval of people, which took over 60 million Europeans - mainly Irish, Italians, Germans, Austro-Hungarians, Russians and Poles - overseas in the century before 1914. Almost eighty per cent of the Jews who left the Pale went to the USA; possibly more than 100,000 settled in Britain between 1881 and 1905, most of whom are said to have come from Lithuania and White Russia⁴⁵. With the Aliens Act of 1905 Jewish immigration from Russia into Britain declined, to rise again after 1911.

This population movement would not have been possible on such a scale had there not become available the means of transport by railway and steamship. The main route of migration from the northern provinces of the Russian Empire, Lithuania and the Baltic lands, was across Germany by train to Bremen, Hamburg, Rotterdam and Antwerp, from where the migrants sailed; smaller groups embarked at the Baltic ports. As the number of travellers grew, a fierce competition developed between shipping companies for the Atlantic emigrant traffic. British lines competed with Continental companies, the Anchor Line started shipping passengers on a large scale from Glasgow in 1891, and eventually it became cheaper to travel from Europe to the east coast of England and Scotland, cross the country by rail, and sail from Liverpool and Glasgow to America, than directly from the Continent. Along the whole route of migration people dropped out and settled temporarily or permanently, creating or enlarging existing Jewish communities. Improved transport and price changes also brought a growing number of Eastern European Jews to Glasgow. By the early 1880s it was believed that ^{two-thirds of} Glasgow Jewry ^{were} immigrants from Eastern Europe⁴⁶.

Why did these immigrants stay in Glasgow? First of all, to find a safe place to live. Many Jews left the Pale in the aftermath of pogroms and restrictions, like the May

⁴⁴ SJAC, MBGHC 19/3/1866, 8/2/1871.

⁴⁵ V.D. Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858, Leicester, 1990., pp. 44-45.

⁴⁶ JC 19/8/1881; compare Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, p. 328. Williams writes that in 1875 there were 7,000 Jews in Manchester and that of these 7,000 Jews at least half and possibly two thirds had come from Eastern Europe.

Laws, which followed the assassination of Czar Alexander II in 1881, and later emigration peaked again during periodical outbursts of violence. Such peaks appeared in 1891, 1896 and notably between 1903 and 1907; in the years between 1911 and 1914 54 times more people left when compared with the 1870s⁴⁷.

Another reason for coming to Glasgow was to find work. Persecution intensified the movement out of the Pale, but underlying this phenomenon was the pressure of a fast growing population with diminishing economic prospects and social-economic modernisation in general. Jews lived in heavily congested areas in the Pale, where unemployment was high. Despite emigration, the number of Russian Jews increased from about 1,6 million in 1825 to about 4 million in 1880, a growth of about 1.8% per year compared with just over 1% for the population of the Russian Empire as a whole. The sharper increase in the Jewish population was probably a result of a relatively low death rate among Jews when compared with the general population, while it is also possible that in some areas the Jewish fertility rate was higher than the general figure, because Jews tended to marry at an earlier age than non-Jews; in the Gentile population sons of farmers and landowners often delayed marriage until they inherited land, while Jews could not own land⁴⁸.

A process of urbanisation led to further growth of the traditional ghettos of the towns in the Pale, with a general movement of the Jewish population to the northern provinces, often fleeing from expected violence and pogroms which tended to start in the southern Ukraine. Towards the end of the century, the forced deportation of almost one million Jews from cities in Russia proper to the Pale overcrowded the Jewish urban centres there. Consequently emigration from Russia proper to the Pale and within the Pale towards Lithuania and the Baltic often preceded emigration from the Pale⁴⁹, and this could explain the existence of the idea that so many Jews in Glasgow originated in Lithuania, as was mentioned in the introduction⁵⁰.

⁴⁷ Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858, p. 45.

⁴⁸ I. Berend, G. Ranki, Economic Development in East-Central Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries, New York, 1974, pp. 16-26; J. Bodnar, The Transplanted. A History of Immigrants in Urban America, Bloomington Indiana, 1987, p. 37; S. Kuznets, "Immigration of Russian Jews to the United States: Background and Structure", in Perspectives in American History, IX (1975), pp. 35-124, p. 63; M. Rischin, The Promised City: New York's Jews 1870-1914, New York, 1962, p. 24.

⁴⁹ S. Baron, The Russian Jews under Tsars and Soviets, New York/London, 1964, pp. 94-95; M. Gilbert, Jewish History Atlas, London, 1985, pp. 72, 74-75; L. Greenberg, The Jews in Russia, New Haven/London, 1965, I, p. 19; H. Seton-Watson, The Russian Empire, 1801-1914, Oxford, 1967, pp. 494-495.

⁵⁰ C. Bermant, Troubled Eden. An Anatomy of British Jewry, pp. 221-222; Collins, Aspects of Scottish Jewry, pp. 3-4; compare SJAC, OHP interviews. The proximity of Lithuanian Jewry to the Baltic ports is said to have made their emigration to Britain easier. The origins of the persons who were interviewed for the Oral History Project of the Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, however, are not always in Lithuania, although some of the families involved might have moved there before emigrating to Britain. In this case, of course, the idea of a shared ancestry is more important than historical reality.

The Jews who left the Pale were often skilled workmen, craftsmen, shopkeepers and traders. During the 19th century mechanical modes of production in the area replaced crafts and many of the displaced craftsmen were Jewish, due to the traditional inability to own land which prevented them from entering agriculture. Economic change created greater social mobility and urbanisation. Some entered the new factories of Russian Poland, where factory production made inroads through, for example, the introduction of the Singer Sewing Machine, and in 1890 28% of all factory hands in Russian Poland were Jewish. Others moved away, joined by those who were made redundant during economic crises and shopkeepers and small traders, who were increasingly unable to compete with larger shops and warehouses which stocked the newly mass produced goods. The very poor were mostly the last to leave, they first had to resort to menial jobs to avoid hunger and find resources to emigrate. Young men often went abroad first - to avoid forced military service in the Russian army, and once they had settled in their new countries, they were followed by other family members. As a result, most immigrants from the Pale did not arrive completely penniless or without skills⁵¹. Glasgow's industrial growth attracted these people because their skills enabled them to adapt relatively easy to the textile trades and industry in Glasgow.

Initially, Glasgow's involvement with this migration was mainly indirect. In 1845 the congregation counted just over 40 members⁵² and the number of Jewish families in the city could not have been more than a hundred with a total population of probably less than 500 persons, making it one of the smallest Jewish settlements in British cities. After the middle of the century the demand by non-members grew for some of the congregational facilities, like circumcision of newly born boys, provision of kosher meat, and the burial of the dead. The number of applicants for these services quickly surpassed the number of holders of seats in the synagogue, which indicated a growing number of immigrants. The synagogue in 240 George Street housed 136 male and 58 female worshippers, but by 1873 it was necessary to hold supplementary services on High Holy Days in Benjamin Simons' building in George Street, to accommodate those who wished to attend such services without annually renting a seat in the synagogue⁵³. Based on the accommodation of the new synagogue at Garnethill, Levy

⁵¹ Berend, G. Ranki, Economic Development in East-Central Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries, p.23; Bodnar, The Transplanted. A History of Immigrants in Urban America, p. 20; H. Pollins, Economic History of the Jews in England, East Brunswick New Jersey, 1982, p. 131-135. During the period 1899-1914, 64% of all Jewish immigrants from the Pale in the USA were skilled workers, compared to 38% of Jewish immigrants from Austria-Hungary who arrived in the USA between 1902 and 1911.

⁵² Newman, "A Short History of Garnethill", p. 56.

⁵³ SJAC, MBGHC 2/4/1866, 7/2/1870, 31/7/1879.

estimates that in 1879 700 or more Jews lived in Glasgow⁵⁴, while Collins writes that about 1,500 Jews were present in the city at that time⁵⁵. According to the Jewish Chronicle⁵⁶, the number of Jews in Glasgow was just under two thousand in 1881. There is, however, no conclusive evidence on the number of Jews in Glasgow⁵⁷. Some figures can be derived about the Jewish residents in Tradeston and the Gorbals - this last neighbourhood on the left bank of the Clyde was to become an area where many new immigrants found shelter. Between 1871 and 1881 at least 36 Jewish families settled in the Gorbals and remained there until at least 1891, becoming engaged in the tailoring and retail trades and notably in hawking. From this group some men established themselves as workshop owners who eventually provided employment for newcomers⁵⁸. They created a Jewish workforce on the South Side which by 1881 had grown sufficiently for the Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society to engage a general practitioner for the Jewish poor in that part of Glasgow, when the Medical Officer of the society resigned because his patients were "mostly all residing on the South Side (and) he could not spare the time to do them justice"⁵⁹.

For these immigrants in general Glasgow was not the first place of settlement in the United Kingdom. Most came from England and some had previously lived on the Scottish east coast and in Ireland. In 1891 the Census enumerators registered 185 Jewish families in the Gorbals area. Out of the total number of 185, 44 families had at least one spouse or child born outside Glasgow but in the United Kingdom before they settled in the city. Benjamin Kaplan, a 28-year-old manager in the tobacco trade, for example, lived at 124 Main Street. He had been born in Odessa, his wife Fanny originated from Kovno in Lithuania. They had four children: Aaron, aged 5, born in London, Ada, aged 4, born in Hamburg, Norman, aged 2, born in Manchester and 1 month-old Dorah, born in Glasgow. With them lived a 21-year-old lodger from Kovno. Isaac Salberg, a Russian-born 41-year-old general draper, and his wife Annie, aged 36 and also born in Russia, living at 130 Thistle Street, had 8 children: Anna, aged 15, born in England, Barnett and Abraham, aged 12, born in Aberdeen, Leha, aged 9, Jane, aged 7, Samuel, aged 5, Minnie, aged 2 and Flori, aged 2 months, all born in Glasgow. These examples show that families like the Kaplans and Salbergs had lived

⁵⁴ Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, pp. 44-45, 47; compare Newman, "A Short History of Garnethill", p. 57.

⁵⁵ K.E. Collins, Go and Learn, p. 58; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 45-48.

⁵⁶ JC 19/8/1881.

⁵⁷ See appendix, table 1.1, for estimates of the number of Jews in Glasgow and other British cities from 1901 to 1939; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 60, 63, 65-66, 69-70, 101, 150; JC 10/5/1895; Jewish Encyclopedia 1903 and 1916; Glasgow Jewish Year Book 1938-1939.

⁵⁸ Scottish Record Office, New Register House Edinburgh, Census of Scotland 1891, Enumerator's Books for Tradeston, Gorbals and the area between Saltmarket-Trongate/Argyle Street-Brown Street-Broomielaw/Clyde Street.

⁵⁹ SJAC, MBGHPHs 29/5/1881.

elsewhere in Britain before settling in Glasgow. The prospects of employment and business opportunities, but also presence of family and landsleit (persons originating from the same area in the Pale), like Kaplan's lodger, attracted these people to the city.

Some people might have got stranded on their way to America. After 1891, during the second wave of emigration from the Pale and the establishment of several trans-Atlantic lines⁶⁰, Glasgow became an important centre for transmigration. It was reported at a public meeting in January 1892 that 5,428 Jews from Russia had passed through Scotland during the previous year, with 105 in the week before the meeting⁶¹. With these sharp rises more Jews decided or were forced to stay in the city and its Jewish population grew to about 6,000 persons in 1900. During the first years of the 20th century, natural increase was responsible for further growth, but after 1908 more immigrants arrived, including many from London's East End, bringing the number of Jews in Glasgow up to about 9,000 persons on the eve of the First World War.

In Chaim Bermant's folklore of the Pale anyone "who emigrated to the West - especially as far as Britain or America (and the former figured in the local imagination as an offshore island of the latter) - was presumed to prosper"⁶². Some did prosper in Glasgow, but not all. Many left for America or the British colonies or went to England, especially in times of economic hardship, to look for a better place to make a living. Some decided to return to the Pale. In 1912, for example, Max Schapiro, Honorary Secretary of the Garnethill congregation went back to Russia⁶³.

After the First World War the number of Jews in Glasgow grew further, with natural increase and smaller additions from outside, while significant numbers kept leaving Scotland to settle overseas. In 1939 it was estimated that about fifteen thousand Jews lived in Glasgow. From being one of the smallest settlements only a century before, Glasgow Jewry had grown in size to become the third provincial Jewish centre in Britain on the eve of the Second World War. This was a sign of

⁶⁰ D. Daiches, Glasgow, London, 1977, pp. 201-202; J. Riddell, The Clyde. An illustrated history of the river and its shipping, Fairlie (Ayrshire), 1988, pp. 55-61. In 1856 the Anchor Line had sent its first steamship from Glasgow to New York. Entering a new era in 1891, the company purchased the 8,415 ton steamship City of Rome for the New York service. At the turn of the century the Anchor Line owned 22 ships. In 1902 the Columbia was launched, being able to carry over 1,300 passengers. Other companies operating from Glasgow in the emigrant trade were Donaldson, the Allan Line and the State line. Among the Donaldson ships was the 10,000 ton Grampian, built in 1907. The State Line started in 1873 and was in 1891 purchased by the Allan Line. During the early 20th century on average three large ships left the Clyde every week for America, among them capable of carrying 4,500 passengers.

⁶¹ GH 23/1/1892. The report was made by the Rev. W.P. Paterson, a Church of Scotland minister from Crieff who in 1894 became professor of Systematic Theology in Aberdeen. He also said that 100,000 had left Hamburg for New York thus giving the impression of a mass exodus.

⁶² C. Bermant, The Patriarch, London, 1982 (paperback edition), p. 51.

⁶³ SJAC, MBG, Printed Report 1/9/1911-31/8/1912.

remarkable growth, but it has to be noticed that despite Glasgow's position as "Second City" of the British Empire, the city failed to become the second largest Jewish centre in Britain. The number of Jews in Glasgow remained smaller than the number of Jews in London, Manchester and Leeds (see table 1 in appendix). This meant that the percentage of Jews in the total population of Glasgow stayed relatively small - about one per cent, which was well below the percentage in London, and lower than in Manchester and Leeds, being significantly lower than in some parts of the Pale of Settlement in Eastern Europe - the situation the immigrants had been used to - and never reaching such high percentages as in Amsterdam (almost ten per cent during the 1920s and 1930s) or New York (almost thirty per cent in 1920; in Brooklyn Jews even formed more than forty per cent of the total population in 1940)⁶⁴. In the Gorbals the percentage of Jews was higher than in other neighbourhoods in Glasgow as a result of the high number of Jewish immigrants who settled there, but similar concentrations had occurred in the other cities mentioned above.

In the eyes of the correspondent of Der Poylisher Yidl, a Yiddish paper which was published in London, the Jews in Glasgow of the mid-1880s appeared to be an isolated group compared to Jews in English towns. They seemed to lack central Jewish facilities and special provisions, but were quite well off and making a respectable living. In general Glasgow Jews were reportedly ignorant: "They do not know what is taking place elsewhere in the world, they have no idea what is happening to other Jews."⁶⁵ This idea might reflect an immigrant attitude towards the older settlers. But how did the older Jewish settlers in Glasgow react to the arrival of growing numbers of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe and did their reaction differ from the reaction of the older settlers in England?

This aspect of Anglo-Jewish history is well documented, in particular for cities like London and Manchester. According to Lipman⁶⁶, reactions in England in general varied from favourable to very negative. The arrival of the newcomers was felt as a threat by part of the establishment of the older group who feared that the presence of a large Jewish immigrant population might stimulate anti-Jewish feelings and therefore endanger their social position.

On local level different developments took place. Finestein and Gartner⁶⁷ find that

⁶⁴ Encyclopedia Judaica, II, pp. 895-905; VII, pp. 602-603; X, pp. 1560-1561; XI, pp. 858-860; XII, pp. 1062-1124; compare The Jewish Year Book, 1939, London, 1939. In 1939 it was estimated that there were about 67,000 Jews in Amsterdam and 1,765, 000 in New York.

⁶⁵ Der Poylisher Yidl, number 10, 26/9/1884.

⁶⁶ V.D. Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858, pp. 74-76, 89-112.

⁶⁷ I. Finestein, "Jewish Immigration in British Party Politics in the 1890s", in A. Newman (ed.), Migration and Settlement. Proceedings of the Anglo-American Jewish Historical Conference, London, 1971, pp. 128-144, p. 129; L. Gartner, "North Atlantic Jewry", in Newman, Migration and Settlement, pp. 118-127, p. 121.

leaders of the older group in London tried to move the immigrants to other British cities, to the USA or send them back to the European Continent. Their success in this was limited. Alternatively, the older settlers tried to stimulate the immigrants to adapt to English culture. Attempts to spread the immigrants over Britain and to acculturate them led to conflicts. Williams⁶⁸ describes how in Manchester these conflicts were fought along class, religious and cultural divisions. He points out that the presence of a population of older settlers also had a cushioning effect on the settlement of the immigrants in that city.

In Glasgow the older settlers supplied the immigrants with financial support in the form of charity when this was felt to be needed. Sometimes in association with general agencies, relief was provided for those who had decided to stay on in Glasgow, but if the immigrants were not able to make their own living shortly after arrival, they were urged or forced to move on. During the 1860s the care for destitute Jews became a heavy burden on the congregational funds (a Philanthropic Society had been founded before 1858⁶⁹, but occasional congregational relief continued, even after congregational charity had officially amalgamated with this society seventeen years later; both organisations initially drew their funds from the same sources - the more well-to-do Jews and their non-Jewish friends). The congregation, for example, had to bear the expenses of the burial of stillborn children when parents were unable to pay⁷⁰. The older settlers came to the rescue of stranded traders. One such case concerned John Lewis, who was repeatedly assisted in making a living. In 1877 his taxes had to be paid too, because he was "in prison (and) in order to prevent his wife and family being left in distress". In the end Lewis was sent away, possibly to Manchester⁷¹. In August 1881 an orphaned "poor Polish boy" without friends and relations in Glasgow was put on a ship to New York where his brother lived⁷². Others were returned to England or the Continent. Louis Goldman, for example, had tried his hand selling pictures with financial assistance from the congregation, but he was unsuccessful and received a further 5 shillings to take his family to Newcastle. In a similar case one month later, Israel Paston was given a ticket to Hamburg for himself, his wife and son: "(...) he tried to travel with pictures(,) but after hawking about for a week" he had earned nothing⁷³.

In this charity work the congregational establishment, like their non-Jewish

⁶⁸ B. Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740-1875, pp. 327-333.

⁶⁹ SJAC, MBGHC 3/10/1858.

⁷⁰ SJAC, MBGHC 5/12/1860, 16/4/1865.

⁷¹ SJAC, MBGHPHs 7/6/1868, November 1870, 25/2/1877, 31/3/1878.

⁷² SJAC, MBGHPHs 21/8/1881. The Philanthropic Society paid one guinea towards his fares, the general Foreign Relief Society contributed 25 shillings.

⁷³ SJAC, MBGHPHs 18/9/1881.

Victorian contemporaries, made a distinction between “deserving poor” and other cases of people who were investigated and found fraudulent or who were regarded as being poor as a result of their own negligence or unwillingness to work⁷⁴. Visits to the poor were made to ensure that the money was well spent, and to show recipients a proper and respectable way of life. An example of this is provided by the case of Abraham Landinsky, during which the following was recorded: “It having come to the knowledge of the committee that Landinsky’s daughter has misappropriated money given (...) for the father, it was resolved that no money be given to children in the future” - in the end the girl was sent to an orphanage in London, while the committee considered whether to send away the father too, because neither of them could be made to behave properly⁷⁵. These, in general, well-meant efforts were obviously also made because it was felt that Jewish poor and improper behaviour would influence the non-Jewish attitude towards Jews in general. In addition to the institutions of the establishment, immigrants also found relief organisations. In 1897, for example, they formed a Society for Providing Strangers with Food and Lodgings⁷⁶.

As a result of such efforts, a relatively low number of poor Jews applied for relief at the local parishes and only few ended up in the local poorhouse. In January 1885, for example, when there was a trade depression in Glasgow, there was only one Jew among almost two hundred applicants for poor relief in the Parish of Govan, which at that time included the Gorbals area where many poor Jews lived. Later there was a slight increase in the number of Jewish applicants for parish relief, but the number of Jews was never more than a handful each month and was insignificant when compared to the number of non-Jewish applicants. Jewish organisations took care of their own poor. In 1898 the parish authorities even went as far as to inform the Jewish congregation that a Jew had applied for parish relief, so that the congregation could take this man off their hands⁷⁷.

For a while, the establishment tried to keep all Jews in the area under its

⁷⁴ SJAC, MBGHC 30/6/1874.

⁷⁵ SJAC, MBGHPhS 1881.

⁷⁶ JC 7/5/1897.

⁷⁷ SRA, D-HEW, Applications for relief, 10/3/1897 (entry 2/1/1898); see also SRA, D-HEW, Applications for relief, Parish of Govan Combination, 17/277, 17/278, 17/283, 17/284, 17/544, 17/545. The following sample of relief applications during years when the economy in Glasgow was in depression shows how relatively few Jews relied on parish relief. In January 1885 there were 182 applications (some of which by people who applied more than once). Only one came from a Jew. This was an immigrant tailor who was unable to earn more than 4 pence a day (said to be a “useless fellow”). In January 1905, when the total number of applications was double the size of the number in January 1885, there were 5 applications from Jews. This concerned a disabled and widowed hawker, his son who suffered from an eye disease and required glasses, another hawker who wished to return to Russia, a rag merchant suffering from bronchitis, and a deserted wife with three children. Of these five applicants only one was sent to Merryflats poorhouse. Examination of other periods shows that Jewish names on average do not appear more than five times per month in these records.

jurisdiction and directed some measures at the immigrants, trying to exercise some control over them⁷⁸. Such measures involved regulations on the provision of kosher meat in 1881. The Jews in the city were more or less forced to rent a seat in the synagogue, in order to obtain kosher meat. It was decided that people were to pay according to their circumstances (26 shillings to £15 per year for the rent of a seat which would enable them to buy meat) and the poor were to receive free tickets with which they could get meat.

If these measures were not taken in order to increase the income of the congregation, enabling it to provide services, the measures were directed at persons who had not joined the congregation, possibly to give the leadership more control over them and to induce them to come to the synagogue. There seems to be no parallel to the development in the Presbyterian churches in Glasgow earlier in the 19th century where the raising of seat or pew-rent had in effect deprived low-income groups of access to divine worship⁷⁹. This way an uneasy relation between the older Jewish settlers and the Eastern European immigrants was established. Not all immigrants stayed outside the congregation. Among the new arrivals there was a number of men with experience and some capital⁸⁰, who started businesses and some of them established themselves successfully in tailoring and retail. Such workshop owners and shopkeepers rented seats in the synagogue and this group would eventually provide the establishment of older settlers with a leadership challenge.

In 1869 a first group of seatholders, protesting at their lack of influence in congregational matters, rebelled and temporarily separated themselves from the congregation. In order to maintain unity the establishment accepted a compromise solution, involving the future letting of seats and employment of a second butcher for the poor. Some of the rebels were allowed in the higher echelons of the congregation without changing its hierarchical structure⁸¹. As the number of newcomers grew during the 1870s and early 1880s, this settlement succumbed under their pressure.

Some groups of immigrants started prayer meetings and synagogue services in private homes and rented halls, often organising themselves along lines of shared occupations and regions of origin, like a tailors' minyan (a prayer meeting or the

⁷⁸ SJAC, MBGHC 3/3/1881, see also 24/4/1881, 19/6/1881.

⁷⁹ C. G. Brown, "The Costs of Pew-renting: Church Management, Church-going and Social Class in Nineteenth-century Glasgow", in The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XXXVIII, number 3 (July 1987), pp. 347-361, p. 361. In the Protestant churches, according to Brown, pew-renting had led to social exclusivity. In the Glasgow synagogue, higher seat rents indicated a higher social status: like in the churches, only those who could pay high rents had proven their worldly success, but poor Jews appear not to have been excluded from the services.

⁸⁰ Royal Commission on Alien Immigration. Reports from Commissioners, Inspectors, and others: Alien Immigration, Cd1742-1743, 27 volumes, 1903-1904 (cited hereafter as Royal Commission 1903), II, Evidence, question 20854; Newman, "A Short History of Garnethill", p. 58.

⁸¹ SJAC, MBGHC 29/1/1870, 7/2/1870, September 1870.

quorum of 10 adult men which is required for communal prayer) and the Odessa minyan. Such groups usually failed to secure a sound financial basis⁸² and they turned to the congregation for help. While this gave the older settlers influence over the immigrants, it also provided their opposition among the immigrant workshop owners with a weapon in their quest for a greater say in congregational matters, because they could threaten to leave the congregation and join an immigrant minyan. In 1879 a group of immigrant entrepreneurs, led by master tailor Julius Pinto, demanded a change in the congregation's constitution. After some hesitation their request was partly granted during the following year - the constitution was amended, fees reduced and some immigrants, like Pinto, were offered a position in the congregational leadership. The new constitution, however, contained a rule stipulating that persons who discredited the congregation could be deprived of their rights which could be used against unruly elements⁸³. On the whole this result also reflected a willingness on the part of the establishment of older settlers to allow socially acceptable newcomers entrance to the higher structure of the congregation.

During the following years, 1883 and 1884, other groups of "seceding seatholders worshipping on the South Side" followed Pinto's example⁸⁴, and they were allowed to establish an official place of worship and an additional Hebrew class on the South Side on the condition that their institutions remained under the patronage of the congregation. In 1885 the Standard Halls in Gorbals' Main Street was hired and used as a synagogue⁸⁵. During the official amalgamation of the congregation and the immigrant prayer groups in 1886, Pinto became Senior Warden of the South Side synagogue, but the leadership of the whole remained firmly in the hands of the older settlers⁸⁶.

The ending of the domination by the older settlers, however, was only a matter of time and the next decades saw further conflicts, resulting in an uneasy truce in 1898 which lasted 8 years. On the eve of the First World War the establishment finally gave way, the families of older settlers being completely overwhelmed by newcomers, and a new communal leadership was welded in the years after the war.

The conflicts between older settlers and new immigrants reflected social tensions between a middle class establishment and immigrant workers, with a contingent of immigrant entrepreneurs with their own social aspirations serving as a middle group. The struggle between older settlers and immigrants can be seen as a class conflict with strong cultural and religious aspects or as a cultural and religious conflict with "class struggle" aspects, in which an elite attempted to control the immigrant poor by

⁸² Newman, "A Short History of Garnethill", p. 58.

⁸³ SJAC, MBGHC 27/4/1879, 28/12/1879, 11/4/1880, 14/6/1880, 10/10/1880.

⁸⁴ SJAC, MBGHC 25/6/1883, 2/7/1883, 17/7/1883, 21/12/1884, 18/1/1885.

⁸⁵ SJAC, MBGHC 15/11/1885.

⁸⁶ SJAC, MBGHC 19/9/1886.

promoting assimilation to their bourgeois standards. Charity was used to this end and the establishment gave financial help to the South Side congregations with the proviso that they conformed to the ways of the older settlers⁸⁷.

Beside social differences, the cultural and religious sentiments which influenced the conflict involved a diverse set of problems. The new immigrant middle class of workshop owners and shopkeepers was trying to establish a leading role in the Jewish population and gain social acceptance in the wider society, while for a long period maintaining religious values they had known in Eastern Europe and looking down on the attitudes of the Jews in their new country. In The Jewish Voice, a Yiddish paper published in Glasgow by the printer Zevi Golombok in 1921, a “Dreamer of the Ghetto” described what was in his eyes a perfect Jewish community. In his vision an Eastern European rabbi and chazan (Reader) conducted the synagogue service. People were involved in studying Jewish law. Instead of desecrating the sabbath and standing smoking on street corners, men went to a National (Zionist) Institute for lessons in Jewish history and literature. A Talmud Torah school, where children received Hebrew education, was housed in a large central building. The Board of Guardians looked after the poor and the Jewish population of the city was a united body⁸⁸. Such sentiments still looked to the past of Eastern Europe for inspiration. The more assimilated way of life and religious customs of the older settlers appeared un-Jewish in the eyes of many Eastern European immigrants, who nicknamed the synagogue at Garnethill “der englisher shul”⁸⁹.

Religious matters were further complicated by the possibility of competition between the congregations of both groups for members and clergymen. In 1877 the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation stipulated that a retiring clergyman would lose his allowance “should the reverend gentleman accept an office in any congregation opposed to the interests of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation”⁹⁰.

In 1885 the divisions led to the necessity of lots being drawn among the congregational leaders to decide who would preside at a South Side minyan of immigrants, and when one of the clergymen of Garnethill refused to officiate at the South Side, he received a letter ordering him to go or “the congregation will have to get

⁸⁷ During the 1880s, for example, the newly found immigrant congregation Chevra Kadisha received support from Garnethill, see Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 80-81. But when in November 1902 the independent “Workmen’s Synagogue” requested some congregational facilities, these were denied on the ground that “if they desired such advantages they should join an existing congregation”, see SJAC, Minute Book United Synagogue of Glasgow (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBUSG) 2/11/1902.

⁸⁸ The Jewish Voice, number 3, September 1921. During the interwar years such an attitude also reflected a growing conflict with young and more assimilated generations.

⁸⁹ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 51, 53, 89.

⁹⁰ SJAC, MBGHC 28/10/1877.

a minister who will do so"⁹¹. The Secretary of the congregation at that time did not even know the names of the men who were leading South Side services⁹².

The religious differences between older settlers and immigrants should, however, not be overestimated. Eastern European prayerbooks, for example, could still be used at Garnethill and despite everything, immigrants could worship at Garnethill and Garnethill members could participate in the South Side services which suggests that the differences were not so large as to force the groups of older settlers and immigrants to worship separately. The emphasis on differences may have been a result of later attempts by a new immigrant leadership in Glasgow Jewry to profile itself by means of differentiation. Looking back after almost half a century in 1937, Joseph Sachs, then one of the leaders of the immigrant establishment, commented that the leadership of the older settlers lacked backbone and remained lukewarm on matters which lay outside the scope of congregational affairs⁹³. His criticism was not quite correct. In 1882, 1891 and 1892, for example, the older leaders organised public meetings to protest against the persecution of the Jews in Russia and collected thousands of pounds to relieve refugees, although it may be added that they might have done so to prevent more refugees from coming to Britain.

Nevertheless, the 1886 amalgamation was in constant danger of breaking up. In 1897, one year after the constitution of the congregation had been amended to facilitate immigrant wishes⁹⁴, the South Siders petitioned the leadership for more independence in the management of their own affairs. At Garnethill, Michael Simons and Julius Pinto, who had become part of the establishment, moved that if this was to happen, South Siders would have to be charged for certain services, except the poor and "indigent" classes, thus creating a financial barrier to their independence. The motion was withdrawn, after opposition from President Julius Frankenburg, who said that this would cause a tendency to create class distinctions within the congregation⁹⁵, and during the next year some independence was granted. Both groups constituted the United Synagogue of Glasgow. Although the South Siders could manage their own affairs, the whole was still dominated by the establishment of older settlers.

At the same time, other immigrant groups formed their own organisations, like mutual aid societies, study and prayer groups, and they founded synagogues, which occasionally and with great difficulty co-operated with the United Synagogue. During the two decades before the First World War a whole network of different and often

⁹¹ SJAC, MBGHC 21/2/1885, 19/4/1885, 11/5/1885. Notably, the decision to send the letter was taken on the smallest possible majority.

⁹² SJAC, MBGHC 6/9/1885.

⁹³ Glasgow Jewish Year Book 1937-1938.

⁹⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 81.

⁹⁵ SJAC, MBG 19/12/1897.

short-lived organisations and institutions came into being. Problems arose when these groups had to deal with matters which touched all Jews in Glasgow and when they had to be represented to the outside non-Jewish world. As the immigrants lacked social standing and experience, the matter of representation was left to the older settlers and well into the 20th century these settlers would speak in public for all Jews in Glasgow⁹⁶. Between 1898 and 1906 the executive of the United Synagogue was in effect the representative body of Glasgow Jewry⁹⁷.

While the immigrants were prepared to leave representation in the hands of the establishment, they sought more internal independence. One recurring issue was the provision of kosher meat. In 1905 a deputation of South Siders, including Abraham Naftalin (an entrepreneur who had arrived in Glasgow during the 1880s) and Bernard Glasser (the son-in-law of a South Side rabbi) who had leading roles in several religious organisations, asked the United Synagogue to construct a Board of Shechita for the whole of Glasgow Jewry. Their scheme, motivated by religious as well as secular (the price of meat) demands, proposed representatives for this board to be elected at mass meetings, who would serve alongside representatives of the various synagogues. Shochetim had to be engaged and work under the supervision of an Eastern European rabbi. The surplus of the sales of kosher meat could be used for the burial of the poor and the finance of the newly founded Talmud Torah school. The board would meet alternatively at Garnethill and on the South Side, but public meetings were to take place in the Gorbals⁹⁸. No agreement could be reached on these proposals. The conflict about shechita and the case of a dismissed clergyman on the South Side led to the Garnethill establishment giving up their attempts to control the immigrants by means of the United Synagogue. On the initiative of Garnethill the organisation was disbanded in 1906⁹⁹.

At this stage the Garnethill congregation was plagued by financial difficulties resulting from a reduction in the number of seatholders¹⁰⁰ and the older settlers were not prepared to participate in an immigrant initiative to form a Communal Council, first launched at the dissolution of the United Synagogue in 1906 as the "Glasgow Hebrew Representative Council", which would look after shechita, engage an Eastern

⁹⁶ See for example JC 8/5/1903.

⁹⁷ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 84, 166. Before 1914 the local branch of the Anglo-Jewish Association, led by Garnethill member Adolph Schoenfeld, also spoke on behalf of Glasgow Jewry.

⁹⁸ SJAC, MBUSG 28/6/1905.

⁹⁹ SJAC, MBG May 1906.

¹⁰⁰ SJAC, MBG 10/3/1907.

European rabbi and represent all groups in other matters¹⁰¹. It would take another 6 years before such a council was founded. During the interim period groups went their different ways and only occasionally some co-operation was established. In 1907, for example, the older settlers formed a “Hebrew Boot, Clothing and Employment Assistance Guild (For Young People)” in aid of destitute immigrants, which quickly involved South Siders too. The Board of Guardians, which followed the former Philanthropic Society, was still very much a Garnethill organisation¹⁰².

How much religious and cultural differences influenced co-operation during this interim period is shown by the continuing shechita conflict¹⁰³. In 1910 a South Side rabbi issued an issur (prohibition) against a butcher’s shop in a dispute about regulations, causing Garnethill to write to the Chief Rabbi stating that this rabbi had no right to interfere with their shechita. At the same time, however, the Garnethill establishment began to find their social equals on the South Side. In the Spring of 1911 Garnethill tried to establish a joint shechita arrangement with Queen’s Park Synagogue, which had been founded by more well-to-do immigrants who had been able to move to the suburbs south of the Gorbals as a result of successful businesses and growing wealth. The venture ended in failure as Queen’s Park had already committed themselves.

The background for these attempts to create unity in Glasgow Jewry was formed by the fear for growing anti-Jewish feelings. Towards the end of the 19th century there was a rising resentment of immigrants or “aliens” as they were called in Britain as a whole. They were accused of taking away jobs and houses from British people by means of unfair competition on the labour and housing markets as they were allegedly prepared to undercut British wages and prices and to pay higher rent for housing accommodation. In addition, aliens were associated with political radicalism, such as anarchism, and crimes like theft, assault, fraud and gambling¹⁰⁴. With the large influx of Eastern European Jews in the 1890s the word “alien” was often used to mean Jewish immigrants and short before the First World War the adjective German was often associated with Jews, although anti-alien or anti-German agitation itself was strictly speaking not anti-Jewish¹⁰⁵. Anti-alien propagandists wanted the government

¹⁰¹ SJAC, MBG 25/10/1907, 8/12/1907, 15/12/1907, 5/1/1908, 31/1/1909; SJAC, MBUSG 10/6/1906. Garnethill was only prepared to contribute towards the costs of the burial of poor Jews and denied a suggestion in a letter from the Communal Council to the British Chief Rabbi that their congregation had joined the council.

¹⁰² Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 155-157.

¹⁰³ The conflict is described by Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 145-147; compare SJAC, MBG 19/10/1910, 30/10/1910, 16/11/1910, 2/3/1911, 26/3/1911, 23/4/1911, 5/10/1911.

¹⁰⁴ JC 19/5/1905; The Times 20/12/1910.

¹⁰⁵ Finstein, I., “Jewish Immigration in British Party Politics in the 1890s”, in A. Newman, Migration and Settlement, pp. 128-144; B. Gainer, The Alien Invasion. The Origins of the Aliens Act of 1905, London, 1972, 35-58; Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, pp. 67-87.

to restrict immigration into Britain in general. The Aliens Act of 1905 was largely meant to restrict the entry into Britain of the most destitute immigrants, those suffering from contagious diseases and criminals.

The protest meetings in Glasgow in 1891 and 1892 to protest against the persecution of the Jews in Russia were held with the idea that a large number of refugees might come to Scotland and during the whole period until the First World War there was a fear that Glasgow would be flooded with aliens. At the time the Aliens Act hardly seemed to stem the tide¹⁰⁶. In Glasgow complaints were voiced about Jews undercutting wages and prices, about Jewish tenants, and about Jewish involvement in political radicalism and crime. Alien or Jewish competition on the labour market in Glasgow, where they were accused of wage cutting and unfair retail competition, will be discussed in chapter 5, while Jewish involvement in politics will be the subject of chapter 6; the situation on the housing market and with crime will be discussed here.

There is little evidence of complaints about Jewish competition on the Glasgow housing market, but instead Jews gained a reputation for being bad tenants. In a 1901 report on some tenement property at Gorbals Cross and Main Street it was noted, for example, that "unfortunately the houses are largely occupied by Jews who make very bad tenants."¹⁰⁷ The Glasgow Municipal Commission on the Housing of the Poor in 1904 reported complaints about insanitary habits of Jewish tenants¹⁰⁸. The substance of such allegations is difficult to judge, but it seems that this reputation led to some house factors refusing to let property to Jews. Reports about such refusals reappeared in 1914, 1928 and 1934¹⁰⁹.

The association of aliens with crime was made in Glasgow¹¹⁰ and this may have played a role in the trial of Oscar Slater in 1909. His case has since become a cause célèbre

¹⁰⁶ See GH 3/4/1906, 14/5/1906, 24/2/1908, 27/2/1908, 28/2/1908, 2/3/1908, 13/3/1908 for examples. Compare Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 164-165. Collins reports a violent incident between Jews and non-Jews.

¹⁰⁷ Glasgow University Archives, 19750, Report by Mess.T. Binnie & Son on Mount Florida and Gorbals Properties, Glasgow 13/2/1901, p. 136.

¹⁰⁸ SRA, C3.2, Report and Recommendations Glasgow Municipal Commission on Housing of the Poor (1904), pp. 220, 232, 255, 352, 358, 547; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 108.

¹⁰⁹ JC 20/3/1914; JE 8/6/1928; Private collection, Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Representative Council (cited hereafter as MBGJRC) 29/11/1934; compare C. Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 1876-1939, London, 1979, p. 205. Holmes writes that the discrimination against Jews on the Glasgow housing market was brought to the attention of the Board of Deputies in London in 1933.

¹¹⁰ See for example JC 2/10/1903, 6/2/1903; 14/1/1916; The Bailie 3/2/1909; The Eagle 4/3/1909; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 109, 111, 189.

and is well documented¹¹¹. Slater was arrested on suspicion of having murdered an old woman in Glasgow's West End in December 1908 in order to steal her jewellery. The evidence which led to his arrest proved to be inaccurate, but as a result of the publicity surrounding his arrest a large number of witnesses came forward. They claimed to have seen him near the scene of the crime and testified about his character and past. Some of these witnesses said that Slater had been involved in prostitution and gambling, which led the judge to say in his summing up of the evidence that "(Slater) has maintained himself by the ruin of men and on the ruin of women, living for years past in a way that many blackguards would scorn to live."¹¹² Slater was convicted and sentenced to death; later his sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. To some people the verdict came as a surprise¹¹³ and they started a campaign for his release. Eventually an appeal court reviewed his case in 1928, returning a verdict of "Not proven".

Daily newspapers in Glasgow, such as the Glasgow Herald, the Glasgow Evening Citizen and the Daily Record and Mail, in their reports of the trial in 1909 did not mention that Slater was a Jew or an alien. The Glasgow Herald and the Glasgow Evening Citizen expressed some sympathy with the accused, while the Daily Record and Mail had little sympathy. It was, however, clear that Slater was from Germany¹¹⁴ and this qualified him as an alien. According to House, one newspaper commented the day after the verdict that the "trial has cast a lurid light in the dark places of our great cities, in which such wretches ply their calling. It shows a brood of alien vampires, lost to conscience and to shame, crawling in black depths at the basement of civilised society." House fails to mention the source of the comment¹¹⁵ but it is possible that he found this comment in a magazine like The Eagle or The Bailie which wrote, for example: "Now an alien breed has come in. Great Britain (...) opens her arms to the foreign scum (...) mole-ish blackguards are on the prowl in the community."¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ For the trial itself see Scottish Record Office, West Register House Edinburgh, AD 21 volumes 5 & 6, Trial of Oscar Slater. Report of Proceedings; W. Roughhead (ed.), Trial of Oscar Slater, Edinburgh/London, 1910. For popular comments on the case see A. Conan Doyle, The Case of Oscar Slater, London, 1912; J. House, Square Mile of Murder, Glasgow, 1984 (revised edition); P. Hunt, Oscar Slater. The Great Suspect, London, 1951; F. Kuppner, A Very Quiet Street, Edinburgh, 1989; W. Park, The Truth about Oscar Slater, London, not dated (1927); T. Ramsay, Stranger in the Hall, Ramshorn, 1988. For recent reports on the case see Glasgow Evening News 25/9/1964; GH 22/12/1990, 20/7/1991; Scottish Field June 1987. Slater's real name was probably Oscar Leschziner.

¹¹² Scottish Record Office, West Register House Edinburgh, AD 21; compare Roughhead, Trial of Oscar Slater, p. 285.

¹¹³ GH 7/5/1909.

¹¹⁴ See for example GH 6/5/1909; compare Roughhead, Trial of Oscar Slater, p. XIV. See also The Times 21/7/1928 which on the occasion of the appeal did not mention that Slater was a foreigner, German, Jew or alien.

¹¹⁵ Jack House, A Square Mile of Murder, p. 214. None of the papers mentioned above carried this comment.

¹¹⁶ The Bailie 12/5/1909; compare The Eagle 13/5/1909.

Such press comments caused great anxiety in the Jewish establishment which tried to distance itself from the Slater-case. When the Rev. E.P. Phillips joined the campaign for the prisoner's release, he was reprimanded by the Garnethill leadership, although the minister was not publicly warned¹¹⁷ as this would have attracted unwanted attention.

The fear for anti-alien feelings as shown in the Slater-case eventually helped to unite Glasgow Jewry, but this unity, in 1914 embodied in the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, was also a result of changes at Garnethill. In September 1913 the Rev. E.P. Phillips of Garnethill reported to have attended a meeting of the organisers of a public protest meeting in Glasgow against a ritual murder case in Russia (the Beilis trial) and said that these organisers subsequently wanted to form a representative body in which all participating Jewish groups would co-operate further. In December the Garnethill congregation decided to send representatives to a follow-up meeting and when the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council was formed in February 1914, two Garnethill members were among the council's five Vice-Presidents¹¹⁸.

The positive attitude at Garnethill towards this Council shows their growing respect for immigrant middle-class leaders, like those in Queen's Park, and a willingness to co-operate with these men. In the Garnethill congregation things had changed. The financial problems had been solved and the number of seatholders had increased. The rise in the number of seatholders may have been due to South Siders moving up the social ladder, moving to the West End and joining the Garnethill congregation¹¹⁹, or may be attributed to the settlement of new immigrants in the West End after 1911¹²⁰, but in any case immigrants were gaining a greater say at Garnethill.

Personal sentiments, however, could still stand in the way of Jewish unity in Glasgow. Joseph Hallside, a tailor and Treasurer of the Glasgow Hebrew Public Burial Society, which was at the time the largest Jewish organisation in the city¹²¹, had led the organisation of the Beilis meeting (the organisers met in the Tailors' Union Hall on the South Side) in the absence of Michael Simons. Subsequently Hallside became President of the Representative Council and not Simons, the champion of the older settlers¹²². Probably because of this, the Board of Guardians and the Literary Society, both

¹¹⁷ SJAC, MBG 16/5/1909; compare JE 2/3/1928, 17/8/1928, 24/8/1928, 2/11/1928, 25/7/1930.

¹¹⁸ JC 19/12/1913, 30/1/1914, 27/2/1914; SJAC, MBG 10/9/1913, 26/10/1913, 11/1/1914, 22/2/1914.

¹¹⁹ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 84.

¹²⁰ Scottish Record Office Edinburgh, Glasgow Valuation Rolls 1911. An examination of the Glasgow returns shows that many persons who held seats in the Garnethill synagogue after 1918 were not registered on the Valuation Rolls which suggests they might not yet have settled in Glasgow in 1911.

¹²¹ SJAC, Financial Statement Glasgow Hebrew Public Burial Society 1912-1913. The society had 993 members, mostly on the South Side, the old city centre and in the East End.

¹²² Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 168-170, 179, 182; JC 24/4/1914.

presided over by Simons, did not join the council at this stage.

During meetings on the outbreak of the war in 1914 the groups came closer together, but a year later the Garnethill congregation accused the Representative Council of a lack of effort to help Jewish refugees from Belgium. Garnethill also opposed the appointment of an Eastern European rabbi to supervise shechita and in general still emphasised the council's limitations¹²³. Some accommodation took place in 1916, but it was not until 1919 that the leadership struggle was resolved, when Simons was awarded the ceremonial role of Honorary President¹²⁴.

The original five Vice-Presidents were the Rev. Isaac Levine and J. Fox, both from Garnethill, Maurice Olsberg, A.I. Sutherland, two immigrant businessmen, and Ellis Isaacs. The last one was a son of Emanuel Isaacs, who had a small jewellery and antique shop in the High Street¹²⁵. Isaacs could play an intermediate role between older settlers and immigrants, because his family had been settled in Glasgow for a relatively long period and he participated very actively in many organisations. Alec Easterman, a Garnethill member whose parents lived on the South Side, and other graduates from Glasgow University also filled important positions on the Council.

According to its first constitution, the Council was established to speak for some thirty Jewish organisations in Glasgow "in all (...) relations with the general public". The draft for this constitution had been sent to these organisations in January 1914 with a letter proposing this body "to deal with any question, local or otherwise, not capable of being dealt with by any one individual organisation, which may arise immediately affecting its welfare"¹²⁶.

The first reported Council business with the general public concerned examinations for bursary competitions, which took place on Saturdays and could therefore not be attended by Jewish students. Arrangements were made whereby Jewish candidates could sit a special exam. There were also the remarks of a Protestant clergyman on the Jewish method of slaughtering, made in Glasgow Cathedral, followed by an article on this subject in a Glasgow periodical, but this was not officially pursued, although Isaacs spoke to the clergyman, and the matter was finally dropped as nothing further was published on the subject. More problems were caused by "the widespread refusal of house factors to let houses to Jews in certain quarters of the city" which proved

¹²³ SJAC, MBG 31/1/1915, 28/6/1915, 10/8/1916.

¹²⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 176, 208.

¹²⁵ SJAC, 50th Anniversary Brochure Glasgow Jewish Representative Council. Joseph Sachs, a businessman from the Gorbals, also played an important role in the Council although it is not clear from when.

¹²⁶ JC 27/2/1914; SJAC, correspondence and constitution Glasgow Jewish Representative Council.

very hard to tackle¹²⁷.

The outbreak of the war created a new situation. Many immigrants were not naturalised and some were among the German and Austrian subjects who were interned as prisoners of war. The Council took up their case and wrote to other Jewish communities in Britain and to the Board of Deputies in London, suggesting to send a delegation to the Home Office to plead on behalf of the interned. This proposal fell on deaf ears in England, although it appeared that some prisoners had been released there by local Chief Constables and the Council decided to approach the Chief Constable in Glasgow and the Lord Advocate for Scotland who referred them to the Secretary for Scotland. Easterman seems to have corresponded at length with Dr. Dundas White MP, the parliamentary secretary to the Secretary for Scotland (Dundas White had been elected for Parliament in 1911 representing the Tradeston division of Glasgow, which was situated next to the Gorbals). The Jewish Chronicle at the time¹²⁸ gives the impression that the Council had to make an enormous effort to get their case across. Whether this impression is correct is unclear, but this is not so important here; the significance of this episode lies in the difficulties which were said to have been encountered and the status which the Council gave itself through its efforts and the Jewish Chronicle reports. According to these reports, it was agreed after some lengthy correspondence that the Jewish representatives would meet the "Scottish Secretary" during one of his visits to Glasgow to discuss the matter. Unfortunately, it was reported that he left the city sooner than expected and the meeting had to be cancelled. On a further suggestion of the Lord Advocate, a deputation followed the Secretary for Scotland to London. There they were said¹²⁹ to have been received by the Chief Under-Secretary for Scotland after the Secretary for Scotland had refused to meet the delegation. The Chief Under-Secretary pointed out practical difficulties and explained that the situation in Scotland was more complicated than in England, but promised that the Scottish Office would give immediate consideration to the matter. The delegation left him with a list of names, probably of 125 prisoners in Wakefield. The Council also decided to lobby Jewish and Scottish MPs. Two months later the Council reported the receipt of a letter from the Scottish Office saying that the War Office had ordered the release of the Wakefield prisoners and to seek the council's assistance in other cases. It remains uncertain what finally decided the fate of the internees, but apparently the

¹²⁷ JC 20/3/1914, 27/3/1914, 24/4/1914, 20/5/1914, 27/5/1914. The bursaries competition reportedly concerned the bursaries of the "City and General Endowments Board" which was also called "Glasgow City Educational Endowments Board". The Protestant minister was said to be the Rev. Sherwood Gunson.

¹²⁸ JC 18/12/1914; the case was regularly reported from December 1914 to July 1915.

¹²⁹ JC 22/1/1915. The Secretary for Scotland was T. McKinnon Wood MP, the Chief Under-Secretary was mentioned as Sir James M. Dodds, and the Lord Advocate for Scotland was mentioned as Robert Munro KC MP.

Council's intervention stimulated the process of their release. The Jewish Chronicle complimented Glasgow: "Thanks to the efforts of the Council, the whole of Jewish 'enemy aliens' for whom it vouched have been exempted from repatriation and internment." By that time, July 1915, there seem to have been only two men still imprisoned, but they were said to have refused the council's assistance¹³⁰.

The outbreak of war had different effects on older settlers and immigrants. The Garnethill congregation became quickly involved in the war effort when in September 1914 they were asked to nominate 12 persons for the Lord Provost's Distress Committee, and their sons volunteered for the army - Reuben Strump became a cadet at the Indian Military College and Ellis Heilbron got to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, both were sons of leading families in the congregation. In 1916 the first casualty was reported, when Private Mike Freeman was killed in action. More deaths among their members would follow¹³¹.

For Jews from Russia this was not really their war. They were often not British subjects and to go to war to support the Czar and a country which they had recently left during pogroms and persecution, was obviously asking for too much. And what about the Jews in the opposing armies? In 1916 at the opening of the Jewish National Institute in Glasgow the guest speaker said that Jews "were fighting not only their enemies but (also) their own kinsmen."¹³² Despite such feelings, British Jewry made some attempts to obtain the voluntary enlistment of Eastern European immigrants. The Jewish War Services Commission in London, for example, asked Garnethill to assist such an effort by distributing posters¹³³, but little is known about the effects of this propaganda.

For the time being, unnaturalised immigrants from Russia were left untouched, although they had to register as aliens at local police offices. When they were asked to provide information about their place of birth in Russia, the Representative Council started to issue certificates, which after some deliberation were accepted by the Scottish Office. In 1917 a commission was reportedly set up to re-investigate their position and once again the Council was said to have intervened.

In 1917 Russian subjects in Britain became liable for compulsory military service. Although eventually they were only to be placed in labour units and auxiliary services, a significant number of immigrants tried to evade the draft. Out of a total of 1350 applications for exemption in Glasgow during the autumn of 1917 and the winter

¹³⁰ JC 19/3/1915, 23/7/1915.

¹³¹ SJAC, MBG 13/9/1914, 10/8/1916, 21/1/1917.

¹³² Quoted in Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 201.

¹³³ SJAC, MBG 25/6/1916.

of 1918, 293 were from Russian Jews, of which 2 out of 3 lived in the Gorbals¹³⁴. These cases were dealt with by a Local Tribunal and in August 1917 Louis Wainstein, Secretary of the Representative Council, wrote to Dundas White asking him whether provisions would be made to appoint representatives of the Jewish community on this Tribunal. Wainstein was advised to direct himself to the Town Clerk of Glasgow and learned that a special committee of the Tribunal would be formed to deal with the "Russian" applications and that two "persons of the Jewish faith" were to be appointed onto that committee¹³⁵. Within days Michael Simons and Ellis Isaacs were appointed on the recommendation of the Council. When a couple of weeks later Simons was transferred to an appeal body, his place was taken by furniture-maker and Garnethill member Benjamin Strump¹³⁶. Abraham Naftalin was employed by the Tribunal as an interpreter. Exemption was granted when the applicant had an occupation vital to the national interest, for example, in the arms industry, or when military service would create extreme financial or business hardship. It appears from the records that most cases involving Jews were refused.

During the war Jewish soldiers, sailors, cadets and Special Constables (auxiliary police) were entertained in Glasgow, and on such an occasion on 24th September 1917 they marched from the St. Andrews Halls to South Portland Street synagogue to pose for a photograph¹³⁷. Such events, organised by the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, were obviously meant to show that Jews had taken up the call to join His Majesty's Army. They show the ambition of gaining respectability but were also the expression of pride about being part of a large war effort. The war had also given the immigrant leaders more status and in general brought all Jewish groups in Glasgow Jewry closer together. The immediate after-war years can be seen as a watershed in the permanent settlement of a Jewish community which by now consisted mainly of Jews from

¹³⁴ SRA, Correspondence Town Clerk Depute, D-TC 19 box 2; compare S. Kadish, Bolsheviks and British Jews. The Anglo-Jewish Community, Britain and the Russian Revolution, London, 1992, pp. 209-210, 228. Kadish mentions that Jews in Glasgow with the Russian nationality who were called up for compulsory military duty were offered the choice of service in the British army or repatriation. Unfortunately, this publication came too late to be fully discussed here. Kadish presents some material which suggests that in Glasgow some 500 Russians chose to return (they were probably mostly Jews, in Lanarkshire between 900 and 1000 Lithuanians, mostly non-Jewish, were reported to have chosen to return). This does not necessarily imply that they were returned to Russia. It is unknown how many actually went. The Town Clerk papers suggest that many immigrants in Glasgow applied for exemption from military service and that their cases were dealt with by a local tribunal but not that Russian Jews were repatriated from Glasgow. Kadish work concentrates on England and it is possible that the English development differed from Scotland.

¹³⁵ SRA, Correspondence Town Clerk Depute, D-TC 19 box 2. The Glasgow Military Representative disagreed with this decision.

¹³⁶ SRA, Correspondence Town Clerk Depute, D-TC 19 box 2, letter Town Clerk 19/9/1917. Maurice Olsberg, originally suggested by the Council, was unacceptable "himself being liable for military service".

¹³⁷ SJAC, leaflet and photograph of soldiers in front of South Portland Street synagogue.

Eastern Europe and their descendants, and during the period between 1918 and 1939 an effective communal leadership was welded.

During the war transmigration virtually stopped, but it was not long after armistice before people started to leave Glasgow again and this time the Council helped with the provision of travel documents. On the other hand, for people who decided to stay, the council was involved in the applications for naturalisation from, for example, the ex-servicemen and Special Constables. The middle-class immigrant entrepreneurs who had been able to enlarge their firms during the war and its aftermath, pushed for more unity within Glasgow Jewry. Already in 1916 a united Board of Shechita was formed at a public meeting, presided by Daniel Rosenbloom, a lay leader of a synagogue who was to establish a large whisky business under the name of Campbell. Other South Side synagogues were actively involved too, "calling" for an Eastern European rabbi when the board would be in full working order¹³⁸. This was followed by attempt to form a Beth Din which would supervise all rabbis in the city. The new communal leaders lived in the fashionable suburbs in the south of the city, like Pollokshields and Langside. The rabbi of Queen's Park synagogue, for example, would later look back and write that "an unusually large proportion of the present lay-leaders and able workers in the religious, national (Zionist) and charitable organisations of the Glasgow Community served their apprenticeship in the Queen's Park Congregation."¹³⁹ They shared their position with Garnethill lay leaders of immigrant origin, who bridged the gap that had separated them from the immigrant groups on the South Side. Ben Strump, for example, a prominent member of Garnethill, became chairman of the Board of Shechita long before his congregation actually joined the Board¹⁴⁰. The Rev. E.P. Phillips and his later successor Dr. I.K. Cosgrove of Garnethill also played an important role in communal matters.

These developments were a result of the social mobility of the immigrants in Scottish society. This mobility can be followed by looking at the place of residence in the city. Early in the 20th century Jewish residents started to move into the southern suburbs when the first immigrants left the Gorbals and other neighbourhoods near Clyde and went to Govanhill, Battlefield, Queen's Park, Langside and Pollokshields. Some went to Kelvinside. The Jewish immigrants followed the general population. The Census of 1911¹⁴¹ shows a net loss of the total population of the City of Glasgow as a

¹³⁸ JC 13/10/1916; compare JE 2/9/1938. The full working order stage with all synagogues involved would not be reached until the 1930s. Rosenbloom became an important communal leader. Later he represented his synagogue in the Board of Deputies of British Jews in London. See also chapter 2.

¹³⁹ Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Jubilee Brochure (1956) pp. 2, 10-11.

¹⁴⁰ This took place in the 1930s, see SJAC, MBG 29/1/1932, 29/1/1934, 9/2/1936, 15/3/1936.

¹⁴¹ Census of Scotland 1911, London, 1912, 3 volumes, I, pp. 42-43; compare J. Cunnison, J.B.S. Gilfillan (ed.), The Third Statistical Account of Scotland. Glasgow, Glasgow, 1958, pp. 63-64. There was also growth in such areas as Dennistoun and Maryhill, where relatively few Jews lived.

result of emigration and movement to the suburbs with a decline in the population of the Gorbals (-6.7%) and growth in Kelvinside (+25.8%), Govanhill (+10.9%), Pollokshields (+11.8%) and Langside (+53%). Table 1.2 (see appendix) shows the residence of a sample of the Jewish population in Glasgow according to the Valuation Rolls of 1881 and 1911. The figures in table 1.2 are arrived at as follows. A list of 800 Jewish family names, compiled from available Jewish communal records in 1911-1912¹⁴², can be compared with the names on the Valuation Rolls of 1881 and 1911. This shows 98 Jewish families in 1881, divided over 12 neighbourhoods, and 473 in 1911, divided over 24 neighbourhoods. This concerns only a sample of the Jewish population because a limited number of communal records are available for these years. The figures remain therefore very impressionistic, but they do provide an indication of the movement of the Jewish population in Glasgow in the period 1881-1911. When the results for 1881 and 1911 are compared it appears that in 1911 Jews lived in more neighbourhoods, which was a result of Glasgow's expansion. But although they lived in more neighbourhoods, Jews were still concentrated in some parts of the city. None lived in the northern part of the city and only a few in areas like Cowcaddens and Maryhill. In 1881 the Jewish population was concentrated in the Gorbals, Blackfriars and Blythswood and Sandyford, showing the division between the poorer element on the South Side and in the old city centre and the better-off group in the western part of the city. In 1911, most Jews in Glasgow lived in Hutchesontown and Gorbals, Govanhill and Langside, Park/Woodside and Kelvinside, Blackfriars, and Calton. It appears that the better-off group from 1881 had moved further west by 1911 into Park/Woodside and Kelvinside. Although there existed large social differences within every Glasgow neighbourhood, Park/Woodside and Kelvinside can be regarded as areas where the more well-to-do middle classes lived¹⁴³. The growth of the Jewish population in the poorer areas in the old city centre and the East End was relatively small, except for Calton where a lot of immigrants had settled. The largest share of the immigrants, however, had settled in Hutchesontown and the Gorbals, with a relatively low number in Kingston. The figures for Govanhill and Langside show how by 1911 Jews were already moving into the southern suburbs. Govanhill was at the time mainly a working class residential neighbourhood but cannot be regarded as a poor area, while Langside was middle class in character and Pollokshields mainly housed the rich. During the 1920s and 1930s the movement of Jews into the southern

¹⁴² SJAC, Communal Record Garnethill (1911); SJAC, Financial Statement Glasgow Hebrew Public Burial Society 1912-1913.

¹⁴³ Compare Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 797. This middle class status is reflected, for example, by the birth rate in these neighbourhoods which shows that many smaller families lived here. Poor people mostly had larger families. The birth rate in Kelvinside in 1910 was 10.4 per 1,000, compared to 38.4 per 1,000 in Hutchesontown in the same year.

suburbs continued, although a large working class group remained in the Gorbals¹⁴⁴.

When the first Jews left the Clyde for Battlefield or Queen's Park and Langside, their settlement resulted in the opening of new synagogues in these neighbourhoods. The existence of Jewish institutions attracted others, but some went further south to suburbs like Netherlee and Newlands and Giffnock where no synagogue existed. They formed small congregations, for the time being without a communal place of worship. In 1936 this situation was a reason for a discussion in the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council about the possible establishment of synagogues in these neighbourhoods. It was said that about 160 Jewish families lived in the Giffnock area and about 200 in Netherlee¹⁴⁵. This means that by 1936 about a thousand Jews - possibly just under one tenth of the total Jewish population - already lived in the better-off middle class suburbs. In addition, new congregations were established in superior working class areas like Crosshill and Mosspark, Cardonald and Hillington.

During the 1930s, the establishment of Glasgow Jewry no longer resided in the Gorbals. Out of a total of 86 delegates sent to the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council in June 1938 only six gave a Gorbals address¹⁴⁶. This concerned mostly representatives of working-class organisations, showing that their people still lived in the Gorbals. In December 1940 arrangements were made with the Corporation of Glasgow to create centres where the Jewish population could be provided with food. Three centres were created in the Jewish Institute, the Workers' Circle House and the Jewish ex-servicemen's club; all three situated in the Gorbals. In total 600 persons could be fed there at one sitting which may offer an indication of the size of the Jewish population there.

After the war Gorbals Jewry became a predominantly older part of the Jewish population. Vincent's findings on the distribution of Jewish schoolchildren in 1958 and the following years¹⁴⁷ show 36 children of school age in the Gorbals, a rapidly declining number during the following years. In the older South Side suburbs, like Battlefield, Queen's Park and Langside, there were 762 Jewish schoolchildren, a number which was slowly declining after 1958 and rapidly after 1963. There was stability and slow growth respectively in the middle and new southern suburbs, south

¹⁴⁴ SRA, DED 7/86/2, Admission Register Gorbals Public School; Vincent, "Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", in The Jewish Journal of Sociology, VI, number 2, Dec. 1964, pp. 220-231, p. 220. The admission register shows that out of a sample of 32 Jewish girls, 4 left the school and went to a school in southern suburbs.

¹⁴⁵ MBGJRC 16/2/1936. Many apparently lived in 'Jewish pockets'. It was said that thirty Jewish families lived in one Newlands' street.

¹⁴⁶ MBGJRC 28/6/1938; compare University of Sheffield Archives, Zaidman papers, folder f, Goldberg to Zaidman 20/12/1958. In 1958 the secretary of the Workers' Circle, a Jewish working class organisation, finally moved away from Crown Street in the Gorbals to the Arden housing scheme, where he immediately started a fight against a rent increase there. At the same time, he writes, he lost his job as a traveller.

¹⁴⁷ Vincent, "Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", p. 227.

from Victoria Road and Shawlands Cross out to Newton Mearns. In 1958, 443 Jewish schoolchildren lived there. In the West End, the northern suburbs like Bearsden, and the East End there were 27 Jewish schoolchildren (with a slow decline after 1958) and 78 lived elsewhere in the south west neighbourhoods and the northern city areas (which showed some decline). The Jews in the Gorbals and the older southern suburbs at that time formed an aging Jewish population.

There were several reasons why the Jews first settled in the Gorbals and then left the neighbourhood. It was an area of mainly working class accommodation¹⁴⁸ with streets like Abbotsford Place and Oxford Street also offering middle class housing accommodation. Good tenements had been erected at Gorbals Cross during the 1870s, when Glasgow's building expansion reached a high point, and some of the tenement flats were of superior quality, with improved sanitary facilities - a water closet on the half landing replacing the older dry closet or privy in the backyard. Working class housing accommodation comprised of room-kitchen and single end apartments (by 1911 two thirds of the population of Glasgow lived in 1 or 2-room apartments). These houses were situated not far from the city centre which was within walking distance or could be reached by public transport. Hospital Street and later Crown Street became the main north-south thoroughfares for traffic over the Clyde bridges into the city centre. Whereas the Gorbals contained both middle and working class tenements, Crosshill and Mount Florida were middle class, with more 2 and 3-room apartments. Govanhill had a working class character, although the neighbourhood was generally inhabited by skilled and relatively well paid workers.

The first immigrants to settle on the South Side were the Irish who moved into Hutchesontown during the 1840s, later newcomers also populated Laurieston/Kingston and the Gorbals. Another area in Glasgow where many immigrants settled was the neighbourhood around the Tron. There, between the Saltmarket and Stockwell Street, the poorest housing accommodation was situated. The population of the Gorbals actually declined between 1871 and 1881 and this, in addition to the new buildings, provided room for businesses and housing accommodation for the Jewish immigrants. Not only Irish and Jews came to the Gorbals. In Portugal Street, for example, there was from 1871 to 1884 a lodging house, where 437 persons could find a bed for the night. Such facilities attracted many travellers, including Germans and Italians, to the Gorbals¹⁴⁹.

Decline in the Gorbals and neighbouring Laurieston and Hutchesontown, started in the 20th century when landlords were unable or unwilling to maintain their property. By the 1940s parts of these neighbourhoods had been turned into squalid slums. As a

¹⁴⁸ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 62; Gibb, Glasgow: The Making of a City, London, 1983, pp. 95, 100, 107, 126.

¹⁴⁹ Worsdall, The Glasgow Tenement, pp. 8-10, 34, 38, 54, 102-104; Smout, A Century of the Scottish People, pp. 8, 32-41; Gibb, Glasgow: The Making of a City, 159-170.

result a quarter of its population left the tenements between 1931 and 1951. At this time the Gorbals gained its reputation, which can be illustrated by Arthur Bliss' ballet "Miracle in the Gorbals". This work, written during the first half of the 1940s is set against a gloomy Gorbals Street. There are drunks, razor gangs, prostitutes and a violin-playing beggar on the street. A miracle is performed when a Christ-like figure called "Stranger" resurrects a suicide, but he is met with hostility by an official, possibly a member of the clergy, who fears for the loss of his authority. The official tries to discredit "Stranger" by linking him with a prostitute. This fails and he has "Stranger" killed by a gang. In desperation and shame a beggar covers his face. By the time of the Second World War, the Gorbals was no longer a respectable neighbourhood.

The Jews from the Gorbals usually first moved to Govanhill and to Crosshill, Mount Florida and in the direction of Shawlands, and when possible from there further south. The fact that by the 1940s many Jews had already left the Gorbals for the southern suburbs was a sign of upward social mobility. People wished to better themselves and to move out of the Gorbals was seen as a step in this direction. The later activities of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council represent a more collective striving for respectability and civic acceptability.

During the 1920s the activities of the Council seem to have been few, but the Council was given a boost during the 1930s. In 1930 representatives from the affiliated organisations or "delegates" as they were to be called, were instructed in the business and position of the Council and embarked on a discussion on a new constitution¹⁵⁰. A few years later the Jewish Echo commented: "The sphere of the Council's activities (has) gradually developed and widened until now it is indeed something in the nature of a Jewish Board of Deputies for Glasgow."¹⁵¹ This means that the Council was now more than just a representative body and had become an institution which in effect governed Glasgow Jewry and united all the communal organisations.

The new situation reflected the status of the immigrant leaders who now headed the Council, but as in 1914 with its foundation, fear about the position of Jews in Glasgow in general may have been a motive to revive and restructure the Council. During the 1930s this position of the immigrants and their children was not felt to be secure. They were still regarded as aliens. Old complaints about unfair alien competition, wage-cutting and Jewish involvement with political radicalism, fraud and gambling,

¹⁵⁰ MBGJRC 9/4/1930. See also SJAC, MBG 3/9/1930. The Council had not been mentioned during the previous years in the Garnethill congregation's minutes and in 1930 two new delegates had to be appointed. At the same time a new lease of life had to be given to the Board of Shechita.

¹⁵¹ JE 31/3/1933.

had not disappeared¹⁵². In addition there were regulations which made life difficult for those who were not British subjects or children of aliens. Jewish students intending to study accountancy, for example, were said to have met difficulties because of such regulations¹⁵³. And when aliens ran into trouble with the law, their status could be hazardous. In 1932 Ellis Isaacs told the Council that he noticed a tendency “of deportation orders being asked for, in cases where the offences were trivial.”¹⁵⁴ It was not easy to become a British subject, according to Maurice Bloch, a spirits merchant and leader of the Council. In 1933 he reported “exhaustively” about negotiations on the naturalisation of ex-service men; the requested fee of £5 seemed to be the main hurdle¹⁵⁵. In 1939 some men still complained that they were prevented from joining voluntary services, because their parents were of foreign birth. Arthur Rose, representative of the Jewish ex-servicemen, who had been wounded during the First World War, was said to have had his application for National Service been turned down, “probably on the account of the nationality of his father”¹⁵⁶.

There is some evidence of incidents between Christians and Jews before 1933. An extraordinary occasion was reported in 1930 when the Jewish Echo¹⁵⁷ wrote that Christian propaganda was being made among Jewish schoolchildren. It appears that this concerned a book with the remarkable title “Tales the Letters Tell”, which was said to be compiled by a “Catholic Sisterhood” and was used in schools. The Chief Rabbi was consulted and he advised “to make courteous representations to the authorities”. According to the minutes of meeting of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, the Council contacted the local education authorities. At the time, this should have involved the Education Department of the Corporation of Glasgow or, before May 1930, the Glasgow Education Authority, but the minutes of the meetings of these bodies do not mention this matter¹⁵⁸ which suggests that there was no official contact. In any case, the Council reported that it was advised to get in touch with the publishers of the book who were named as the Great Publishing Company. When this did not produce any results,

¹⁵² JE 5/9/1930, 8/5/1931, 3/7/1931, 17/6/1932, 15/7/1932, 22/7/1932, 23/10/1936, 30/10/1936, 1/1/1937.

¹⁵³ MBGJRC 7/12/1930; compare JE 22/6/1928, 12/12/1930, 4/5/1934; SJAC, OHP interview H. Crivan. Insurance companies were reported also to have discriminated against Jews for similar reasons, not accepting job applications and refusing Jews as clients.

¹⁵⁴ MBGJRC 11/2/1932.

¹⁵⁵ MBGJRC 7/9/1933.

¹⁵⁶ MBGJRC 20/3/1939, 24/12/1939, 15/8/1940, 13/10/1940, 24/11/1940. At the beginning of the Second World War some aliens were interned and the Council intervened on their behalf.

¹⁵⁷ JE 5/12/1930.

¹⁵⁸ Compare MBGJRC 18/12/1930, 8/1/1931, 14/6/1931, 22/10/1931; and SRA, DED 2.1.2, Minutes of the Education Authority of Glasgow; idem, Corporation of Glasgow, Minutes, November 1930-April 1931. The Corporation Minutes (26/1/1931) only mention books from the Scottish Band of Hope Union. Presumably this concerned temperance literature. It is possible that Jews were mentioned in this literature.

the council reportedly wrote to the Education Department asking them to withdraw the books from schools. It seems as if the Education Department promised to look into the matter, but the Council executive did not report on the outcome of this rather odd affair. The significance of this episode does not lie in the exact details, but in the fact that the Council was apparently concerned about anti-Jewish propaganda.

Hitler's rise to power in 1933 increased Jewish fears, especially when some Protestants in Glasgow publicly declared their support for Nazism. A serious threat came from Alexander Ratcliffe and his Protestant League. It is assumed that Ratcliffe was more anti-Catholic than anti-Jewish and did not express vicious anti-Jewish feelings until 1939, when he opposed the war on the grounds that it was fought for world Jewry and Papacy¹⁵⁹, but this assumption may not be correct. Already in 1930 a correspondent of the Jewish Echo warned that Ratcliffe had stated that Jews were the worst enemies of the Protestants¹⁶⁰. The fact that his Protestant League won 6 seats in Glasgow's municipal elections in 1933 might have caused further alarm. The Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, however, urged not to make public statements about Ratcliffe, because these were believed to do more harm. Another incident was reported in 1933 by the Jewish Echo about the Rev. H.S. McClelland who had said that he was "a Hitlerite"¹⁶¹. Three years later he referred to this statement, saying: "I was a fool."¹⁶² On the whole, however, relations between Glasgow Jewry and the Church of Scotland were friendly¹⁶³. The Rev. I.K. Cosgrove of Garnethill spoke, for example, in 1937 in Protestant churches and a year later the first Glasgow synagogue invited a Protestant minister to speak from its pulpit¹⁶⁴.

What is remarkable about these episodes is the rather timid and submissive way in which the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council handled these affairs. During the 1930s the matter of anti-Jewishness in Glasgow dominated the Council's proceedings. On most occasions its leaders chose for a quiet diplomatic approach, building on the contacts they had established during recent years with police and municipal officials but avoiding public debate. Letters, for example, in the press by non-Jews which were accompanied by remarks that were taken to be derogatory towards Jews in general

¹⁵⁹ C. Holmes, "Alexander Ratcliffe. Militant Protestant and Antisemite", in T. Kushner, K. Lunn (ed.), Traditions of Intolerance. Historical Perspectives on Fascism and Race Discourse in Britain, Manchester, 1989, pp. 196-217; T. Kushner, The Persistence of Prejudice: Antisemitism in British Society during the Second World War, Manchester 1987, pp. 38, 46-47, 103-104. Compare JE 3/11/1939, 10/11/1939, 8/12/1939 for examples on Nazi hooliganism in connection with the war.

¹⁶⁰ JE 21/3/1930, 28/3/1930.

¹⁶¹ JE 18/8/1933; compare JE 5/5/1933.

¹⁶² JE 17/1/1936.

¹⁶³ See also C.G. Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland since 1730, London, 1987, pp 237-238. The Assembly of the Church of Scotland had urged the government to stem Irish immigration during the 1920s, but the Church cannot be regarded as anti-alien.

¹⁶⁴ JE 10/2/1937, MBGJRC 8/3/1939.

were not answered. In this situation it was felt that more negative publicity might jeopardise the position of the Jews in Glasgow. This is not to say that the leadership was against publicity in general. Favourable reports in the general press and notes on Jewish activities were welcomed¹⁶⁵.

In September 1936 Maurice Bloch formulated a four point programme for the Council on these matters. First of all, Jews had to show that they were law-abiding people. Secondly, allegations about Jewish responsibility for Bolshevism had to be shown to be incorrect. It was said, for example, that the Jewish ex-service men with their annual parade could show loyalty and patriotism. Thirdly, close contacts with the police and the magistrates of the city had to be maintained by the Council. Fourthly, contacts with church leaders had to be established because traditionally "the Church is against Jew-baiting"¹⁶⁶. It was not always easy to judge what was genuine anti-Jewishness and on one occasion a delegate told the Council that "the Jewish people should not be so touchy and should ignore a lot of these pinpricks"¹⁶⁷. In order not to raise unnecessary problems, Jews were told by the Council to "be careful in their actions and not alienate sympathies of our non-Jewish fellow citizens"¹⁶⁸ and that the council's leaders would deal with all matters that involved anti-Jewishness. Individuals were not reply to letters in the general press¹⁶⁹ and they had to be careful in their behaviour, especially with regard to political activity¹⁷⁰ and the management of Jewish firms with a view to the treatment of employees and Sunday trading.

While most Jewish organisations in Glasgow did not object to this policy, two issues were not so easily resolved. This concerned the Jewish refugees from Germany who had arrived in Britain and the question whether a boycott of German goods should be organised¹⁷¹. The Council felt that to bring large numbers of refugees to Glasgow¹⁷² and to publicly announce a boycott of German goods in protest against the persecution of the Jews in Germany might provoke anti-Jewish feelings and harm the position of the Jews in Glasgow. This was disputed by a local group of Jewish Socialists and in their wake by a Jewish youth organisation.

The spokesman of the Socialists was Lewis Rifkind. He called the Council's leaders

¹⁶⁵ See for example Glasgow Evening Citizen 29/9/1933, Glasgow Evening News 2/12/1932, Sunday Post 30/10/1932.

¹⁶⁶ MBGJRC 14/9/1936.

¹⁶⁷ MBGJRC 22/6/1936.

¹⁶⁸ MBGJRC 8/10/1933.

¹⁶⁹ MBGJRC 22/1/1936.

¹⁷⁰ MBGJRC 8/10/1933.

¹⁷¹ MBGJRC 13/4/1933.

¹⁷² See for example JE 31/8/1934; MBGJRC 27/8/1934. Compare JE 9/12/1938, 16/12/1938, 23/12/1938, 6/1/1939. After the Kristalnacht in Germany in November 1938, a protest meeting was organised and refugees were housed in special hostels in Glasgow.

dictators. A few rich men financed Jewish life in Glasgow: "They pay the piper and they call the tune."¹⁷³ In 1933 he criticised the Council for not proclaiming a boycott of German goods and for not participating in demonstrations against the Nazi-regime in Germany¹⁷⁴. Rifkind was followed by young Jews¹⁷⁵. They had formed their own organisations, held demonstrations and eventually established the United Jewish Youth Movement. The initiative for this Movement had come from a group which noted the following in 1938:

The lifelong tragedy of the Jewish people having been once more vividly impressed upon us by the heart-rendering events in Central Europe. We the Jewish Youth of this city are determined to undertake the full share of the responsibility which falls on us.¹⁷⁶

The Movement was joined by some 400 hundred young Jews in Glasgow. But this success proved to be short-lived. Their attempts to organise a boycott of German goods failed.

It is, however, not their failure which is significant, but the fact that they tried to take over responsibilities which rested with the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council. Members of the United Jewish Youth Movement openly criticised the Council's leaders for leaving Glasgow Jewry defenceless against anti-Jewishness, for the lack of help offered to German Jews and in general for the undemocratic character of the Council¹⁷⁷. The leadership's answer was to condemn the Movement as a Communist attempt to mobilise the Jewish youth for political purposes. They may have been correct. As will be discussed in chapter 6, many young Jews were influenced by extreme left-wing politics. In addition, there was the usual impatience of young people to take over from what is seen as the former generation. The Jewish youth revolt in Glasgow at the end of the 1930s, however, was also influenced by their worries about the position of the Jews in the city.

In the sixty years between 1880 and 1940 this position had changed dramatically. The Jewish population in the city had grown from a relatively small group of small and middle class retailers and manufacturers to a socially mixed community of Eastern

¹⁷³ Lewis Rifkind (Commemorative volume of essays issued on behalf of the Lewis Rifkind Memorial Book Committee in conjunction with Glasgow Poalei Zion), Glasgow, undated (probably 1938), p. 75.

¹⁷⁴ JE 12/5/1933. See also JE 24/3/1933, 26/5/1933, 2/6/1933. It is possible that the Council declined to call for a boycott because some Jewish firms traded in German goods. The department store A. Goldberg & Sons announced in May 1933 that it would sell no more German goods.

¹⁷⁵ JE 4/8/1933.

¹⁷⁶ SJAC, Minute Book United Jewish Youth Movement (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBUJYM) 18/12/1938.

¹⁷⁷ JE 17/4/1936, 11/11/1938, 10/3/1939; compare MBGJRC 18/4/1939, 27/4/1939, 4/2/1940, 18/4/1940; SJAC, MBUJYM 12/1/1939.

European origin. The immigrants had been attracted to Glasgow because it offered safety, employment and business opportunities, they might have come to Glasgow to travel to America, but were stranded in the city. On the whole these people did well in Scottish society, which was shown by their move out of the original area of settlement into the suburbs or the city, but a significant working-class group was socially not so successful.

The immigrants were assisted by the Jews who had settled in Glasgow before 1880. The relation between the older settlers and the newcomers was somewhat uneasy. The older settlers initially were able to control the immigrants by means of the provision of religious services and charity, but their domination ended at the time of the First World War when they were overwhelmed by the sheer number of newcomers and the rise of an immigrant middle class. The background for the conflict between older settlers and immigrants was formed by a traditional ambivalent attitude towards Jews in general which existed in Glasgow. This attitude and the fear for growing bias caused a feeling of insecurity among Jews, worsened during the 1930s by events outside Glasgow such as the rise of Nazism, stimulating them to strive for respectability and civic acceptability.

Chapter 2: Rise and decline of religious congregations

By 1823 the Jews in Glasgow had formed a religious congregation. An individual Jew can say his daily prayers and study religious texts on his own, but for some prayers a quorum of ten adult men or a minyan is needed. Communal prayers require some organisation and therefore Jews usually congregate in small voluntary associations called chevroth. Larger congregations own synagogues, used for prayer, study and as meeting places, and in addition they run communal services like the provision of kosher food and the burial of the dead. The fact that such a congregation already existed in Glasgow in 1823 when the number of Jews in the city was still low shows the importance of this institution in Jewish life. Other congregations would follow later.

The development of the congregations in Glasgow can be compared to the development of these institutions in England. Their history is well documented. A difference has to be made between congregations of the older settlers and those of the immigrants. In general it can be said that the organisation of immigrant congregations in England did not mature until the eve of the First World War¹. Prior to 1914 these organisations were weak when compared to the congregations of older settlers. Soon after the immigrant congregations had matured, however, the synagogues began to decline and started to lose their central place in Jewish communal life.

There were local differences. Lipman and Newman² describe the history of the United Synagogue, an institution which originally formed the framework for a number of congregations in London and later spread to the provinces. The United Synagogue was established by the older settlers during the 19th century. This institution tried to extend its influence over the new immigrant congregations which sprung up in London at the end of the 19th century, leading to a long period of conflicts. Next to the United Synagogue, the Federation of Synagogues was formed as an independent institution in which many immigrant congregations united. During the 20th century the second generation of immigrants gained control over the United Synagogue³.

Kokosalakis, Krausz and Williams⁴ describe developments in the provinces. In Liverpool and even more so in Leeds and Manchester there were conflicts between the congregations of older settlers and immigrants similar to those in London. Groups of

¹ L.P. Gartner, The Jewish Immigrant in England 1870-1914, London, 1973, pp. 217-218, 268-269.

² V.D. Lipman, A Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950, London, 1954, pp. 71-73; A. Newman, The United Synagogue 1870-1970, London, 1977, pp. 201-204.

³ In 1962 former Glaswegian Isaac Wolfson, an immigrant-son, became President of the United Synagogue. For a personal immigrant view on these conflicts see: B. Homa, Footprints on the Sands of Time, Gloucester/Chippingham, 1990, pp. 79-117.

⁴ N. Kokosalakis, Ethnic Identity and Religion. Tradition and Change in Liverpool Jewry, Washington D.C., 1982, pp. 75-76; E. Krausz, Leeds Jewry. Its History and Social Structure, Cambridge, 1964, pp. 9-10; Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, pp. 331-333.

immigrants, often originating from the same area in Eastern Europe or with the same occupation, started small prayer groups or chevroth which developed into congregations. At first the immigrant organisations were often associated with the congregations of older settlers which were larger, owned synagogue buildings and could provide religious services. Later the immigrant groups gained independence and established their own places of worship. This led to the existence of dozens of independent synagogues in Liverpool, Leeds and Manchester at the turn of the 20th century. The immigrants had various reasons to establish their own congregations. Their religious culture and way of worship were different, but there was another aspect. The congregations offered the new immigrant middle classes a chance to define their collective identity and power and they provided individuals with offices and honorary posts which were often a recognition of newly gained social status.

In Glasgow the development of the congregations went along similar lines to what happened in London, Liverpool, Leeds and Manchester. The attempts, for example, of the older settlers to dominate the newcomers were made by means of the provision of religious services. In 1881 the leaders of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation decided the following:

“(...) that it is of the highest necessity and only right, that all (Jews) in Glasgow and in country towns who make use of the Synagogue and its institutions are forced to contribute towards the expenses of the congregation.”

This would be enforced through the provision of kosher meat:

“(...) the easiest way to effect this (...) is: To issue tickets to such at the price of the rent for a seat which will entitle him (the ticket holder) to buy his meat and to all the privileges of a seatholder. Parties having no ticket will get no meat.”

People would pay (26 shillings to £15 per year) according to their financial means and circumstances. The poor were to receive free tickets⁵. This decision, which if successful would have made all Jews in the city seatholders of the congregation, appears to have been taken in order to improve the financial position of the congregation, while another motive (as has been shown in chapter 1) behind this decision must have been to extend control over the growing number of Jews in the West of Scotland who applied increasingly for certain facilities, like the provision of kosher meat, often without joining the congregation.

To a certain extent, the decision already indicates the changing position of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation. Until the 1880s its synagogue had been the main centre

⁵ SJAC, MBGHC 3/3/1881, 24/4/1881, 19/6/1881.

of Jewish life in the city. It catered for all needs stipulated by traditional Jewish law, provided charity, and was a communal meeting place. But by the 1880s, the congregation appears no longer to have been the exclusive centre for the Jews in Glasgow because not all of them had joined the congregation.

They might not have done so for various reasons. Possibly, because the majority of them had little say in congregational matters. The administration of the congregation and its place of worship was in the hands of a council or committee, which was elected from and by the general meeting of the members or Free Members as they were called. They also appointed the honorary officers of the congregation and decided on the engagement of paid officials and clergy. The general meeting voted on the admission to the congregation of new members too: applicants were judged on social behaviour, financial position (membership fees were relatively high), and the number of years of residence in the city. Consequently the members formed an elite within the congregation. Underneath this small body of members were the more numerous seatholders (a Jewish resident of Glasgow and the surrounding area could be a seatholder in the synagogue without being a member of the congregation), who annually rented a seat in the synagogue, but had less rights than members, had no vote in the general meeting of members and could therefore exercise little influence in congregational affairs.

To link the provision of kosher meat and other facilities to the condition of renting a seat in the synagogue, as was done in 1881, was meant to force the regulations and the leadership of the congregation upon the non-aligned Jews in the city for whom such facilities were vital if they were to remain Jewish. Renting a seat would mean submitting to the authority of the elite. This congregational structure, which in some aspects still reflected social distinctions made in general society, remained largely unchanged during the whole period between 1880 and 1939.

The lay leaders of the congregation came from the ranks of the wealthy members. In British society in general, during the last three decades of the 19th century, many successful businessmen put their experience in trade and industry to the service of their communities. In London, as in Glasgow, they were the leaders of the newly formed United Synagogue⁶. Privileged or Free Membership within the congregations made them an elite. In London a report of June 1877 for the executive of the United Synagogue tried to explain as follows how the exclusive institution of Free Membership had come into being:

“The conditions of society were then (the first half of the 19th century and previously) widely different to those now existing, and probably it was intended to secure a governing class, consisting of those persons who (...) were 'masters of

⁶ A. Newman, The United Synagogue, 1870-1970. London, 1977, p. 35.

houses', described as 'domiciled in the country', and having some social standing."⁷

As the numbers of Jews in Britain grew enormously towards the end of the 19th century, privileged membership was more and more indefensible and became unacceptable for most congregations. In Glasgow, however, the institution seemed to have survived much longer than in London. The reasons for this may have been that the pressure from the seatholders for more democracy came later in Glasgow than in London or that the wish of the establishment in Glasgow to maintain its privileges and control over the poorer Jews proved stronger in Scotland than in England.

Prior to the 1870s the Jewish population in Glasgow was small, especially when compared to Jewish settlements in English cities such as London, Liverpool and Manchester. There was little pressure for democracy and the perspective of congregational life was rather inward looking. Events which lay outside of day-to-day routine and religious affairs were rarely discussed in council and general meetings. The deliberations followed a regular pattern, only disrupted by internal disputes and individual quarrels. The small number of members encouraged parochial quarreling. The synagogue's move in 1842 from the Post Office Court in Candleriggs to 204 George Street led to a split in the congregation, when a minority of members objected to the new premises, because they were housed under the same roof as some medical dissecting rooms of the Andersonian Institute. This was a genuine religious objection. It was argued that a place next to dissecting rooms should not be permitted as a site of worship, and the minority decided to remain in Candleriggs⁸. Religious motives dominated the dispute, but the rivalry between different families in the congregation probably formed the background of the conflict. The majority of the members was led by the optician and jeweller David Davis, the President of the congregation, while the furrier Woolf Levy headed the seceding minority. During previous years, Davis had been involved in another sharp conflict with the Michaels, a family of cabinetmakers who - challenging Davis' leadership - held unauthorised private prayer meetings.

These families contested the honorary positions of the congregation. During the 1880s the administration of the congregation was in the hands of an executive, consisting of a President, a Treasurer and a Honorary Secretary, supplemented by a small council of several elected members (usually 3 to 6 men). Education and other affairs, like the arrangement of burials, were supervised by small committees of members, who were elected at the general meeting of the members. The honorary officers of the congregation also conducted the synagogue services. In later years the Garnethill congregation would copy the arrangements of the immigrant synagogues on the South Side of Glasgow, where a Parnass and a Gabai conducted the services and

⁷ Quoted in Newman, The United Synagogue, p. 33.

⁸ Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, pp. 31-33; Newman, "A Short History of Garnethill", pp. 55-60.

where these functions were separated from the administration of the congregation. The Parnass and Gabai, who were both laymen, were also referred to as Senior and Junior Warden.

At the time of the split in 1842 there were still relatively few Jews in Glasgow. In 1845 the Candleriggs group was said to have 21 members, just one less than the George Street congregation, which also boasted of 20 “resident visitors”, 17 married ladies, 4 single ladies, 20 boys and 25 girls⁹; in total just over one hundred Jews lived in Glasgow. In the course of time the groups were reunited and moved their synagogue to Howard Street and in 1857 from there to 240 George Street¹⁰, by which time the number of Jews in Glasgow might have been about two hundred. From George Street it went further westward. In 1873 eleven of the thirty members of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation (which would suggest that the congregation, at least in membership, was smaller than the sum of the two groups which had preceded it), lived near Sauchiehall Street and Bath Street¹¹, the fashionable middle class area of the city, and in 1875 they possibly already had an eye on the site at the corner of Hill Street and Thistle Street (later Garnet Street), where Garnethill Synagogue was eventually erected for some forty members and one hundred and twenty seatholders¹². The growth of the congregation was a result of natural increase and immigration during the first half of the 1870s. Between 1873 and 1879 at least seven new members were admitted and the congregational income more than doubled due to increasing seat rent¹³.

The new synagogue at Garnethill, consecrated in September 1879, was an impressive building. Congregations derived some of their status from the buildings which they used: Garnethill's design reveals some of the intentions of the owners and provides a clue about the wish of the Jewish establishment to maintain its privileges and control over the poor. Garnethill synagogue incorporates a variety of architectural styles. The Glasgow Herald in 1879 described the style of the building as follows:

⁹ Newman, “A Short History of Garnethill”, p. 56. These figures were given in response to a questionnaire of the Chief Rabbi. Both groups had their own clergy, Hebrew classes for children and poor relief.

¹⁰ JE 14/2/1975; compare SJAC, MBGHC, printed financial statements. In 1975 the Jewish Echo reproduced a Jewish directory from 1874 showing the synagogue in 239 George Street with 194 seats (136 for men, 58 for women). The financial statements show a number of 27 members in 1873, with an addition of at least 7 new members during 1874. This suggests that about a quarter of all the male seatholders in 1874 were members.

¹¹ SJAC, cover MBGHC 1873-1887.

¹² SJAC, MBGHC 22/4/1877. In April 1877 some objections were raised against the site at Garnethill, possibly because it was situated relatively far away from the residences of many seatholders who lived near the Clyde. The matter was referred to a meeting of members and seatholders which took place on 22nd April 1877. At this meeting, however, the ten seatholders present were completely outvoted by 22 members, most of whom favoured the site at Garnethill. The number of Jews in Glasgow at that time is discussed in chapter 1.

¹³ SJAC, Printed Financial Statements in MBGHC.

"Romanesque (...) with the Byzantine (Oriental) feeling introduced in the detail (...) As to the scheme of decoration, one is impressed with the pleasing harmony pervading the whole, and the fitness of the Moresque work adopted in embellishment of a building of this character."¹⁴

Such a mixture was not uncommon at this time, contemporary public constructions in Glasgow likewise displayed a rich variety in design. These included, for example, the Gothic University of Glasgow at Gilmorehill (1870), the Italian Gothic Stock Exchange (1875) and the City Chambers (1888). The buildings of the Glasgow International Exhibition of 1888 would show some preference for Oriental and Moresque styles. Religious buildings in the Garnethill area included the Gothic Milton Free Church (c. 1850) and the Italian Roman Catholic St. Aloysius (1910). In this respect, the synagogue's design followed a general trend.

Garnethill's design also fitted into a pattern of synagogue building in Britain. Synagogue architecture in general usually borrowed the stylistic vocabulary of the period, although designs could be limited by the position and financial means of the congregations. In places where Jewish existence was still felt to be precarious, synagogue building was usually reticent, while wealthy and more confident congregations mostly erected attractive synagogues which figured prominently in their decor. In 19th-century Britain, the establishment of Anglo-Jewry embarked on an ambitious building programme. In their search for a distinctly Jewish building, they adopted a Moorish style with strong Byzantine influences which was supposed to go back to the Golden Age of Spanish Jewry before 1492 and to assert the Oriental heritage of the Jews. In London, this Moorish style was embodied in the Central Synagogue (1870) and the minarets which ordained the New West End Synagogue in Bayswater (1879). Ironically, this style contradicted one of the intentions of the designs. Instead of demonstrating the integration of the Jews into general society, the newly found status of the congregations and the social respectability of their members, the Moresque features emphasised their foreignness. Awareness of this defect led to the further adoption of more common Romanesque and Gothic styles¹⁵. The variety in Garnethill synagogue's design is a product of this development.

Inside, the area of the Glasgow synagogue is dominated by the ark, placed in an apse.

¹⁴ GH 10/9/1879.

¹⁵ G. Abramson (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Jewish Culture. From the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, Oxford, 1989, pp. 35-36; *Encyclopedia Judaica*, XV, pp. 619-620; J. Glasman, "Architecture and Anglicization: London Synagogue Building 1870-1900", in *Jewish Quarterly*, volume XXXIV (1987), number 2, pp. 16-21; E. Jamilly, "The Architecture of the Contemporary Synagogue", in C. Roth (ed.), *Jewish Art. An Illustrated History*, London, 1971 (2nd edition), pp. 273-285; S.S. Levin (ed.), *A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life 1870-1970*, London, 1970, pp. 75-91; N. Pevsner, J. Fleming, H. Honour, *A Dictionary of Architecture*, London, 1975 (revised edition), p. 494.

The ark is an important and ornamental feature of the Jewish place of worship where the Torah scrolls are kept. In an imitation of the Christian High Altar, as had recently become fashionable¹⁶, the ark was set on a higher level than the floor of the area with a flight of five white marble steps leading to the ark. Garnethill did not follow another imitation of Christian churches, fashionable among synagogues on the Continent and in America, namely to move the Reader's desk or Bimah away from the middle of the area towards the ark¹⁷. The desk is the place from where the scrolls are read and in front of which the lay officials are seated, overlooking the congregation, and from where in effect the service is conducted. That the Reader's desk is placed on a higher level than the seats in the area may be regarded seen as an imitation of the altar in churches, but this might not have been intended. Later, however, a significant church-like alteration was made at Garnethill when a marble pulpit was erected. Initially, a brass lectern stand had been placed in front of the ark. From behind this stand the Reader said his prayers and the minister of the congregation or a layman could deliver a sermon from there. In 1896 this stand was replaced by a pulpit, which over the years became the private domain of the minister and the Reader moved to the Bimah to say his prayers. The pulpit was erected to honour the former President of the congregation, Samuel Morris, and it was probably paid for out of the legacy which Morris left to the congregation. By comparison, the Chevra Kadisha on Glasgow's South Side, an immigrants' synagogue which was opened in 1897 in a former Baptist church did not have a pulpit¹⁸.

The apse of Garnethill's ark has a circular roof divided into panels which are filled with stained glass as are all other windows; the staircase in the vestibule which leads up to the gallery, where the ladies sit separately from the men as is traditional in synagogues, has a highly ornamental three-light circular headed window filled with stained glass. These windows were produced by a Glasgow workshop¹⁹. The outlay of the building and the windows, while giving the synagogue an attractive and dignified

¹⁶ Pevsner, A Dictionary of Architecture, p. 494. Some synagogues, including Garnethill, followed the example the Ark of the synagogue in Berlin's Oranienburgerstrasse.

¹⁷ Compare The Builder 22/5/1880 in which the New Synagogue in Brussels was described. See also C. Grossman, A Temple Treasure. The Judaica Collection of Congregation Emanu-El of the City of New York, New York, 1989, p. 21 for interior of Temple Emanu-El in New York. In the Belgian capital and in New York the Reader's desk was placed in front of the ark.

¹⁸ SJAC, alteration plans Chevra Kadisha. This synagogue was housed in a former Baptist church. In 1964, however, the Chevra Kadisha synagogue did have a pulpit which was used during the induction of a new minister (see photograph in JE 27/4/1964).

¹⁹ SJAC, MBGHC 5/5/1878 and Cash Book Building of New Synagogue 11/7/1879, 28/2/1880; E. Williamson, A. Riches, M. Higgs, Buildings of Scotland. Glasgow, London, 1990, p. 264. In May 1878 the building committee of the congregation approved the designs for the windows. The commission for the windows probably went to the firm of J.B. Bennett & Sons, who were eventually paid £324 for their work. The Minutes and Cash Book, however, also mention the firm of Stirling of Keir receiving a similar amount for work which may have involved stained glass.

character, had the effect that the light and sound produced in the building were very much like light and sound in a church or cathedral. This must have been done on purpose and a considerable amount of money was spent on this, although the repetition of certain designs in stained glass instead of the use of different designs suggest that the available funds for decorations were limited. Such windows offered another chance to give the building a Jewish character by employing Jewish religious themes in the design, but the Garnethill windows lacked any special Jewish themes - the frequently employed roses, for example, were not roses of Sharon but ordinary dog roses - which could have been caused by the lack of funds or might suggest a deliberate choice of Scottish designs.

The leadership of the congregation made these choices. According to the correspondent of the Jewish Chronicle, the congregational leaders had taken a "very zealous interest"²⁰ in the erection of the synagogue. In November 1876 a building committee had been elected, consisting of the most prominent members of the congregation, to prepare plans and estimates for the envisaged building. Four months later they submitted several plans to the general members' meeting. A plan was selected and it was decided to obtain estimates for the construction work²¹. During the following years the building committee took several decisions on the designs and adjusted the building plans²².

The building costs of Garnethill synagogue can be compared to the costs of contemporary synagogues and churches. At the planning stage the Glasgow synagogue was valued at £7,000²³; the eventual total expenditure was £22,741, which included £2,500 for the purchase of the site²⁴. The New West End Synagogue in London's St. Petersburg Place which was consecrated during the same year, cost over £21,000²⁵. But that synagogue provided accommodation for 800 to 900 worshippers, while Garnethill could accommodate not more than 600. Compared to the building costs of contemporary churches in Glasgow, Garnethill synagogue may not stand out much either. At the time church building in Glasgow mostly took place in the suburbs. Compared to the estimated values of the building plans, the value of the Garnethill

²⁰ JC 12/9/1879.

²¹ SJAC, MBGHC 19/11/1876, 17/3/1877. Neither the architects nor the number of plans are mentioned, but there were at least three plans because plan number 3 was selected. The author of the plan is not mentioned.

²² SJAC, MBGHC 6/5/1877, 1/5/1878, 5/5/1878, September 1878. Changes and decisions involved the situation of the choir box, the area seating arrangement, the stained glass windows and other decorations.

²³ SRA, Dean of Court Proceedings, D-OWP (cited hereafter as SRA, D-OWP) 19/8, 10/5/1877.

²⁴ SJAC, Cash Book Building of New Synagogue. The figure also includes a sum of £200 on the bank and cash in hand.

²⁵ The Builder 5/4/1879, 27/7/1879. Unlike the London synagogue, the main entrance of Garnethill was set in a recess (from Hill Street) but this might have been caused by the L-shape of the land on which the Glasgow synagogue was built, with the east wall of the building furthest away from Hill Street.

synagogue building is lower than the value of most of the Glasgow churches of this period²⁶.

When the relative small size of the congregation of not more than 200 regular worshippers is taken into account, it appears that the congregation spent a very large sum of money on a large place of worship. They were obviously looking for a building which represented their status, but it must also be assumed that the leaders of the congregation opted for such a large building because they expected further growth of their congregation.

There was, however, also something else. It is widely assumed that Garnethill synagogue was designed by Glasgow architect John McLeod with advice from Nathan Joseph from London²⁷. Neither McLeod nor Joseph ^{was} ~~an~~ influential architect²⁸. McLeod was responsible for some housing accommodation at the corner of Wellington Street and West Campbell Street (1880), the Young Women's Christian Association in Bath Street (1886) and a stable in St. Vincent Place at Dumbarton Road (1898)²⁹. No other religious buildings are registered on his name. McLeod was paid £300 by the congregation for his work at Garnethill, but the question is whether the design actually came from him.

The nature of Joseph's contribution is unclear. The Builder³⁰ makes no mention of him in its report on Garnethill synagogue. It is possible that at the planning stage of the new synagogue, the congregation sought the advice of their former secretary, Dr. Asher Asher who had moved to London and had become an important communal figure in Anglo-Jewry as the influential Secretary of the United Synagogue of London. Asher might have suggested to involve Joseph. He was little known architect; British Jewry did not particularly excel in architecture at this time with the only influential Jewish architect of the 19th century in Britain being David Mocatta who designed a series of railway stations during the 1830s and 1840s and the synagogue of the London Reform

²⁶ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, p. 178; SRA, D-OWP 19/8, 28/6/1877, 30/8/1877, 14/11/1878, 9/1/1879; SRA, D-OWP 19/9, 15/1/1880, 29/4/1880, 29/7/1880. These churches included Camperfield UP Church (valued at £10,000), Cranstonhill Free Church (£7,000), Duke Street UP Church (£15,000), Cathedral Street UP Church (£16,000), Cumberland Street Roman Catholic Church (£15,000), John Street Wesleyan Methodist Chapel (£10,000), Woodside Church (£9,000).

²⁷ See, for example, Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 40; JC 12/9/1879; Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, p. 47; Williamson, Buildings of Scotland. Glasgow, p. 264. The Jewish Chronicle writes that the construction work at Garnethill was carried out under the superintendence of McLeod and that Joseph had given his counsel in the preparation of the plans. Collins writes about Joseph McLeod.

²⁸ They are not mentioned in reference works such as Pevsner, A Dictionary of Architecture; A.K. Placzek, (ed.), MacMillan Encyclopedia of Architects, London/New York, 1982; J. Richards (ed.), Who's Who in Architecture from 1400 to the Present Day, London, 1977; D. Yarwood (ed.), Encyclopedia of Architecture, London, 1985.

²⁹ R. Blass, Historical Study Report on Garnethill Synagogue, report for University of Strathclyde, Department of Architecture and Building Science, not dated, p. 11; Williamson, Buildings of Scotland. Glasgow, p. 252. His office was in 160 Hope Street.

³⁰ The Builder 5/3/1881; compare JC 12/9/1879.

Congregation in 1851. But Joseph was an important communal figure in London Jewry, where he filled positions in the United Synagogue, its Visitation Committee and the Russo-Jewish Committee. Furthermore, Joseph, acted as adviser for several trusts involved in the provision of housing for the poor. He also wrote some tracts on Jewish religion³¹.

He was involved in synagogue building. As a young man, Joseph had submitted a plan in 1857 to the Manchester Old Congregation for their new synagogue at Cheetham Hill, but his plan was not selected³². Later he was more successful with plans for the Central Synagogue in 1870 and his communal position could have led to these commission. A few years later Joseph was contracted for the New West End Synagogue in the London neighbourhood of Bayswater. For this commission Joseph was coupled with a non-Jewish architect, namely the Liverpool firm of W. & G. Audsley³³. Work in the New West End was completed in 1879.

The curious thing is that in 1874 Audsley had finished a synagogue in Liverpool. This was the Princes Road synagogue³⁴. There is a remarkably strong resemblance between the Princes Road synagogue, the New West End Synagogue and Garnethill synagogue. This resemblance can be found in all aspects of the buildings: the mixture of styles, including the Oriental aspects; the facade, in Glasgow the minarets which flanked the entrance gable in London had been replaced by smaller pinnacles; in the form of a galleried hall, with central nave and barrel vault; and in details like the shape and place of the ark³⁵. This suggests that the same design was used in these three synagogues and as the Princes Road synagogue in Liverpool was the oldest of the three, the building plans for this place must have been adapted for London and Glasgow. The Liverpool building followed Josephs' plans for the Central Synagogue in London, which

³¹ Alderman, London Jewry and London Politics 1889-1986, London, 1989, p. 8; Newman, The United Synagogue, pp. 67,81; A. Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, pp. 27, 34, 54-55, 71, 75, 251.

³² Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, p. 254. Ten other plans had been submitted.

³³ The Builder 27/7/1878. Magazines like The Builder frequently discussed synagogue architecture, showing the interest of non-Jewish architects in this subject.

³⁴ B.B. Benas, "A Survey of the Jewish Institutional History of Liverpool and District", in Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England, volume XVII (1951-1952), pp. 23-37, p. 26; R.E. Gonshaw, The Development of Synagogue Architecture in Liverpool, Liverpool, 1975 (dissertation Royal Institute of British Architecture, not published), 2, 20-24; D. Hudaly, Liverpool Old Hebrew Congregation 1780-1974, Liverpool, 1974, pp. 17-18, 28, 31-33. The Princes Road synagogue was also a prestigious establishment building. The building costs were £12,722. The synagogue provided accommodation for some 800 worshippers. W. & G. Audsley had been selected from a total number of 7 architects who drew up plans for the building. According to Gonshaw, other examples of their work are mainly in the neo-Gothic style.

³⁵ Compare SJAC, MBGHC 6/5/1877; The Builder 27/7/1878. The occurrence of the idea of placing the choir in a gallery behind the ark is also curious. A gallery was realised in Liverpool. It was arranged for the London synagogue and appeared in Glasgow as early as 1877 but was later dropped there. This idea appears to be copied from the Oranienburgerstrasse synagogue in Berlin which provided inspiration for the facade in Liverpool (this facade also resembles the Reform Temple Emanu-El in New York).

itself had been inspired by other Jewish places of worship, but Joseph's name is not associated with the Princes Road synagogue. It is possible that all these buildings are similar by accident or that Joseph's involvement in Liverpool has been overlooked, otherwise we have to assume that his contribution in the New West End Synagogue design was smaller than previously thought. This evidence also suggests that Joseph's involvement at Garnethill led to the copying and adaptation of the English building plans and that McLeod's role was one of a superintendent of the construction rather than the design work.

In any case, the size and the style of the building, and its decorations in Garnethill synagogue reveal the intention of the establishment of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation to own a place of worship which would impress their non-Jewish neighbours. It had to be respectable without being too extravagant and well adapted to its non-Jewish environment. In addition it had to attract the Jews of the city to the services.

There were by this time already a growing number of families who depended on the congregation's facilities without joining it. Shortly before the move to Garnethill, a group of seatholders separated themselves temporarily from the congregation. The immediate cause of the seatholders' revolt was the leadership's manipulation of the facilities, when in 1869 the Treasurer refused permission for the burial of Abraham de Vries, a non-seatholder. Perhaps the Treasurer wanted to set an example, but his decision backfired. A number of seatholders, frustrated by being barred from the ranks of members and voicing discontent with the high price of kosher meat - a constant grievance³⁶ - left and formed the New Glasgow Hebrew Congregation, opening their own burial ground and employing a shochet. They were joined by some relatively poor families, non-seatholders who were attracted by the provision of cheaper meat, and they applied to the Chief Rabbi in London for recognition. His intervention led to negotiations and reconciliation³⁷ but underneath the surface of unity trouble kept brewing. During the consecration of Garnethill synagogue in 1879 the Chief Rabbi "exhorted all the Jews of Glasgow to remain united in peace, forbearance, goodwill and brotherly concord."³⁸

As the leading members of the congregation moved away from the old city centre and the Clyde in a north-west direction, arriving Jewish immigrants settled on the riverbanks and in the East End. In May 1879 a small hall in Glassford Street had been rented for use as a classroom and during the following winter months the hall also

³⁶ SJAC, MBGHC 29/1/1870.

³⁷ SJAC, MBGHC 7/2/1870, September 1870. The Treasurer resigned and was succeeded by Emanuel Cohen.

³⁸ JC 12/9/1879.

functioned as a place of worship for those who were unable to reach Garnethill³⁹. This hall could also have been utilised to accommodate groups on the South Side, who set up private prayer meetings. The 1881 decision to issue tickets for meat, as discussed above, was a further effort to bring such groups under the jurisdiction of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation.

After the 1897 petition of some South Siders requesting the management of their own affairs, as described in the previous chapter, the United Synagogue of Glasgow was formed (almost thirty years later than in London), with a special general meeting of South Side members and seatholders supporting the new constitution. They would now form a branch of the congregation. It was said that the previous situation had led to schisms, the creation of minyanim and small congregations, and in general did not induce members to take an interest in congregational affairs⁴⁰.

Between 1898 and 1906 three synagogues formed the United Synagogue of Glasgow. Garnethill, the congregation of the older settlers, provided the leadership and dominated immigrant groups who had previously met place like communal halls or tenement rooms in Commerce Street and Rutherglen Road (Loan) and now occupied the Halls in Gorbals' Main Street until they moved to new accommodation in South Portland Street in 1901. The third synagogue was the Chevra Kadisha or Oxford Street synagogue, also in the Gorbals and possibly accommodating worshippers from Rutherglen Loan. The name Chevra Kadisha (Holy Brotherhood) referred to a burial society and it is possible that this congregation originally constituted a friendly society). The congregation was formed in 1886 and eventually established a place of worship on the corner of Buchan Street and Oxford Street in 1897⁴¹. The three synagogues occasionally co-operated with another synagogue called the Beth Hamedrash Hagodol, founded in 1902 by Daniel Rosenbloom and other immigrants who left the Chevra Kadisha after some disagreements, taking with them some hundred and fifty seatholders. Initially the new synagogue had been rebuffed by the United Synagogue; the Beth Hamedrash Hagodol leaders were told that they had not been able to show sufficient reason for yet another synagogue⁴², but in reality their foundation was probably regarded as dangerous competition for the official places of worship and the

³⁹ SJAC, MBGHC 4/5/1879, 7/12/1879.

⁴⁰ SJAC, MBG 2/1/1898, April 1898. An important figure, Emanuel Isaacs, who probably did not have enough confidence in independent management, unsuccessfully opposed the constitution of the United Synagogue.

⁴¹ JC 24/9/1897; JE 25/12/1964. Vincent writes in the Jewish Echo about the early days of the Chevra Kadisha, saying that the congregation was established in 1886 by a small group of immigrants who purchased land at the Western Necropolis for the burial of their dead. They met in Cleland Street and then in Stockwell Street, from where they moved to Clyde Place and then to Clyde Terrace. After that a Baptist church at the corner of Buchan Street and Oxford Street was bought and refurbished.

⁴² Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 94.

employment of a popular Maggid (preacher) was also at stake⁴³. After some time, however, the Beth Hamedrash Hagodol was accepted on the same footing as the Chevra Kadisha, but in 1908 the Beth Hamedrash Hagodol consecrated its new place of worship, housed in a former church. The consecration service combined the different elements of Glasgow Jewry. The opening of the building was performed by Michael Simons, who received the ceremonial key from Daniel Rosenbloom, South Side Rabbi Samuel Hillman delivered a sermon in Hebrew and the Rev. E.P. Phillips offered a prayer for the Royal Family⁴⁴.

There are some figures available for the number of seatholders in the synagogues which constituted the United Synagogue of Glasgow. These figures, covering the period 1902-1912, are reproduced in table 2 (see appendix). The figures come from Minute Books⁴⁵ of some of the congregations, which only occasionally reported on numbers of seatholders, and can provide therefore only a very impressionistic picture. They show that during the years 1902-1904 roughly about six hundred to six hundred and fifty persons rented a seat in the three united synagogues. Of the total number of seatholders only 23% worshipped in Garnethill, which means that the majority of the seatholders were immigrants. There are estimates of a Jewish population in the city which grew from some six and a half thousand persons in 1898 to about eight thousand in 1902. So what United Synagogue figures suggest is that only 10% of the all Jews in Glasgow rented a seat in these three synagogues. The communal statistics of the United Synagogue, available for the years 1902-1904, also offer some information about the number of marriages, births and deaths. As they come from only three synagogues they are not sufficient to provide a general picture of the Jewish population in Glasgow, although they give some indication of its structure. They indicate a relatively young Jewish population, just beginning to settle permanently. This is indicated, for example, by the number of marriages which boomed initially, a possible sign of young people getting married shortly after arrival in Scotland, to drop from 76 in 1902 to 36 in 1904. At the same time, however, the number of births fell from 166 in 1902 to 137 in 1904, while deaths numbered 103 in 1902 and 88 in 1904, rising to 90 in 1906 (of these roughly two thirds were children under 12 years of age and one fifth concerned stillborn babies). On the basis of such figures one should expect a growing membership. Initially, there was only a rise in the number of seatholders in the South

⁴³ SJAC, MBUSG 18/1/1903, 15/3/1903.

⁴⁴ GH 21/9/1908.

⁴⁵ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 139-145, 225; SJAC, MBG printed report 1/9/1911-31/8/1912 and MBUSG 29/3/1903, 13/3/1904, 4/6/1906; compare Jewish Encyclopedia, 1903, p. 676.

Portland Street synagogue, from 300 in 1902 to 350 in 1904⁴⁶, but compared to figures for 1911-1912, the rise in the number of seatholders is considerably higher. When compared to 1902, the number of seatholders in 1911-1912 in Garnethill and the South Portland Street synagogue more than doubled, while the smaller Chevra Kadisha also made important gains. It is possible to conclude that the growth came after 1904 and that only a part of the Jewish population in Glasgow during the years 1902-1904 was connected to the United Synagogue, with not more than one out of every ten Jews in Glasgow renting a seat there.

The United Synagogue was still the largest Jewish organisation in Glasgow, but it failed to unite all Jews in the city. People found their way to other synagogues. Shortly after the Beth Hamedrash Hagodol, the Beth Yaakov synagogue in Gorbals Street was established in 1905, and the Poale Zedek or Working Men's Congregation was formed in 1906, meeting in Oxford Street, while a chevra existed in Govanhill in 1901 and in Battlefield in 1906. The United Synagogue leadership did try to bring all these groups together. In November 1905 Michael Simons called for a conference of all places of worship, to solve what he referred to as the "regrettable financial position of most of the local Jewish organisations"⁴⁷, but this initiative did not materialise. The new immigrant institutions remained separate and set up their own facilities, through which they eventually helped to pave the way for the break-up of the United Synagogue.

Within the United Synagogue the conflict centered around the domination of the older settlers from Garnethill. Serious frictions occurred in December 1905 after South Portland Street members dismissed their clergyman, Isaac Bridge (following an incident in August which is unfortunately not described), and the council of the United Synagogue refused to confirm this action, saying that South Portland Street required the council's consent before such a dismissal. The council was firmly in Garnethill hands and the South Siders, hurt in their pride and wanting to settle such affairs independently, said they "reluctantly felt compelled to sever their connection" with the United Synagogue, which could just be prevented by a promise from the council to change this regulation⁴⁸.

The Bridge-incident showed only the tip of the iceberg and the underlying conflict, caused by class, cultural and religious differences, sealed the fate of the United Synagogue of Glasgow. This conflict centered on shechita. Traditionally the older settlers had made shechita provisions for the South Side. A profit was made on the

⁴⁶ Compare SJAC, Register of Births, Marriages and Deaths of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 101, 240. On the basis of the figures recorded by the Garnethill congregation and the United Synagogue (no figures are available for other congregations) Collins estimates that for the whole of Glasgow there were about 50 deaths in 1899, a figure which almost doubled during the following years. For 1899 he estimates 250 births, with just over 500 births in 1904.

⁴⁷ SJAC, MBUSG 26/11/1905.

⁴⁸ SJAC, MBUSG 10/12/1905, 17/12/1905, 7/1/1906. Bridge was later employed by the Poalei Zedek.

supply of meat, which was used to finance some congregational activities. This arrangement met growing competition from the newly created facilities of independent immigrant groups, who tried to discredit the Garnethill provision.

The Garnethill shechita was carried out according the regulations of the British Chief Rabbi, which differed from the traditional methods as they had been known in Eastern Europe. The immigrant shechita was supervised by Abraham Shyne, an Eastern European rabbi who had settled in Glasgow. When the Beth Hamedrash Hagodol entered negotiations to join the United Synagogue, they made the condition that the Board of Shechita of the United Synagogue, of which they were to become a part, would employ a Russian "Rav" (rabbi; the difference between rabbis and minister will be discussed below), probably meaning the proper engagement of Shyne, who would then supervise all congregational shechita matters. There can be little doubt that Shyne would disapprove of the Garnethill shechita and the United Synagogue questioned the engagement of a Rav, expressing doubts about his position in relation to the Chief Rabbi. The older settlers obviously did not want any immigrant supervision of their arrangements. Although these negotiations were therefore unsuccessful, the question of shechita supervision became more pressing.

As the older settlers were not numerous enough and the income of their congregation partly depended on their provisions for the South Side, which came under growing fire of immigrant agitation and were in danger of losing clients, they would inevitably have to give in to the demands for rabbinical supervision, which were probably supported by the South Side members of the United Synagogue. To prevent this, the older settlers tried some delaying tactics. They said that first a new United Board of Shechita had to be established, after which a Rav might be desirable. This delayed the matter for some time, but in January 1906 they had to agree that a Rav would be engaged forthwith⁴⁹, the details of the scheme being left to be decided in further meetings.

By that time the Garnethill leadership had had enough, and in May, one week after the new shechita arrangements were discussed, they decided to dissolve the United Synagogue. Michael Simons resigned as President, mentioning as the reason for his resignation "the utter impossibility of carrying on the organisation under the present conditions" which would bring no financial or spiritual advantage⁵⁰. South Side leader Percy Weitzman begged Simons "not to leave them 'as a flock without a shepherd'"⁵¹,

⁴⁹ SJAC, MBUSG 19/2/1905, 28/1/1906.

⁵⁰ SJAC, MBUSG 6/5/1906; compare MBG 18/3/1906, 15/4/1906, 10/5/1906, 13/5/1906. There is a possibility that the break-up was initiated by Simons alone. The Garnethill members did not sanction Simons' action until 13th May. On 15th April and 10th May there was no quorum at Garnethill and the matter could not be discussed.

⁵¹ SJAC, MBUSG 6/5/1906.

but to no avail.

Financial problems in general must have contributed towards the anxiety at Garnethill about the United Synagogue; the feared loss of shechita revenue certainly contributed towards difficulties, which resulted from the decline in the number of seatholders in the synagogue. These problems were sufficiently serious to lead to thoughts about the sale of the synagogue and the site on Hill Street to the Royal Sick Children's Hospital or the "German community", which was said to be looking for accommodation for their church⁵². These ideas came to nothing. Just as well, because in October 1909 Treasurer Bertie Heilbron was able to report that the financial situation had improved⁵³. The number of seatholders had started to rise again as more Jews moved into the West End and a year later President Abram Harris told a meeting of forty Garnethill members that "a period of gloom and depression had been passed"⁵⁴. In 1911 the number of seatholders amounted to 361 (162 men, 130 ladies and 69 junior seatholders), to drop slightly in 1912 to 356⁵⁵.

A significant change also took place in the leadership of Garnethill. With the entry of more Eastern European Jews into the congregation, as discussed in chapter 1, some former South Siders and immigrants were elected on the Council and started to fill honorary positions. In 1909, for example, Max Schapiro became Honorary Secretary of the congregation and Isaac Meyer Speculand, formerly Treasurer of the Chevra Kadisha synagogue on the South Side where he had a business in Gorbals Main Street, became Junior Warden at Garnethill in 1912. At the same time Benjamin Strump was elected Treasurer. In 1915 Speculand became President of the Garnethill Congregation⁵⁶. Men like Schapiro, Speculand and Strump personified the bridging of the gap between Garnethill and the South Side groups.

The growth of the Jewish population in Garnethill's catchment area in the West End was beneficial, but also raised some problems for this congregation. New provisions had to be made, especially education facilities for young people in the neighbourhoods further away from the synagogue, like Hyndland. Such facilities were considered in 1916 and during the years following the First World War⁵⁷. The congregation had previously organised Hebrew classes in the basement of the synagogue and in the nearby Garnetbank School, but a report in 1916 showed a significant decline in the

⁵² SJAC, MBG 8/12/1907, 23/2/1908, 29/2/1908, 18/6/1908.

⁵³ SJAC, MBG 24/10/1909.

⁵⁴ SJAC, MBG 16/10/1910.

⁵⁵ SJAC, Printed Report 1/9/1911-31/8/1912 in MBG.

⁵⁶ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 81; Scottish Record Office, Calender of Confirmations, UGD 174/71; SJAC, MBG 24/10/1909, 13/10/1912, October-November 1915, 9/2/1925. Speculand died in 1933. He left an estate of £32,337 and was a Justice of the Peace, which shows his successful career in general society.

⁵⁷ SJAC, MBG 3/12/1916, 26/2/1920, 13/3/1921.

number of pupils⁵⁸. It was believed that the decline was partly due to children in the outlying neighbourhoods receiving private lessons. This prompted the consideration of a proposal to open special classes in Hyndland to cater for the education of these children. The response, however, was disappointing. Some two hundred notices about the classes were sent out, but only sixteen people replied as requested⁵⁹.

The decline of the number of pupils in the Hebrew classes in the 1910s was not an isolated problem. Despite the growth in the number of seatholders, regular synagogue attendances at Garnethill dropped. Again it was thought that the distance between home and the synagogue was to blame for this (another reason was thought to be the nature of the service itself, which will be discussed in the following chapter) and the leadership resolved to increase its activities in the West End. It was also noticed that mostly young people stayed away and some of the measures were directed at young people. The creation of continuation classes, for example, was an attempt to educate children of secondary school age, who were seen as future seatholders, and to explain to them the meaning and significance of religious ritual (traditionally boys were taught Hebrew and Jewish history until their bar mitzvah or coming of age ceremony, at the age of thirteen). Another measure was the appointment of a young assistant-minister, who might have a greater appeal among young people than the older ministers of the congregation⁶⁰.

In May 1920 the Garnethill executive unfolded new plans for communal work in the West End, but real progress proved difficult. An appropriate hall, which had been envisaged as a communal centre and class rooms, was too expensive to rent and this idea had to be shelved. It was suggested that a "Board of Elders" should be set up to start visiting the Jewish residents in the West End⁶¹. In the years to come the financial situation of the congregation improved. In 1922 the synagogue was free from debts as a result of the rise of seatholders and income, but apathy among the seatholders kept worrying the Garnethill leadership⁶².

In general, the South Siders adopted similar structures for the administration of their congregations, with honorary officers usually being chosen from the ranks of successful businessmen. On the South Side, however, some relatively poor, but pious men also filled leading positions. Initially the seatholders on the South Side mostly lived in the neighbourhood of the synagogues in the Gorbals and their numbers grew

⁵⁸ SJAC, MBG 29/10/1916. The number of pupils in the Hebrew classes fell in one year from 69 to 53 children, while sixteen pupils instead of previously twenty five participated in a Study Circle discussing papers on Jewish history and other subjects of Jewish interest, and twenty four teenagers instead of previously twenty eight studied in continuation classes.

⁵⁹ SJAC, MBG 20/2/1920.

⁶⁰ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 196-197.

⁶¹ SJAC, MBG 16/5/1920, 23/6/1920.

⁶² SJAC, MBG 5/11/1922, 9/1/1921.

fast. The South Portland Street synagogue counted 626 seatholders in 1912, while the Poale Zedek and Chevra Kadisha synagogues together had at that time about 250 seatholders⁶³. Most of these people might have been non-seatholders at the turn of the century, making use of the facilities of the congregations which they eventually joined, or they had arrived in Glasgow during the first decade of the 20th century, decided to stay in the city and started to rent seats in the synagogues.

Eventually, six synagogues accommodated the Jewish worshippers in the Gorbals. Next to the South Portland Street synagogue and the Chevra Kadisha on the corner of Buchan Street and Oxford Street, which had been part of the United Synagogue, there was the New Central Synagogue in Hospital Street (formerly the Beth Hamedrash Hagodol, which had been housed in several premises in Oxford Street, Mathieson Street and Govan Street before the synagogue moved to Hospital Street in 1925) and three smaller synagogues - the Poale Zedek in Oxford Street, the Beth Yaakov which moved from Gorbals Street to Abbotsford Place, and the Nusach Ari Synagogue, a Hassidic place of worship⁶⁴ also situated in Oxford Street (for a period around the First World War there was another synagogue in Oxford Street, namely the Machzikei Hadas). The smaller synagogues were all housed in converted tenement flats, while the others had been situated in rebuilt churches or factories.

After the First World War a decline in the Gorbals' congregations started. This decline was blamed on the Jewish population movement out of the Gorbals to the southern suburbs and the West End. In the southern suburbs the congregations were growing. When the Battlefield chevra or Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation, as it became known, decided to build a new synagogue in 1912, it was intended to accommodate four hundred people. More synagogues were opened in the southern suburbs: Langside (1916), Pollokshields (1929), Newlands and Giffnock (1938) and Netherlee, Stamperland and Clarkston (1940). Notably, no new synagogue was opened in the West End, where the Garnethill congregation was trying to create facilities and attract people to their synagogue. In Crosshill, a mixed area of mainly upper working-class and lower middle-class housing accommodation, a synagogue was established in 1932 and it is significant that this Crosshill synagogue became known as the "cut-price shul"⁶⁵ as its seat rents did not exceed 1 shilling per week. A number of working class Jewish families from the Gorbals was rehoused or moved during the 1930s to the newly built districts of Mosspark, Hillington and Cardonald. Although a South-West Hebrew Congregation came into existence in this area, a permanent place of worship was never established and the congregation was finally dissolved during the 1950s.

⁶³ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 139-141, 145, 225.

⁶⁴ SJAC, OHP interview W. Egdoll.

⁶⁵ Collins, Aspects of Scottish Jewry, p. 27.

This failure was a result of the relatively weak financial position of the people in this area, who simply did not have the means to open a synagogue and employ clergy⁶⁶.

The decline of the congregations was at the time also seen as an indication of a growing laxity in religious observance. This view first became apparent in the 1920s⁶⁷. During the late 1920s the Jewish Echo frequently reported on the decline in synagogue attendance, often using alarmist expressions, like “deserted” or “empty” synagogues and “depleted membership”⁶⁸. What had happened, according to the editor of the Jewish Echo, Zevi Golombok, was that young people stayed away from the services⁶⁹. Other reasons which were mentioned for the decline of the synagogues in the Gorbals was the population movement from that neighbourhood to the suburbs and the growing competition between the synagogues for those worshippers who remained in the Gorbals, the disunity in Glasgow Jewry, and the attraction of secular activities. It was also thought that people stayed away because of the “slump” in trade and industry. Significantly, Rabbi Salis Daiches from Edinburgh mentioned “social barriers”, which kept people out of the synagogues, when he reviewed the situation in Glasgow for the Jewish Echo⁷⁰. He possibly meant that the middle-class leadership and high seat rents formed obstacles for working class Jews to come to the regular services (shortly after that Crosshill Synagogue was founded).

There was a parallel for this in the wider society where Christian observance was under pressure. The membership of the churches in Scotland stagnated, failing to increase in line with the growth of the population. People increasingly seemed to prefer material comforts and leisure activities which came within the reach of the masses, rather than church-going. Other ideologies, such as Socialism, and secular organisations absorbed the energy which had previously been devoted to religion. As a result church attendances started to drop in absolute numbers: while in the early 1910s most Scots still went to church on Sunday the same could not be said anymore of the 1930s, although most people counted themselves as a member of one of the religious groups⁷¹. Religious laxity was not simply apathy as was often believed at the time. Something similar happened in the Jewish population.

The decline of the congregations was usually illustrated by the drop in regular

⁶⁶ JE 6/12/1935. Unsuccessful attempts were made to establish a building fund.

⁶⁷ The Jewish Voice, number 1, July 1921, wrote “one finds the Synagogues empty”. See also number 3, September 1921.

⁶⁸ JE 6/1/1928, 21/12/1928, 2/8/1929, 21/9/1928.

⁶⁹ JE 2/8/1929, 12/2/1931 and 8/1/1937.

⁷⁰ JE 13/7/1928.

⁷¹ C. G. Brown, “Religion, Class and Church Growth”, in H.W. Fraser, R.J. Morris (ed.), People and Society in Scotland. Volume II, 1830-1914, Edinburgh, 1990, pp. 310-335; K.G. Robbins, The Eclipse of a Great Power. Modern Britain 1870-1975, London/New York, 1983, pp. 155, 248-251; A.J.P. Taylor, English History 1914-1945, Oxford, 1976 (reprint), pp. 168-169. See also chapter 3.

synagogue attendances. On the normal sabbath the synagogues remained empty, while they would be full on High Holy Days. The synagogue in South Portland Street was seen as an example of this. The realisation of this synagogue, which after a long search for an appropriate site and a period of preparation was eventually opened in 1901, had been an ambitious enterprise. The synagogue seems to have been intended to unite different groups on the South Side and provide accommodation for the minyanim. In May 1898, for example, a reunion had taken place between the Main Street synagogue and a group which had been meeting in Breadalbane Hall⁷² and in April 1900 the South Side branch of the United Synagogue received an application from one of the Gorbals' chevroth to share the place of worship in Main Street and bring in their Sifrei Torah (scrolls)⁷³. With several prayer groups still meeting in the Gorbals and others organising synagogue services on the Festivals in rented halls without the consent of the United Synagogue⁷⁴, the opening of a large synagogue must have been seen as a solution to the shortage of space as well as a possible end to the existence of minyanim and chevroth outside the United Synagogue.

During the 1890s, Glasgow Jewry went through a spell of rapid growth and most immigrants settled in the Gorbals. The envisaged synagogue, which would eventually have 1,000 seats, was meant to accommodate most of the growing Jewish population in the Gorbals. It was obvious at the time that the creation of such a large synagogue would put an enormous financial strain on the relatively weak shoulders of the South Side branch of the United Synagogue and this led to internal discussions about the necessity of a large synagogue.

A similar situation existed in London, where the East End had been the area where most Eastern European immigrants settled. There the United Synagogue, as in Glasgow the institution of the establishment of Anglo-Jewry, introduced a plan in the early 1890s to open a large and "properly conducted Synagogue" to replace many "unsuitable and insanitary places where they (the immigrants) now resort for Divine Worship"⁷⁵. The envisaged London East End synagogue would have 1,000 seats. The London plan met fierce opposition from those who favoured the growth of smaller synagogues and it had to be repeatedly revived, accompanied by other suggestions for social centres, provident societies and some rather paternalistic ideas as were expressed in a report in 1898 as follows:

"(...) the poor but honest, hardworking foreign Jew may realise that his Brother in faith in this country, while respecting his religious feelings, desires to extend to

⁷² Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 85.

⁷³ SJAC, Minute Book South Portland Street (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBSPS) 1/4/1900.

⁷⁴ SJAC, MBG 3/10/1897, MBSPS 22/8/1900.

⁷⁵ Quoted in Newman, The United Synagogue, p. 69.

him the helping hand of fellowship to enable him to raise his social position and establish himself and his family as worthy citizens of the country in which he had found shelter.”⁷⁶

A large and properly conducted synagogue was seen as a step in the direction of raising the social status and respectability of the immigrants.

What was immediately clear in Glasgow was that the South Side branch could not raise enough funds. The Garnethill congregation had to assist the South Siders financially, because of the continually rising building costs. Garnethill organised, for example, a bazaar with help from their non-Jewish friends. It should be noted, however, that the older settlers were only prepared to help once they had received the assurance that the envisaged synagogue's income would be enlarged by the increase of seat rent⁷⁷. Still more money was needed and only a loan of £4,000 from the coal and metal merchant Mark Cohen meant in the end that the plans could receive the go-ahead. Some South Siders still doubted the feasibility of the scheme, despite Cohen's loan⁷⁸, and in August 1900 their opposition led to the intervention of Michael Simons. A meeting was called, at which objections were raised about the extra “thousands” of pounds which would have to be raised, but finally the following was decided under Simons' pressure:

“(the) voice of the Meeting however was that if once the happy time came for the Glasgow Jewish Community (to b)uild a Synagogue they would like to have a proper place of Worship and attractiv(e) to its visitors and they would not like to see it spoiled for the sake of £1,000, and the(y) hop(e) the difficulty would not be so great to pay it up.”⁷⁹

The new place of worship in South Portland Street was appropriately called Great Synagogue.

Several groups in the United Synagogue were involved in the dispute about the new synagogue. Although it is not always exactly clear who belonged to which group, something can be said about the background of the groups and their aims. On the one hand were obviously the older settlers, like Simons, who were pressing for a prestigious building, which would attract independent groups and impress the non-

⁷⁶ Quoted in Newman, The United Synagogue, p. 72.

⁷⁷ SJAC, MBG 17/1/1897, 5/11/1899; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 85-87.

⁷⁸ SJAC, MBSPS 3/5/1900.

⁷⁹ SJAC, MBSPS 14/8/1900; compare SRA, D-OPW 19/17 and 19/18. On 17th May 1900 the congregation had submitted plans to the Dean of Court for the removal of the existing building in South Portland Street and erection of a Jewish place of worship, valued at £5,000. By comparison, plans submitted during the same year for Shawlands Cross Free Church (17/5/1900) and Govan Parish Church in Poldamie Road (6/12/1900), were valued at £9,000 and £6,000, making the synagogue a relatively cheaper building.

Jewish population. They might have been supporting some South Side leaders who opted for a large synagogue. What perhaps also played a role was the idea that more control over the immigrants could be exercised in a larger, more openly conducted synagogue where the organisation was in the hands of the establishment. The opposition came from those who were more cautious about the financial future and probably rejected a large synagogue because they preferred the atmosphere in the smaller places of worship, to which the immigrants might have been used to in Eastern Europe. This last group possibly also wanted to resist the tendency in the United Synagogue to replace smaller prayer and study meetings with large synagogue services. Instead they would most likely have wanted to spend the money on more traditional provisions like ritual baths and study rooms. The Simons-group won the dispute, but some provisions were made in the envisaged synagogue to accommodate the wishes of the last group.

The opening ceremony of the Great Synagogue reflected the ambition to gain respectability and civic pride which lay behind the creation of a large synagogue. Several dignitaries were invited to open the building, but the Chief Rabbi was ill, Lord Rothschild declined and Lord Provost Samuel Chisholm was unable to attend the opening. Leading Jews from the North Side had to do the honours and the Rev. E.P. Phillips of Garnethill conducted the consecration service. They must have looked down on the immigrants in the Gorbals, because when an appeal was made to raise money for the new building, it was decided that a circular was to be printed in English and “Jargon”, a rather derogatory term for Yiddish⁸⁰.

This outcome left the South Portland Street congregation with a financial burden for the future, which was not solved before 1939. The money problems also fuelled the rivalry between persons and groups within the South Side congregation. In May 1900, for example, Ellis Isaacs resigned as Treasurer when he felt insulted because a rival had been elected President and it was said that “a gentleman of ability should be elected”, implying that Isaacs was not a gentleman of ability⁸¹. The problems also contributed towards the collapse of the United Synagogue, because the supervision of that body did not make the administration of the synagogue any easier. In 1903, for example, the South Portland Street congregation reduced its membership fees, possibly to attract people who could not afford the earlier fees, and were told by Julius Pinto, Secretary of the United Synagogue, that it did not lie within their power to take such a step⁸². Such problems and grievances from both sides of the Clyde led to the end of the united body in 1906.

⁸⁰ SJAC, MBSPS 14/8/1901, 19/8/1901, 22/1/1902.

⁸¹ SJAC, MBSPS 3/5/1900; compare SJAC, MBG 7/11/1897, 19/12/1897. In 1897 Isaacs had taken up the post of Senior Warden when this rival had not accepted that post because of disputes concerning the acquisition of ground to build the new synagogue and an increase of the clergy's salaries.

⁸² SJAC, MBUSG 25/1/1903.

It had been hoped in 1900 that the Great Synagogue would eventually pay off its debts since it was expected to attract more people and, some ten years after the opening, this stage seemed to be coming nearer. During the 1910s the South Side synagogues in general went through a more prosperous phase, like Garnethill in the West End, profiting from the growth in Glasgow's Jewish population. In 1915 a new Beth Hamedrash (room or literally "house" for the study of the Jewish Law) was opened in the Great Synagogue with "no expense spared to equip it for Talmudic studies"⁸³. After the First World War, however, the decline started, coinciding with the general depressed economic conditions of the 1920s and 1930s. This might suggest a link between the financial position of the Great Synagogue and the economic circumstances. Obviously, the better-off members of the congregation left the slowly deteriorating Gorbals and moved to other suburbs where different congregations operated, while those who stayed might have been hit by the depression and could have been unable to donate large sums of money to their synagogue.

The increasingly more difficult position of all the synagogues in the Gorbals became a pressing problem during the 1930s. At first, attempts were made to form a united body on the South Side that could solve the problem⁸⁴, but a conference called to establish a United Synagogue Board of Glasgow in 1933 did not receive enough general support. During the following year the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council discussed plans for a possible amalgamation of synagogues in the Gorbals⁸⁵. In 1935 another conference was organised, which did meet and during which different opinions about a solution were expressed. Most representatives at this conference believed that the population movement to the suburbs had caused the decline in the Gorbals, but some suggested that this was not the only cause of the decline of the synagogues there and, without mentioning them, said that other reasons should be sought. The representative of the New Central Synagogue told the delegates that an "effort (should) be made to make every Jew in Glasgow a member of a synagogue" with fees at a modest level of 2 pence or 3 pence per week, suggesting that working-class Jews were leaving the congregations, while Jack Levine of Garnethill asked for an investigation to find out why some Jews were not members of a congregation⁸⁶. The conference resulted in further talks about the possible coordination of the synagogues' activities in the Gorbals, but these finally broke down shortly before the Second World War because none of the congregations was willing to close their place of worship in favour of another synagogue⁸⁷, which was seen as the only solution. Meanwhile, the Great

⁸³ Quoted in Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 200.

⁸⁴ SJAC, MBP 24/8/1933.

⁸⁵ SJAC, MBGJRC 30/4/1934.

⁸⁶ SJAC, MBGJRC 27/1/1935.

⁸⁷ SJAC, MBGJRC 23/3/1939.

Synagogue was suffering from growing debts and cuts had to be made. In 1939, the leaders of the Great Synagogue feared also that they would be forced to close its ritual baths and applied to other congregations for support for this traditionally important facility. On the eve of the Second World War, the Great Synagogue could no longer pay the interest on its debts⁸⁸.

No such financial worries were felt in the Queen's Park congregation, although there were some problems. This congregation had come into being in 1906 when their first minyan met in Battlefield Road. They were able to attract some successful businessmen who moved to the suburb, like Maurice Bloch who became a seatholder in 1909. The congregation met at first in a private flat, so plans had to be made for a synagogue building. Bloch, in 1909 not yet a very wealthy man, with financial backing from other members of the congregation founded a Building Fund. His first result was a temporary synagogue in Lochleven Road. The modest building, in later chronicles called "Tin Shul" after its corrugated metal roof, was opened in 1915 by David Heilbron (like Bloch involved in distillery and the wholesale of wine and spirits) and consecrated by the Rev. E. P. Phillips, both from Garnethill. The congregation at Garnethill felt associated with Queen's Park and offered its support. It is significant that such support was not given to the Langside congregation, which about this time also opened a synagogue in the area (at the corner of Queen Margaret Avenue and Langside Road). The Langsiders were possibly seen as local upstarts without the status of Queen's Park, while their synagogue might have been regarded as a competitor for the building in Lochleven Road. It is also possible that the Langsiders did not want Garnethill's support.

In 1912 it was estimated that the building of the synagogue in Lochleven Road would cost about £2,115, with accommodation for just over 400 worshippers⁸⁹. There would be additional costs for ground, roads, sewers and legal fees. The modesty of the building is usually attributed to the war circumstances and shortages⁹⁰, but it may well be that financial worries made the congregation decide for a temporary modest building with future plans for a new synagogue. After the war, the fundraising effort was renewed with, in the end, considerably better results. In 1927 a new building was opened, with an interior which like the Great Synagogue strongly resembled Garnethill synagogue⁹¹.

⁸⁸ SJAC, MBGJRC 22/6/1939; MBP 12/1/1939.

⁸⁹ SJAC, correspondence M. Bloch, A. Yuile and John Hamilton & Son. 11/6/1912-24/8/1912; compare SJAC, letter L. Karnovski to J. Bloch 18/2/1914. In 1914 the congregation had 74 members (an increase from 66 in 1909), living in Govanhill, Shawlands, Langside and Crosshill. There were two plans, for 451 or 466 seats.

⁹⁰ Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Jubilee Brochure (1956), p. 3; compare SJAC, Financial Statement and Report Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation 1915-1916. There were at the time 124 seatholders.

⁹¹ Williamson, Buildings of Scotland, Glasgow, p. 547. The architectural style of the synagogue is described here as Italian Romanesque and Venetian.

That it took almost ten years to raise the funds and two years to actually build the new synagogue are indications of a long and tiresome process and further suggest that the modesty of the "Tin Shul" might have been a result of financial shortages rather than war-time shortages of building materials. Obviously not all wealthy businessmen could afford large donations, because most of their money might have been tied up in their businesses, and it is likely that the financial situation which allowed for a new synagogue to be built, did not arise until the membership of the congregation had grown sufficiently. The growth of the membership had been significant during the 1920s. Their numbers rose from 80 in 1922 to about 300 in 1927⁹².

The opening ceremony of the new Queen's Park synagogue was performed by Maurice Bloch, who was by now becoming an important figure in Glasgow Jewry. Several Queen's Park members filled key positions in Jewish organisations in Glasgow, establishing a number of cultural societies too, and in effect Queen's Park became the leading congregation on the South Side. It was hardly a coincidence that the first official communal Rav of Glasgow, Rabbi Kopel Rosen MA, was inducted in Queen's Park synagogue in 1944. The growth of the Queen's Park synagogue and a few other suburban congregations was related to some of the losses in the Gorbals, but it did not completely compensate the decline in the Gorbals.

At about the same time as the new Queen's Park synagogue was opened, the other Langside congregation consecrated a new place of worship in Cromwell Road (Niddrie Road) which became known as the Langside synagogue. This building was less ambitious than the Queen's Park synagogue⁹³. In 1926 the congregation had submitted its building plans to the Dean of Guild Court, which were valued at £5,425, which makes the Langside synagogue a comparatively cheap building⁹⁴.

Another suburban synagogue was opened by the Pollokshields congregation, formed in 1929 in this well-to-do district. This group had initially serious difficulties in finding a minister and teacher for its Hebrew classes and found it hard to fill the vacancies on the lay leadership. Despite the expected wealth of its members, the

⁹² Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Jubilee Brochure, Glasgow (1956); compare Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 199-200. In 1956 Queen's Park had about six hundred members. The number of pupils in Queen's Park's Hebrew classes was 80 in 1909, growing to about one hundred in 1917, which indicate relatively small families with low numbers of children - another sign of the middle-class character of this congregation.

⁹³ Williamson, Buildings of Scotland. Glasgow, p. 548.

⁹⁴ SRA, D-OWP 19/31, 14/1/1926. Although no exact figures are available, it is believed that the Queen's Park synagogue might well have costed something like £20,000. By comparison, on 14th January 1926 plans were submitted for the Kinning Park Parish Church, valued at £2,047 and about half the size of the Langside synagogue, while on 6th May 1926 plans for the Mossbank Church at Ashkirk Drive, just over double the size of Langside synagogue, were estimated at £22, 676.

congregation was plagued by financial difficulties⁹⁵. It became obvious that these problems could not be solved without the greater involvement of the members and seatholders of the congregation. In order to stimulate this involvement, the executive allowed seatholders in 1930-1931 to become members, reversing a former and more exclusive decision that members were to be selected, and finally, in 1936, it was decided that all seatholders, who had rented a seat for three years and were not in arrears, would automatically become members⁹⁶. In 1932 Pollokshields counted at least 123 members⁹⁷, most of whom, however, did not participate in congregational affairs and meetings.

Although the total figure for the number of members and seatholders for all the synagogues in Glasgow during this period is not available (due to the lack of statistical material and cohesion in the use of both terms during the 1930s), it is possible to draw some conclusions out of the difficulties which the congregations encountered during the 1930s. First of all, it can be said that the feeling that the decline of the synagogues in the Gorbals was due only to the Jewish population movement out of this area, was not quite correct. Similar problems in the West End and in Pollokshields seem to indicate that another reason for the decline in the Gorbals had other reasons too which will be discussed in following chapters.

It would equally be wrong to relate dropping synagogue attendances and decline to social status. At the time, it was sometimes believed that religious laxity spread notably among the working classes, but the problems in middle class areas suggest that if people were becoming more irreligious, this was a more general phenomenon, which might possibly have been stronger among young people. In relation to the question of growing irreligiousness among the Jews, there is a parallel with the wider society, where Christian churches knew almost identical problems. When the editor of the Jewish Echo wrote about the religious decline which was similar among "Christian people"⁹⁸, this observation, reflected falling church attendances rather than a general religious crisis, and perhaps this was a sign of Jewish integration into a society in which in general religion was increasingly losing its prominent place in everyday life.

During the 1930s the synagogues were no longer the centre of Jewish life in Glasgow and their place was taken over by other Jewish institutions which might be labelled secular rather than religious as will be discussed below. The problems in Pollokshields to find lay leaders and to a lesser extent the difficulties of other South Side congregations, could suggest that the successful Jewish businessmen, whose

⁹⁵ SJAC, Minute Book Pollokshields Congregation (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBP) 3/11/1929, 15/1/1930, 19/11/1930.

⁹⁶ SJAC, MBP 8/12/1930, 25/11/1931, 29/11/1936.

⁹⁷ SJAC, MBP 21/6/1932.

⁹⁸ JE 17/5/1929.

predecessors had supported the synagogues at the turn of the century, had begun to look for positions in these secular organisations to provide them with a prominence in Glasgow Jewry which reflected their social success.

The success of a synagogue was often related to the position of its clergy, because a wealthy congregation could employ qualified and therefore more attractive clergymen. The congregations derived some of their status from the clergy which they employed. Isaac Bridge, for example, was referred to as Rev. in the records of the United Synagogue and the use of terms like Reverend (Rev.) or Minister, like the ministers in the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches, was possibly a result from the Chief Rabbi (in effect the nominal ecclesiastical head of all Jewish clergy in the United Kingdom) objecting to clergymen in Britain using the title rabbi, but may also be seen a sign of assimilation of British habits.

Originally, rabbis were the spiritual leaders of Jewish communities. They had no specific role in the synagogue service, their status rested on their Talmudic knowledge, and they acted as teachers and arbitrators in matters involving Jewish law. They received their authority (smicha) from learned rabbis after a lengthy period of study at a yeshiva or centre of advanced Jewish studies. The clergymen of the Garnethill congregation had their main task in the synagogue service and education, and were called minister. During the 19th century there was no yeshiva in Britain. A minister, normally addressed as Rev., had no rabbinical authority and could have been educated at Jews' College in England or had no training at all. Jews' College had come into being to provide Anglo-Jewry with gentlemen who would "be able, on the level educationally of their flock, to teach the essentials of their faith and knowledge to strengthen religious belief"; their knowledge had to be secular as well as religious⁹⁹.

The stipends of these ministers was rather low compared to the incomes of professional people, on average £200 to £250 per year, and candidates for the ministry usually came from the Jewish lower middle classes. At this time, the end of the 1870s, the congregations were administered by the upper middle classes and as a result, the status of the ministers was comparatively low with the lay leaders exercising a strong control over their clergy¹⁰⁰. According to a contemporary comment, the average minister was expected to preach during the synagogue service "simply, decently and in good English and not above the head of the congregants, to read the Law correctly, to assist in the reading of prayers, to engage in charitable work, to keep

⁹⁹ Newman, The United Synagogue, pp. 30-31.

¹⁰⁰ Newman, The United Synagogue, p. 55.

(account) books, render synagogue bills, and to be all things to all men.”¹⁰¹

A salary could also reflect the status of the clergy within the congregation. Compared to the power of the lay leaders, the influence of the clergy in congregational affairs was minimal during the years preceding 1880. The Glasgow Hebrew Congregation was too small to engage any but second-rate figures. When the congregation grew, it was able to offer higher salaries and attract better trained persons with more qualities. But the congregation was still headed by men who would hardly allow the clergy to interfere with their affairs. Only a determined person, like the Rev. E.P. Phillips, could make his influence be felt, but even his position was finally subordinate to the lay leadership. It was not until the arrival of Eastern European rabbis that the position of the clergy changed and their importance grew. During the 1930s a new orthodox religious leadership came into being in Glasgow.

Appropriately, the first recorded business of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation concerned the engagement of a Reader and lecturer, who would also serve as a teacher in the Hebrew classes and shochet¹⁰². Although this official combined several duties due to the smallness of the congregation, his main function was as Reader in the synagogue service, where he recited the text of the Law and the prayers, followed by the congregation. If capable, he might also give a small sermon.

The conduct of the service was traditionally in the hands of the lay leaders. In addition to a Reader they might employ a collector. Both men were no more than simple employees. In December 1858 the congregation suspended their Reader, when he was charged with using “bad and improper” language against the President of the congregation, who supervised his duties, and with not attending a Saturday morning service¹⁰³. He left eventually and his successor was Marks Alperovitch. The new Reader also ran into trouble. In October 1873 he was forced to write a letter to the members of the congregation, apologising publicly for “words and expressions” he had used towards their President after being rebuked or being told that his behaviour needed improvement. In this letter he curiously also gave his promise “henceforth never to taste wine or spirits of any kind in any other public house or privat(e) except my own”¹⁰⁴, indicating that he might have been rebuked for public drunkenness. The incident was possibly a result of the awakening wish of the members, whose

¹⁰¹ Quoted in Newman, The United Synagogue, p. 87; see also pp. 199-200. Between 1925 and 1952, 114 students entered Jews’ College, but over half of them did not enter the ministry. Reasons for this were the decline of religious enthusiasm, financial disadvantages and the lack of prestige. This caused clerical shortages.

¹⁰² SJAC, MBGHC 5/9/1858. The secretary spelled the word shochet as “showkat”, showing his unfamiliarity with the transcription of Hebrew into English.

¹⁰³ SJAC, MBGHC 16/12/1858, 2/3/1859. Shortly afterwards, one of the children of this Reader died and he resigned and left the city.

¹⁰⁴ SJAC, MBGHC 12/10/1873.

congregation and social status in general was growing, to have a more dignified clergyman - a feeling which grew stronger during the following decades.

The difficult relationship between Reader and lay leaders was further complicated by the financial situation of the congregation. In 1860 temporary financial problems led to the suggestion that the congregational expenditure could be reduced by cutting the Reader's salary¹⁰⁵. Two years later, when the finances had been put back in order and the synagogue was redecorated, the salary was increased. That a reduction was considered at all was clearly an expression of the low status of the official and this could not have improved the relationship.

Growing congregational income in 1870 allowed the employment of more clergy. Alperovitch became 1st Reader¹⁰⁶ and a vacancy for a 2nd Reader, who would on alternative days function in the service, act as shochet and assistant-collector and possibly take charge of a choir, was advertised in the Jewish Chronicle. The congregation stipulated that the 2nd Reader had to be a married man or had to marry within five months of his engagement, thus showing that they were looking for a man who had or was about to settle down in life and whose family responsibilities might prevent him from behaving improperly and risking his employment¹⁰⁷.

When Alperovitch retired, the congregation used this opportunity to find a man of higher standing. In 1878 the Rev. E.P. Phillips was elected as "Minister" of the congregation for an annual salary of £200¹⁰⁸. Phillips had come from Adelaide in Australia and being an English-speaker, he must have appealed to the Garnethill leadership. His colleague, the Rev. Isaac Levine (the 2nd Reader), who had been engaged shortly before Phillips' arrival, had been born in Eastern Europe and had

¹⁰⁵ SJAC, MBGHC 2/5/1860, 14/10/1860, 18/10/1860. Alperovitch initially refused to be re-engaged at a reduced salary, but finally accepted an offer on the condition that he could shed some of his teaching duties.

¹⁰⁶ SJAC, MBGHC 20/10/1874, 1/11/1875; Scottish Record Office, Census of Scotland, 1871. In 1874 Alperovitch was paid £59 per year, in 1875 he got £86. In 1871 he lived with his wife, 7 children and a servant in a flat adjoining the synagogue. His oldest son Harris, born in Russia, was a dealer in picture mouldings (later he acted also as shochet) which reflects the continuing low social status of the family.

¹⁰⁷ SJAC, MBGHC September-October 1870, October 1874, 8/11/1874, 24/2/1875. It proved rather difficult to find a suitable candidate for the salary which was offered and a 2nd Reader was not engaged until Isaac Levine was employed as such in 1875.

¹⁰⁸ SJAC, MBGHC 17/10/1878.

known a difficult start at Garnethill¹⁰⁹. Together they shared much more responsibilities than their predecessors in the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation, but neither of them held a position similar to that of a rabbi in Eastern Europe.

Not all the members of the congregation accepted the growing responsibilities of the clergy and Phillips had not been able to take up his post as early as had possibly been expected. This had probably been caused by an incident on the burial ground early in 1878, which involved a "Mr. Phillips". In February it was reported that Mr. Phillips had struck Mr. Michael, an official of the congregation who presided at the burial ground. It is not certain whether Mr. Phillips was the Rev. E.P. Phillips, but this seems likely, because Michael proposed to the members of the congregation that Phillips "be debarred from reading the Law" for 12 months. The leadership of the congregation said to recognise "the spirit which prompted Mr. Michael to forego insisting on the punishment of the offender," but successfully mounted pressure on Michael to withdraw his proposal¹¹⁰. The Rev. E.P. Phillips was not officially engaged until October 1878 after he had satisfactory^{ie} rendered his services during the High Holy Days¹¹¹ and possibly after he had been away from Glasgow for a period to give the heated atmosphere a chance to cool down. In the years to come, the Rev. Phillips established himself at Garnethill, became engaged in several charitable activities in the city and gained a considerable amount of influence, without, however, being able to nullify the domination of the lay leadership. An example of his position was the reprimand he received for becoming involved in the Slater-case, as discussed in chapter 1.

South Portland Street synagogue also had problems with the behaviour of their clergy. In 1899 the Rev. Abraham Cantor of the Great Synagogue, who had come from Sheffield in 1896 when he was engaged for the South Side branch synagogue in Gorbals' Main Street with financial help from Garnethill¹¹², was told to "keep up his dignity as a Minister of the Congregation"¹¹³. What was exactly meant by this remark is not clear from the records of the congregation, but Cantor had just been accused by members of

¹⁰⁹ JC 4/11/1921. His obituary credited him with obtaining a "Rabbinical Diploma" before reaching the age of 21. He was, however, never addressed as rabbi. Phillips wrote in his tribute that Levine had been "a man in every sense worthy of his high calling. Trained and nurtured from his earliest youth in that great Eastern nursery of Jewish life, thought and learning, he had all the qualities and qualifications, natural and acquired, to fit him for the efficient discharge of the manifold and onerous duties of his sacred office." Phillips' comment reflected their later position and self-esteem, rather than the situation in the 1870s. The following remark probably reflected the 19th century better: "The earlier years of his life were hard and strenuous, and obstructed by difficulties that should never have existed for him, but which he overcame and surmounted by his splendid spirit of patient endurance and perseverance, which, though often bent by bitter trials and experiences, was never broken."

¹¹⁰ SJAC, MBGHC 24/2/1878.

¹¹¹ SJAC, MBGHC 9/10/1878.

¹¹² SJAC, MBGHC 29/11/1896.

¹¹³ SJAC, MBSPS 3/12/1899, see also MBUSG 24/12/1899.

the congregation of trading in goods. Later, Cantor was repeatedly said to be involved in the sale of treife (not kosher) meat and it was alleged that he had dealt in false banknotes¹¹⁴. The minutes of the South Portland Street synagogue dismissed such rumours as a "lot of untrue stories". It is possible that the leadership of this synagogue was not prepared to dismiss their clergyman on such charges, but that continual accusations came from their members or seatholders which forced the issue or came from the leadership of the United Synagogue, the older settlers who wanted to cause the resignation of a minister, whom they regarded as unsuitable. It is possible that such accusations might not have been true, but were based on gossip or came from members who were dissatisfied with the laxness of the congregation's leadership with regard to their clergy. They helped, however, to increase the pressure on the South Portland Street clergy to conform to the wishes of the lay leadership. These wishes mostly concerned the conduct of the synagogue service. In 1900 it was felt that both Cantor and Bridge should be more punctual during the services. And when they failed during the following year to do so, they were threatened with a new rule in the congregation's constitution, which made it possible to dismiss clergymen who did not carry out their duties¹¹⁵. The rule was not put into effect immediately, because both parties were prepared to be reconciled, but the matter refused to die down.

In 1902 new allegations concerning Cantor were brought forward. This time it was the council of the United Synagogue that took the matter in hand and it became clear that the older settlers wanted to get rid of Cantor. The matter of the allegations was dropped because it was said there was no evidence to sustain the accusations, but a statement was made expressing the long standing dissatisfaction with Cantor's conduct. This made his position impossible and Cantor wrote a letter of resignation, which must have been rejected. Ironically, he was suspended for one month. Three months later, August 1902, Cantor was offered a sum of money (£150-£175) if he was prepared to "leave Glasgow at once and not to officiate here again", which he accepted in September¹¹⁶. All paid officials of the United Synagogue served in a very subordinate position. The shochetim of the Board of Shechita, for example, also had to obey the strict orders of the lay leaders or risk suspension¹¹⁷, which meant loss of income.

The resignation of Cantor was not only a matter of the congregational leaders

¹¹⁴ SJAC, MBSPS 30/3/1902; MBUSG 5/1/1902, 5/3/1902. One rumour was that Cantor had bought 30 stolen £5 banknotes for a total sum of £10.

¹¹⁵ SJAC, MBSPS 11/9/1900, 4/11/1900, 27/1/1901, 14/4/1901.

¹¹⁶ SJAC, MBUSG 12/5/1902, 20/5/1902, 6/8/1902, 9/9/1902, 9/9/1902, see also 2/11/1902. The offer showed the fear that Cantor might be engaged by a rival congregation in Glasgow and despite his acceptance, Cantor stayed in Glasgow for some time and practised as a shochet.

¹¹⁷ SJAC, MBUSG 28/5/1905. In 1905 shochet Jacob Bogdanski, who worked for dissenting butchers, was suspended without pay and "sent to the Beth Din, London, to be dealt with by Dr. Adler," the Chief Rabbi.

establishing their authority, but also showed a growing preference for English ministers at this time. In contrast with Phillips who came from Australia, Cantor was Eastern European and his English was probably not very good. When being called to explain his actions in a shechita dispute in 1900, Cantor asked permission to speak in Yiddish¹¹⁸. This strengthened the opposition against him. In 1901 the President of the South Portland Street congregation said about the possible appointment of a new minister: "The need was chiefly for the younger generation, and it would be but fitting that now they should have an English Minister, who should (worthily) represent their community"¹¹⁹.

The aspirations to have an English minister did not prevent members of the South Side congregation from consulting an Eastern European rabbi on religious matters. Rabbi Abraham Shyne had settled in Glasgow about the turn of the century and unlike the previously mentioned clergymen he was not associated with one synagogue. He gave advice and took decisions involving the interpretation of traditional Jewish law, on which subject the ministers of the congregations had no authority, and his role came close to the position rabbis held in Eastern Europe.

This made Shyne relatively independent. He was supported in his livelihood by donations and collections, and supervised, for example, shechita matters and granted divorces. He still had to reckon with the lay leadership and on several occasions had to follow their advice, as when he was warned not to grant divorces without involving a Scottish judicial court, which was illegal¹²⁰. Shyne, who spoke little English¹²¹, functioned as a communal rabbi on the South Side, where he was widely respected by the immigrants, without being appointed to that post.

Shyne's successor, Rabbi Samuel Hillman, had a similar position, although his connection with the congregations was stronger than Shyne's. In several respects Hillman's activity in Glasgow formed a transition from one period to another. He came from Russia. It was Hillman who issued the issur against a butcher during the shechita dispute, which was mentioned in chapter 1. And in 1911 he rebelled with other provincial rabbis against the authority of the Chief Rabbi¹²². Hillman and his provincial colleagues came from an Eastern European tradition of independent rabbis and were not prepared to accept the Chief Rabbi's authority and they also disagreed with some of the assimilated religious customs which had been approved or instigated

¹¹⁸ SJAC, MBUSG 21/10/1900, 25/11/1900.

¹¹⁹ SJAC, MBSPS 27/4/1901.

¹²⁰ SJAC, MBUSG 30/5/1905, 21/6/1905.

¹²¹ SJAC, MBSPS 21/10/1901. In 1901 he needed an interpreter to explain his views on the construction of the ritual baths to the architect of the South Portland Street synagogue.

¹²² Collins, second City Jewry, pp. 138-139; Gartner, The Jewish Immigrant in England, pp. 217-218; JC 10/3/1911, 17/3/1911. Hillman acted as secretary at their Leeds conference and made the closing speech.

by the Chief Rabbi. They certainly rejected a similar status as ministers of congregations who had been trained in England.

In 1912, when, following Adler's death, a new Chief Rabbi for Britain had to be elected, these provincial rabbis made several demands. They wished a wider delegation of the Chief Rabbi's powers and the formation of an advisory committee which had to assist the Chief Rabbi. Some rabbis saw no room at all for a Chief Rabbi because, according to their views, with which Hillman might have sympathised, experience in other countries had shown that where a Chief Rabbinate existed, orthodox Judaism had disappeared¹²³.

Although the rebellion and demands did not fundamentally influence the appointment of the Chief Rabbi, it showed the status of the rabbis in the immigrant communities in Britain, in which they wanted to preserve an Eastern European custom, and the growing immigrant influence on British Jewry in general. But Hillman was not a backward looking person. He played a significant role in Glasgow Jewish education and may have helped to carry out a change from Yiddish to English in educational practice¹²⁴. Eventually Hillman became a member of the Chief Rabbi's Beth Din in London, which acknowledged his erudition and marked the beginning of the merger of the Eastern European immigrant and the Anglo- Jewish cultures at that level.

The employment of Eastern European rabbis on the South Side came about when the congregations grew during and shortly after the First World War. Their growth gave them some financial power to engage such figures. The status of these rabbis went beyond that of the position of the ministers. At this time the function of the Reader in the synagogue changed. More and more, this position was filled by a traditionally trained chazan or Cantor, a professional who conducted the service, led prayers and musically recited the text of the Law, instead of the Readers at Garnethill who simply read the text. In some of the smaller immigrant synagogues on the South Side this task had been carried out by laymen who had learned to recite the text properly in Eastern Europe. The introduction of a professional chazan might have been seen as a return to the ways to which the immigrants had been used to in Eastern Europe, but in Glasgow it also served another purpose. On the eve of the First World War it was widely acknowledged¹²⁵ that a good chazan was able to attract more people to the synagogue services. By 1937 the Jewish Echo was able to write about the "cult of the chazanuth" when its editor commented as follows on a review in another paper about an "outstanding concert" of a visiting chazan:

¹²³ Newman, The United Synagogue, p. 98. The last group is said to have withheld their objections for the sake of peace in Anglo-Jewry and on the condition that the new Chief Rabbi would be strictly orthodox and a man of great Talmudic learning. Dr. Joseph Hertz was elected Chief Rabbi in 1913.

¹²⁴ See chapter 4; Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 138.

¹²⁵ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 139.

“People do not rush to the synagogue because it is a house of God, nor do they find time to visit it oftener because it is a house of prayer, but they crowd there and fill it in order to hear an ‘outstanding concert’.”¹²⁶

Following Hillman, Rabbi Jacob Lurie became the religious leader of Gorbals’ Jewry in 1916¹²⁷, but his status was lower than his predecessor. Several unsuccessful attempts were made to appoint him as communal rabbi, supervising all Jewish clergymen in the city, to form a rabbinical college or to elect a Chief Rabbi of Glasgow, which would give the whole of Glasgow Jewry more status and make Glasgow more independent from the Chief Rabbi in London. The initiative came from the South Side. Its failure was due to two factors. First of all, the immigrants were divided amongst themselves - which congregation would supply Glasgow’s spiritual leader? And secondly, the proposals met fierce opposition from Garnethill. Pinkus Levy, a successful businessman and house-owner who had joined the Garnethill congregation, said in 1919 that a communal Rav might be beneficial for the “smaller congregations”, but that he would not be prepared to accept the jurisdiction of such a rabbi over the whole city¹²⁸, obviously because this in effect would have meant subjecting Garnethill to immigrant supervision. In the early 1920s no such attempts were made. While the growing congregations had been financially strong enough to engage several highly qualified men, their decline reversed the trend.

Efforts were made to use the ministers to fight the decline of the congregations. Garnethill, for example, was looking for a minister, whose duties would include the attraction of younger members to the synagogue. This person would work in the congregation and stimulate its social life by visiting the members and seatholders of the congregation. In this, the congregation followed a contemporary trend in Scottish society where Protestant ministers had become organisers of social and sporting events as much as preachers¹²⁹. The Rev. E.P. Phillips could not be persuaded to do such parochial work. But when Phillips retired, the feeling was expressed that he should be succeeded by a dignified clergyman who would play a bigger role in congregational life to stimulate participation in the congregation’s activities¹³⁰.

The problem of Phillips’ succession dominated congregational life for several years and the way in which this problem was settled showed the growing immigrant influence in the Garnethill congregation. The leadership was looking for a minister who would do

¹²⁶ JE 12/11/1937.

¹²⁷ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 199.

¹²⁸ SJAC, MBG 26/1/1919, 23/2/1919, 2/3/1919.

¹²⁹ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, p. 212.

¹³⁰ SJAC, MBG 29/3/1925, 17/1/1927.

parochial work, accept some alterations to the synagogue service and at the same time accommodate their wishes for the re-introduction of some traditional rituals (the changes to synagogue ritual will be discussed in the following chapter). He had not to be too expensive and should be prepared to subject himself to their demands. It was still felt that the behaviour of the paid officials needed improvement and the shochet of the congregation, for example, was instructed to carry out his duties with the “decorum which his office demanded”¹³¹.

In 1925 Garnethill contracted with a more traditional chazan - the Rev. Isaac Hirshow, who came from the Chevra Kadisha which could obviously not compete with the Garnethill congregation when he was offered an annual salary of £500¹³². This engagement was intended to make the Garnethill services more attractive for traditional worshippers. When the Garnethill leaders learned in 1928 that the widely respected Nathan Morris MA, headmaster of the Talmud Torah on Glasgow’s South Side and the principal of the Glasgow Hebrew College, was said to be planning to leave the city when that College closed in the foreseeable future, he was considered as a successor of Phillips. At that time several suggestions for alterations in the service and the congregational Hebrew education facilities were made at Garnethill and Morris seemed the ideal man to carry out such changes. Initially a large majority of the members voted in favour of Morris, but after they had been told that Morris was ordered by the Chief Rabbi to go to Jews’ College for one month and to sit an exam for a “Certificate of Religious Fitness”, the required majority in the final election in 1929 in favour of his appointment fell short by just one vote¹³³.

As a result of this defeat, the Rev. M. Simmons from Cardiff was elected. Soon after his appointment Simmons came into conflict with the leadership of the congregation. Simmons refused to chant the law in a traditional way as was demanded and he also expressed his personal views on alterations in the service, for which he was rebuked¹³⁴. Instead of the re-introduction of traditional ritual, like the chanting of the law, Simmons unsuccessfully suggested the introduction of more English to replace Hebrew.

In 1931 the conflict reached a new stage when the congregation openly expressed their growing dissatisfaction with the minister. His sermons were said to be “often regrettable in taste”¹³⁵. Four out of five members agreed with a report which listed the complaints about the minister: from the modern subjects of his sermons (which Simmons allegedly published in a daily newspaper on the day preceding the sabbath service when he was supposed to deliver the sermons) to his not co-operating with the

¹³¹ SJAC, MBG 11/9/1927.

¹³² SJAC, MBG 7/10/1925, 1/11/1925.

¹³³ SJAC, MBG 28/10/1928, 18/11/1928, 16/12/1928, 28/1/1929.

¹³⁴ SJAC, MBG 1/12/1929, 5/12/1929.

¹³⁵ SJAC, MBG 29/3/1931.

education committee of the congregation and his personal hostility towards members of the congregation (possibly the leadership). Furthermore, Simmons had not visited the members of the congregation systematically as had been prescribed¹³⁶. Only a small group of members supported him.

It was not yet possible, however, to dismiss Simmons. In this hostile atmosphere the controversial minister was interrupted during one of his sermons early in 1932, which prompted him to write to the council: "I appreciate to the full whatever they (the council) do to dispel the calamitous impression that seems to have got abroad that I have outstayed my welcome at Garnethill."¹³⁷ It should in this context not be overlooked that Simmons probably acted under the influence of a report in 1927 which had suggested alterations to the synagogue service and had made his own adjustments, without realising that his position was not powerful enough to introduce alterations without the approval of the congregational leadership.

In May 1932 the general meeting of members voted against the renewal of Simmons' 3-year contract, curiously only six days after the minister had received a "call" from the relatively new Pollokshields synagogue¹³⁸. Something had obviously been brewing and during the next month Simmons was appointed in Pollokshields. Prior to his appointment there, Pollokshields had encountered difficulties in finding a minister and this congregation had unsuccessfully tried to win the synagogues in Queen's Park and Langside to the idea of the appointment of a joint- minister for three congregations¹³⁹.

Garnethill had to find a new minister. As they were no longer able to offer a very attractive salary¹⁴⁰, only recent graduates from Jews' College could be considered as candidates for the post. In 1935 Rabbi Penkower from New York was interviewed, but although he seemed to be prepared to accept the salary on offer, he refused to conduct the synagogue service and rather wished to serve as a spiritual leader of the congregation, which made him unacceptable. Instead, the Rev. Dr I.K. Cosgrove was elected in November 1934¹⁴¹. During the following years Cosgrove was able to build a reputation for himself in Glasgow and due to his strong personality and seemingly

¹³⁶ SJAC, MBG 16/6/1931.

¹³⁷ SJAC, MBG 3/4/1932.

¹³⁸ SJAC, MBG 8/5/1932; MBP 2/5/1932.

¹³⁹ SJAC, MBP 2/5/1932. All three congregations in the southern suburbs were believed to have had similar problems in finding clergy. In their search for a minister, Pollokshields had started very ambitiously. The vacancy was initially advertised in the Jewish Chronicle with an expressed preference for somebody with a "Rabbinical Diploma". When they did not receive any applications, this reference was dropped in the second advertisement. That probably did not bring any results either, which explains why the Pollokshields executive turned their attention to Simmons, who was still under contract at Garnethill, although his difficult position there must have been widely known.

¹⁴⁰ SJAC, MBG 18/1/1933.

¹⁴¹ SJAC, MBG September-October 1934, 8/11/1934.

endless activity his status rose above that of a minister who only worked within his congregation.

Simmons, meanwhile, ran into problems in his new congregation. They started when he made alterations in the Friday night service in Pollokshields synagogue, possibly by ending the service in English instead of Hebrew. This caused an incident. He was warned that he did not conduct the service on strictly orthodox lines and that any alterations had to be approved beforehand by the council. Almost repeating the exercise at Garnethill, Simmons complained in a following sermon about the council questioning his orthodoxy¹⁴².

In general Simmons proved a difficult person to deal with and the conflict, not surprisingly, surfaced when his contract came up for renewal. He was told by the council that he did not have the support of the members and was asked to consider his resignation. A stalemate situation developed: Simmons refused to go voluntarily and public embarrassment and the impossibility of finding a replacement ruled out his dismissal. Maurice Bloch intervened and explained to the members in 1936 that although a minister was normally engaged for life, in this situation a further 3-year period was "definitely in the interest of the congregation (seeing) the undercurrent of dissatisfaction"¹⁴³. In the end, Simmons was re-engaged for three years, but received a strongly worded warning that a repetition of unsatisfactory behaviour (irregularity in teaching, outrageous behaviour and insulting officials had been mentioned) could harm the congregation and would not be in his "own interest"¹⁴⁴.

One of the reasons for maintaining Simmons was certainly the pride which the relatively small congregation must have felt in having their own minister. Similar feelings were expressed when a member enquired whether the minister should be designed as "Rav" or "Reverend" and when the congregation asked the Glasgow Beth Din to invite Simmons to join their college. Eventually the sharp differences in Pollokshields were smoothed over, because Simmons was asked to accept a permanent position and was appointed subsequently at an annual salary of £450 in February 1939¹⁴⁵.

In general the status of Glasgow clergy dropped during the 1930s with the decline in synagogue attendances and the financial difficulties of the congregations. Where these problems were worst the ministers probably suffered most. According to the Jewish Echo, the clergy of the South Portland Street synagogue was not treated in a "commendable manner"¹⁴⁶. Still, some rabbis were impressive figures. A man like

¹⁴² SJAC, MBP 3/12/1933, 24/12/1933, 14/1/1934.

¹⁴³ SJAC, MBP 17/2/1936.

¹⁴⁴ SJAC, MBP 16/12/1936.

¹⁴⁵ SJAC, MBP 13/4/1937, 24/12/1933, 19/2/1939.

¹⁴⁶ JE 21/8/1928.

Rabbi Lurie of the Chevra Kadisha was known as “an excellent Baal Tefilah, and the traditional style of his rendering of the services (on High Holy Days) is admired by everyone.”¹⁴⁷ Notably, the emphasis in this tribute is laid on his conduct of synagogue ritual rather than learning. A new style of rabbi had been introduced in Glasgow: rather like a blend of the old rabbi and the Anglo-Jewish minister. Its ideal type had been described by the Dreamer of the Ghetto in 1921 as follows:

“The Rav was on the pulpit expounding a text in a manner which everyone, young and old, understood and appreciated. He was a tall, impressive man, with a reverend countenance that commanded respect and admiration. He spoke in clear, lucid tones, and his voice was of that soft musical quality which at once pleases and convinces. He concluded his sermon, and all left enlightened and instructed.”¹⁴⁸

A decade later, most congregations in Glasgow could hardly afford to engage such a figure and even the congregations that did, found it difficult to keep such able men in their employment. In 1938 the rabbi of Queen's Park synagogue, who was described as an “ideal modern Jewish minister”¹⁴⁹ left for London, where he could better his position. The British capital and its institutions, like the Jewish communities in the USA, were able to attract distinguished rabbis, most congregations on Glasgow's South Side employed persons who had recently acquired their smicha in Eastern Europe and after 1933 they were joined by rabbis who had fled from the Nazi-occupation of the Continent.

The activities of the struggling congregations were increasingly organised by a declining and aging group of men and an occasional woman. In 1938 the Jewish Echo paid tribute to Daniel Rosenbloom of the New Central Synagogue (formerly Beth Hamedrash Hagodol): “It is entirely due to such men as Mr. Rosenbloom that the congregation has been able, since its inception, to carry on its affairs with such success, despite (...) considerable financial difficulties”. The occasion for this tribute was the re- consecration of the New Central Synagogue in Hospital Street on 4th September 1938, which ceremony was to be directly followed by the celebration of Rosenbloom's golden wedding. Rosenbloom was praised as the founder of the Beth Hamedrash Hagodol in 1902 and it was reported that he was still “one of its staunchest and most active workers” when the synagogue moved to the site in Hospital Street in 1925, where he “energetically” supervised the building, “aided” by his son Sam Rosenbloom JP, who was Treasurer of the Building Fund. In May 1938 the redecorating of the synagogue began with the leaders of the congregation reportedly supervising the work in person and instructing the workmen, for example, how to

¹⁴⁷ JE 21/9/1928.

¹⁴⁸ The Jewish Voice, number 3, September 1921.

¹⁴⁹ JE 25/3/1938.

erect the Bimah (Readers' desk). Accordingly, the Jewish Echo also paid tribute the work of these leaders, who were said to be "always in the forefront"¹⁵⁰ of things.

By this time such tributes were customary. The administration of all Glasgow's synagogues was in the hands of a small number of families, like the Rosenblooms of the New Central Synagogue, who took pride in such affairs and the standing of the lay leaders in the congregations gave them a status in Glasgow Jewry which had to be acknowledged in the Jewish press. These positions might of course bring such families in conflict with others, who felt themselves to be denied such posts. Family rivalry had been as old as the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation, as was shown in the conflicts between the Davis and Michaels families in the early 1830s.

Traditionally in Glasgow, the honorary offices in the congregations were contested by the most successful businessmen and entrepreneurs. These men obviously attached great value to such functions, and in general the loss of status symbols, like the more prominent seats in the synagogue, was not easily accepted. Quarrels about this had also started before the 1880s. In October 1860, for example, J. Cohen complained in a letter about the then Treasurer Benjamin Simons "having insulted his wife (Mrs. Cohen) in requesting her to remove into another seat in the synagogue out of the one she considered she was entitled to"¹⁵¹.

The men who filled the honorary offices also paid for most of the upkeep of the synagogues or guaranteed loans, like the Trustees of Garnethill. In return the most active and the most paying members of the congregation received ceremonial titles and privileges, and their memory was honoured in ritual artefacts, plaques and rooms in the synagogue. On occasions such men, like Rosenbloom in 1902, left their congregations to start their own groups and open their own synagogues, where in time they were honoured.

After the First World War this situation slowly changed and the enthusiasm for the executive offices in the congregations waned. The congregations on the South Side had been led by immigrants, who also supplied some leaders for Garnethill, but when they died the second generation failed to fill the gaps. Queen's Park flourished, but Pollokshields, for example, had for a while serious problems in finding members who were prepared to take up executive posts, despite the fact that the Pollokshields congregation did not lack successful businessmen in its membership. Obviously these men had favoured other organisations in which they took leading positions.

The congregations also came under attack from critics, one of whom was Lewis Rifkind who wrote during the 1930s that honorary officers in synagogues needed only one qualification, namely "an expensive seat in the synagogue, and a free hand and open

¹⁵⁰ JE 2/9/1938.

¹⁵¹ SJAC, MBGHC 7/10/1860. The executive resolved that Simons had been right to do so.

pocket to help balance the budget.” No piety or consciousness were required and with their ceremony and decorative services, the synagogues had become dummies of Jewish life¹⁵².

There were several secular organisations which attracted non-religious Jews. Most noteworthy in Glasgow had been the rapid growth of the friendly societies or mutual aid groups. The first Jewish friendly society in Glasgow had been formed in 1886 by a group of tailors¹⁵³, to be followed by numerous other self-help groups. There were dozens of Jewish friendly societies in Glasgow: in 1928, for example, at least twenty of such groups reported their activities in the Jewish Echo, and among them were organisations with colourful names, like the “Judas Maccabeus Beacon of the Order of Ancient Maccabeans” or the “Dr. Adler and Rabbi Shyne Lodge no. 70 of the Grand Order of Israel”. These friendly societies were mainly self-help groups created by immigrants and they existed next to organisations founded by the older settlers, like the Glasgow Hebrew Benevolent Loan Society and the Jewish Board of Guardians. In addition, there were numerous Zionist groups, who also offered their leaders some status in the Jewish population, these will be discussed in chapter 6.

Unlike the synagogues, the secular groups were able to attract non-religious Jews and their total membership quickly outnumbered the synagogue seatholders. The largest mutual aid organisation was the Glasgow Hebrew Public Burial Society, which in the autumn of 1913 was also the largest Jewish organisation in Glasgow with 993 members. Most of its members lived on the South Side, in the East End and on the north bank of the Clyde, south of Argyle Street. They paid weekly amounts from 1 pence upwards and in contrast to the synagogues, the Burial Society claimed that it would take care of the burial of the poor “which we are at all times ready to take”¹⁵⁴.

The friendly societies took over responsibilities which had previously belonged to the congregations, like poor relief and the burial of the poor. Although these groups, like the Burial Society, remained for a while working class in character, they provided honorary positions attractive for ambitious men, with their own rituals and offices. These groups were followed by new institutions, like the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council and Jewish Institute which became a centre of Jewish life in Glasgow during the 1930s. These organisations and institutions started to absorb the activity of many successful businessmen.

Like the older settlers in England, Garnethill initially dominated the immigrant institutions in Glasgow. This created conflicts and relatively early the older settlers

¹⁵² Lewis Rifkind (Commemorative volume), pp. 73-74.

¹⁵³ JC 29/1/1897. See further chapter 5.

¹⁵⁴ SJAC, Financial Statement Glasgow Hebrew Public Burial Society 1912-1913. In 1913 the Treasurer of this Society, Joseph Hallside, became president of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, which shows the communal importance of the Society.

gave up their attempts to control the immigrant congregations. It should also be noted, however, that during the early years of the 20th century only one out of every ten Jews in Glasgow rented a seat in one of the synagogues which was controlled by the older settlers or the congregations associated with Garnethill. The congregation of the older settlers itself was more or less taken over by immigrants after the First World War.

In their striving for respectability and civic acceptability the congregation of the older settlers had built an impressive synagogue at Garnethill, respectable without being too extravagant and well adapted to its non-Jewish environment. This synagogue was also meant to attract the Jews of the city to the services. At the time when the relation between older settlers and immigrants was dominated by the first group and the congregations were growing, the South Siders were encouraged to build similar places of worship. In later years, the running costs and maintenance of these synagogues provided the congregations with a heavy financial burden.

The congregations tried to improve their status by the appointment of their clergy. The older settlers also encouraged the immigrant congregations to employ English speaking clergy rather than Eastern European rabbis. In this, however, they were not so successful. The South Side congregations derived their status from the Eastern European rabbis and later from the chazanim, while the new congregations in the suburbs sought to employ men who combined the qualities of the rabbis and the British ministers. This, with the appointment of Simmons, Cosgrove and Goodman, heralded the rise of a modern orthodox religious leadership.

The ongoing decline of the congregations during the 1930s was not as was sometimes believed a result of religious laxity spreading among the working classes. The problems in middle class areas suggest that if people were becoming more irreligious, this was a more general phenomenon, which might possibly have been stronger among young people. During the 1930s the synagogues were no longer the centre of Jewish life in Glasgow. The following chapter will show how people were altering their religious habits and lifestyle as the society in which they lived was changing.

Chapter 3: Changes in religious ritual and lifestyle

Jewish congregational life in Scotland during the 1930s no longer resembled the situation in 19th century Eastern Europe. Did this mean that Judaism was in decline? The fact that synagogues were only filled to their capacity on High Holy Days was not an indication of this. Jews do not have a duty to go to synagogue¹. The immigrants were settling in an environment which differed very much from Eastern Europe. Less time was available to go to the synagogue. For many, the economic necessity of working on Saturday made it impossible to attend a religious service on the sabbath. The children who grew up in Scotland, had little or no notion of the way of life in Eastern Europe and did not feel the same urge to go to synagogue as their ancestors may have felt.

Scottish society itself was changing. A new urban social system came into being during the 19th century, based on competition, self reliance and status derived from accomplishments rather than inheritance. Scottish evangelicalism provided a framework of response to the challenges of the new system. In Britain church dogma was weakening during the 20th century, but this had little immediate results before 1939. The society remained Christian in morality². There was some decline in church attendance as a result of the preference of material comforts and the pursuit of leisure activities, but prior to the Second World War the erosion of general religious life in Scotland was limited. Churchmen nevertheless voiced loud concerns about the decline of religious habits and the dangers of modern liberties, pastimes and materialism³. The reaction to modernity, however, did not consist of orthodox hell fire raising alone; alterations were made in religious ritual and parish life, following the changed needs of the church members. Sermons, for example, were shortened, organs were introduced to accompany hymn-singing, and parishes started social, cultural and leisure clubs⁴. Did something similar take place in the Jewish population? Brown writes that incoming religions in Scotland after 1780 in general felt a need to adapt their liturgies to suit native inclinations and customs⁵, the question is whether this was also the case with Judaism.

The changes in religious habits and lifestyle in Glasgow Jewry can also be reviewed in the wider context of British Jewry. According to the Jewish Chronicle the norm by

¹ Compare JE 1/6/1928, 21/9/1928 for this idea.

² Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, p. 136; Robbins, The Eclipse of a Great Power, pp. 154-156; Smout, A Century of the Scottish People, pp. 181-208; Taylor, English History 1914-1945, pp. 168-169.

³ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, pp. 20, 63, 85-87, 209.

⁴ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, pp. 5-17, 90, 138, 147, 178.

⁵ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, p. 7.

1879 was to worship on sabbath and Holidays, but no longer on weekdays⁶. At this time, that is before the mass influx of immigrants from Eastern Europe, Anglo-Jewry as a whole tended towards nominal adherence to Judaism, limited to religious marriage and burial and synagogue attendance on the High Holy Days, like New Year and Day of Atonement⁷. Jewish religious leaders in England, guided by Chief Rabbi Hermann Adler, introduced changes in religious ritual which can be associated with religious practices in general society and which accommodated the changing needs of the members of their congregations. Simeon Singer, for example, the minister of the New West End congregation in London, produced a prayerbook for the United Synagogue with new prayers which could be associated with Christian rites de passage. The Eastern European immigrants objected to these changes, but change was not limited to the older settlers. Gartner⁸ writes that on the eve of the First World War the main currents in Jewish immigrant life in England with regard to religious habits and lifestyle were adaptation of English culture and secularisation, with a decline of Yiddish after 1914. Krausz⁹ writes that in their response to modernity, Jewish religious leaders formulated a new moral code, which still divided Jews from their non-Jewish environment and stimulated cohesion within the Jewish group. Similar developments took place in Glasgow.

During the 20th century new ideologies became available and organisations other than the congregations started to attract growing numbers of people. Although these ideologies and organisations competed with religion and the congregations, they did not necessarily separate people from Judaism. Zionism, as will be discussed in chapter 6, had a religious background and proved to be a binding force among Jews in Glasgow, including those who did not go to synagogue anymore. At the same time the immigrants founded self-help groups like the friendly societies and the Hebrew Burial Society, to be reviewed in chapter 5. These groups helped the immigrants to settle in Glasgow. Education, which was also very influential in this process, will be discussed in chapter 4. This chapter will concentrate on changes in religious habits and aspects of lifestyle.

The building of the new synagogue at Garnethill was itself a result of changes in religious habits and lifestyle of the Jews in Glasgow. The services in the synagogue were adapted too. One of the most significant changes was the introduction of a choir. This was not without controversy and the attention paid to the situation of the choir in

⁶ JC 12/9/1879.

⁷ Lipman, A History of the Jews in England, p. 93; compare Brown, A Social History of Religion in Scotland, pp. 20-23, 209, 250-251. Lipman writes that Anglo-Jewry in this generally resembled the churchgoing Victorian middle-class environment. Recent research shows, however, that Victorian middle-class churchgoing in Scotland was not yet declining as fast as Lipman presumes.

⁸ Gartner, The Jewish Immigrant in England, pp. 268-269.

⁹ Krausz, Leeds Jewry, p. 104.

the building plans of Garnethill synagogue shows the concern of the members of the congregation over this subject. The first mention of a choir was made in September 1872 when a committee was elected from the leadership to look into the desirability of such an institution¹⁰. The suggestion to introduce a choir might have come from a member who had recently arrived in the city, from somebody who was still in contact with family and friends in England or on the Continent, where choirs already served in synagogue services, or from a member who frequently travelled to these places, which was not uncommon. The suggestion could also have been an effort to copy Christian ways of communal worship - unlike synagogues, most churches traditionally employed choirs. In any case, the Garnethill committee felt that a choir was desirable and in March 1873 £40 was raised for the maintenance of a choir¹¹. Regulations were drawn up: the choir had to practice at least once per week and they were to be conducted by a choir master who received an annual stipend of £15. The rest of the money would be used to stimulate a harmonious performance. Each choir member received an annual sum of money, subject to proper behaviour and regular attendance, and financial awards of 10 shillings and 20 shillings were promised to those who attended most regularly¹².

The establishment of a choir met opposition and this grew when ladies were to participate in the choir. The change could have been suggested to give women a larger share in the synagogue service, traditionally their main role in religion was limited to the household, or they might have been invited because there was a shortage of suitable male voices. The introduction of prominent female voices would give the service a new character. This was resisted and dismay was openly expressed from 1879, leading in March 1881 to the resignation of the whole choir. During the next year an attempt was made to establish a new choir, the seat rents went up by fifteen per cent to finance this¹³, but a compromise on the question of female participation was not found until 1897, when the boys of the choir were situated in a choir box in the gallery, above and behind the Reader's desk, and ladies would be induced and trained to take part in the choral portions of the service and would receive seats in the gallery adjacent to the choir box, from where they could easily see the choir master. Thus the choir could be heard but not seen by the male worshippers in the area of the synagogue. It was said that a similar situation had been a custom in a London synagogue and carried the Chief

¹⁰ SJAC, MBGHC September-October 1872.

¹¹ SJAC, MBGHC 23/3/1873.

¹² SJAC, MBGHC 23/11/1873.

¹³ SJAC, MBGHC 6/4/1879, 3/3/1881, 2/1/1882.

Rabbi's approval¹⁴.

The introduction of the choir was meant to give the service more decorum. Traditionally, during communal worship the members of the congregation said or chanted the prayers at their own pace, which obviously caused a rather unharmonious service. During choral services this could be regulated, which gave the officials of the congregation an opportunity to conduct the service. The wish for a more decorous service was clearly an attempt to adapt to British ways of worship, like those that were practised in churches.

The opponents of a mixed choir were generally adherents of the more traditional form of Jewish worship. They resisted the move towards a greater involvement of women in the synagogue service, which was seen as a break with orthodox Judaism, but they also used their opposition to object to the new way in which the service was conducted. Not surprisingly, similar misgivings about choral services came from the immigrant groups on Glasgow's South Side. In 1901 the Garnethill choir was to sing at the consecration of the Great Synagogue in South Portland Street. Although the South Side President warned his congregation not to offend the members of Garnethill who had made the arrangements for the consecration service, the largely immigrant membership in South Portland Street objected to a mixed choir¹⁵. The immigrants felt no need for a degree of decorum which had been unknown in Eastern Europe. An attempt to organise a choir for South Portland Street, after the clergy of that synagogue were said to have been unable or was unwilling to form a choir, met fierce opposition¹⁶. Not all immigrants, however, were against change and, likewise, not all the older settlers and their descendants favoured alterations to synagogue ritual. Emanuel Cohen, grandson of the first Jewish settler in Glasgow, for example resisted changes at Garnethill¹⁷.

The advocates of change had another reason for wanting to stimulate seemliness. The executive saw the adaptation of religious ritual as a way to induce more people to go to the synagogue. The new building at Garnethill had failed to attract large regular attendances and it became increasingly difficult to hold daily prayer meetings and the traditional service at the start of the sabbath on Friday evening, for which a quorum of ten adult men was needed. In order to hold daily services for those members who

¹⁴ SJAC, MBG 7/3/1897; compare MBG April 1899, 22/10/1899, May 1902, Choir Committee's Report 1935. The problem of finding suitable voices for the Garnethill choir remained a problem for a long period. In 1890 a Hebrew Choral Society had been formed with the sole function of assisting in the Garnethill services. Appeals to wives and daughters of members to join the choir were suggested and rejected, and later the congregation unsuccessfully tried to induce South Side boys to take part in the choir by advertising vacancies at 2 shillings per week. In 1935 the choir was still said to be in a "state of flux".

¹⁵ SJAC, MBSPS 26/3/1901.

¹⁶ SJAC, MBSPS 27/4/1901.

¹⁷ SJAC, MBGHC 5/3/1882.

wished to attend them, for example, because they wanted to say the required prayers for the dead, different ways were sought to acquire a quorum. One of the suggested but unsuccessful measures stated that able bodied men would only receive poor relief from the Philanthropic Society if they attended the “minion” at Garnethill¹⁸.

Most members and seatholders at Garnethill attended the sabbath service on Saturday morning, but that did not fill the synagogue. The leaders of the congregation therefore advocated changes to this service. It was believed that by giving the service more decorum, a stricter routine and a set time-table, people would be attracted to come to the synagogue. It had been realised at the time of planning of the new synagogue building that the site in Hill Street on Garnethill would be too far away for a large number of Jews who lived near the Clyde, but the distance to the synagogue was not regarded as the main problem, at least not openly. What the leadership overlooked was that people living further away might prefer private prayer meetings, as were held on the South Side, and also the fact that people might be forced to work on Saturdays was initially neglected.

Several changes were made to synagogue rituals. In April 1874 new rules abolished the practice of money offerings during the reading of the scrolls, which in the eyes of the leadership amounted to a public sale of certain honours, and the custom of the duchan was cancelled¹⁹. The duchan was the blessing which was traditionally recited at Festivals by the cohanim, the descendants of the Temple priests. There were several possible reasons for abolishing this blessing. People might have lost the knowledge of the exact words of the blessing or the proper way to recite it, causing an embarrassing display which the leaders of the congregation wanted to prevent. It could also have become difficult to establish whether anybody could rightfully claim to be a descendant from the Temple priests; the name Cohen suggested but did certainly not guarantee this. Others looked upon the tradition as a remnant from the past, unfitting in modern times²⁰. And unlike the honours given to members of the congregation who had rendered special services or distinguished themselves, the duchan was limited to certain families and could not be administered by the leadership of the congregation, which might also explain their wish to abolish it. This proposed change met traditionalist opposition, but although it was suggested by the opposition that the duchan could take

¹⁸ SJAC, MBGHC 17/4/1887, 13/11/1887.

¹⁹ SJAC, MBGHC 19/4/1874.

²⁰ Compare D. Daiches, Was. A pastime from time past, Glasgow, 1990 (paperback edition), p. 107. Daiches describes how in his youth (1920s) special seats in the synagogue in Edinburgh were reserved for the cohanim, which he resented because he felt that none of them could have been direct descendants from the original cohen Aaron, adding that his father, Rabbi Salis Daiches, must have had similar ideas without ever being explicit about it. Salis Daiches was an orthodox rabbi who tried to reconcile traditional Judaism with modern secular culture. This could create doubts about some traditional rituals although the rabbi would not discuss his doubts. His son felt that the “purely ritual aspects of (the original Law) were surely concessions to primitive frailty.”

place with the cohanim simply repeating the words of the blessing after an official had said them, the custom seems to have gone out of use²¹.

The discussion about the duchan suggests two things. First, it seems as if such matters were settled by the establishment of the congregation. In 1882, however, a discussion amongst the members about a resolution on modification of rituals sanctioned or initiated by the Chief Rabbi was adjourned to consult the larger body of the seatholders²². This could imply that the leadership wanted to involve the whole congregation in this matter, but it is equally possible that the discussion was adjourned to overcome opposition or to delay the matter in the hope that opposition would dwindle. In most cases, the available evidence would lead to the conclusion that at this stage changes were discussed and adopted by the members rather than the seatholders of the congregation.

Secondly, the duchan controversy shows that changes were initially only adopted for the special services on Holy Days, to be followed later by changes in the regular services. Changes tried to alter and minimise, for example, length and alleged monotonous character of services. In 1897 Adolph Schoenfeld declared that the service for the Festival of the Rejoicing of the Law which takes place on the completion of the annual reading of the scrolls, had become monotonous because too many men were called upon to read the Law. He proposed that only the boys were to be called who had celebrated their bar mitzvah during the previous year²³. Another adaptation was to have the Prayer for the Royal Family to be read in English instead of Hebrew by the officiating minister and on a further occasion the ministers were urged to perfect the reading of the Law²⁴.

Subsequently, the ministers were asked to improve the sabbath service. The Rev. Isaac Levine made some suggestions in 1900 concerning the use which could be made of the choir and the adherence to a stricter time-table. The daily morning service was on Saturdays to last from 9 to 10am, to be followed after a break of 15 minutes, by the main sabbath service which would not last longer than 12 o'clock. To enforce propriety, nobody would be allowed to enter the synagogue during the main service until the scrolls had been taken from the ark and placed on the Reader's desk. Previously, latecomers had disrupted this solemn ceremony, causing frequent complaints²⁵.

²¹ SJAC, MBG 9/11/1902. It is possible that the duchan was re-introduced a month after the 1874 decision, in the form as mentioned above, but in 1902 the blessing was certainly out of order. A motion tabled during the annual general meeting in that year to re-introduce the blessing was lost, with 14 votes against and 9 votes in favour of the duchan.

²² SJAC, MBGHC 5/3/1882.

²³ SJAC, MBG 26/12/1897.

²⁴ SJAC, MBG 23/4/1899, 30/4/1899.

²⁵ SJAC, MBG 25/3/1900, 13/5/1900, 14/6/1900.

These changes did not help. Regular attendances were said to have dropped further. The capacity of Garnethill was brought back to 178 ladies' seats and 213 men's seats, but the majority of these seats remained empty during the regular sabbath service. A "Service Improvement Committee" was formed, which reported in December 1901. Although its precise findings are unknown, it is certain that it was generally felt that its suggestions went too far. Only several recommendations of the report were adopted: greater emphasis was to be put on punctuality, the congregation would stand when the ministers left their places and went to and from the ark, some psalms would be sung in English rather than Hebrew, and improvements were to be made to the performance of the choir²⁶.

A year later it was realised that such adaptations did not lead to growing regular attendances and for several years the number of seatholders at Garnethill also declined, causing financial difficulties because of the loss of seat rent²⁷. The number of seatholders started to increase again after 1906, due to the influx of immigrants into the West End, but regular attendances did not rise significantly. The demand for further changes grew stronger. Requests were made for the incorporation of more English instead of Hebrew. It was suggested that parts of the service could be omitted and on the eve of the First World War a claim was made that only a much shorter service would induce more people to come to the synagogue²⁸. However, as the demand for changes grew, the opposition to changes became stronger too. This opposition was re-inforced by immigrants who recently joined the congregation and who, rather than accepting further changes, wanted a return to traditional ways of worship. On the eve of the war and during the First World War some of these immigrants, like Isaac Speculand, were making their way into the leadership of the congregation and while doing so, they tried to re-introduce synagogue ritual to which they had been used to in Eastern Europe and on Glasgow's South Side. In April 1909 they unsuccessfully attempted to return to the tradition of the duchan²⁹. The rise of the immigrants at Garnethill, who hoped that a return to traditional practices rather than further change would attract more people, resulted in a struggle between opponents and supporters of change which would last for almost a decade.

The opponents of change or traditionalists contested the idea that the length and the

²⁶ SJAC, MBG 22/12/1901.

²⁷ SJAC, MBG 7/12/1902, 25/10/1907, 8/12/1907; compare SJAC, MBG 15/9/1907. An incident in the autumn of 1907 shows the growing attraction of forbidden pursuits on the sabbath when the Rev. Phillips refused to invite the theology student Ephraim Levine to preach in the synagogue because he "had been seen emerging from a tearoom on a Saturday afternoon."

²⁸ SJAC, MBG 11/4/1909, September 1909, 26/12/1909, 27/2/1910, 12/2/1911, 9/11/1913.

²⁹ SJAC, MBG 11/4/1909, 24/10/1909; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 196-197. The motion to re-introduce the duchan was defeated in April 1909 by a 4-23 vote, but six months later a similar motion won 16 votes with 21 against.

style of the service kept people away. They said that people did not come “to be entertained” and that Judaism meant self-denial³⁰. The basis of their argument was that if you did not accept the whole body of regulations, as laid down in Jewish law (Torah and Talmud), and selected only what you fancied and threw the rest overboard, Judaism would disappear. The supporters of change maintained that the length of the service was out of step with modern reality and that this would drive people away. Bertie Heilbron, who noted that the congregation “was drifting back spiritually”³¹, became the spokesman of the supporters of change. He said that people were not able to come to the synagogue because they “had unavoidably to attend business on Saturdays, and the length of the Service kept these people away from attending.”³²

For a while the opponents of change seem to have gained the upper hand, without being able to dominate the congregation. No significant alterations were made to the service until the mid-1920s. In 1922 the traditionalists scored a small victory when the addition of the Amida was re-introduced³³. The Amida was a devotional prayer which was to be recited, standing, at all services. It was rather long and after the congregation had recited the prayer, the Reader would repeat the words. During the repetition there was a chance that some worshippers would use the opportunity to start chattering loudly³⁴, which could not have done the decorum of the service much good and might have been the reason for the earlier omission of the prayer. It was not until later, in 1937, that an attempt was made in Glasgow to shorten the prayer. In that year, the Rev. M.S. Simmons, by now minister of the Pollokshields congregation, propagated an abridged version of the Amida “for those who have not the strength to prolong prayer.”³⁵

Meanwhile at Garnethill, the supporters of change also had some reason for celebration. In May 1919 Bertie Heilbron proposed to allow women to become members of the congregation and to be admitted on committees. His motion to change the rules of the congregation to this effect initially failed to gain the required two-thirds majority, but at the end of the year the motion was carried. A provision was made, however, that ladies would “not (be) eligible for the offices of Senior and Junior

³⁰ SJAC, MBG 9/11/1913.

³¹ SJAC, MBG 7/4/1912.

³² SJAC, MBG 9/11/1913.

³³ SJAC, MBG 14/5/1922. Again the argument was that the inclusion of a formerly abolished tradition would improve the service and attract people.

³⁴ Compare Daiches, Two Worlds. An Edinburgh Jewish Childhood, Edinburgh, 1987 (reprint), p. 121. Daiches, writing about the 1920s, calls the Amida an important prayer, despite the chattering, which would suggest that the Edinburgh congregation shared the views of the traditionalists at Garnethill or could indicate, as he makes this observation in retrospect, that most Jews in Scotland eventually arrived at that point of view.

³⁵ JE 8/1/1937.

Warden”³⁶, meaning that they would be unable to conduct the services.

This decision was obviously influenced by changes in society in general, where as a result of the First World War women started to operate in roles from which they had hitherto been excluded³⁷. Such changes, however, were not necessarily permanent and at Garnethill women were only reluctantly allowed to take part in the proceedings or did so hesitatingly. The first female members, present at meetings, were mostly relatives or wives of some executive and council members, and it was not until 1925 that a woman was elected onto a committee - the education committee which dealt with an activity of the congregation in which women as teachers of young children already participated³⁸. Nevertheless, by that time the Garnethill members saw themselves proudly as pioneers of women’s rights. In 1926, following a reported article in the Jewish Chronicle which stated that a congregation in Birmingham had taken an initiative to grant women membership and electoral rights, the Garnethill executive decided to send a letter to the editor of the Chronicle to inform his readers that years ago their congregation had already admitted ladies as members and elected them onto the council³⁹.

The greater involvement of women at Garnethill was also part of another development, which would eventually bring further changes. This concerned the social life within the congregation and new measures which were aimed at stimulating the interest of the members in the affairs of Garnethill. During the years following the First World War, the members of the congregation in general moved further away into the West End and Hyndland. As described in the previous chapter, it was suggested in 1920 that the clergy and elder members could be asked to visit the members in the West End on a regular basis and to move some of the Hebrew classes to Hyndland. The

³⁶ SJAC, MBG 18/5/1919, 27/12/1919. This was obviously a burning issue as some seventy members attended the general meetings, substantially more than usual. The mention of the offices of Senior and Junior Warden implies that the Garnethill congregation had already copied a practice from the immigrant congregations on the South Side, namely that the conduct of the services had been allocated to special officials (the Wardens, on the South Side called Parnass and Gabai) and was no longer in the hands of those who administered the congregation (President, Treasurer and Secretary). The change at Garnethill probably took place shortly before 1912 (SJAC, Garnethill Souvenir Jubilee Brochure, 1929). Until 1908 the Treasurer also functioned as a Junior Warden in the synagogue service, but in that year Bertie Heilbron is said to have declined the office of Junior Warden when he was elected Treasurer. When Heilbron retired in 1912 and was succeeded by Ben Strump, the offices remained separated.

³⁷ K.G. Robbins, The First World War, Oxford, 1985 (paperback edition), pp. 161-162.

³⁸ SJAC, MBG 29/11/1925.

³⁹ SJAC, MBG 21/11/1926; compare SJAC, Garnethill Souvenir Jubilee Brochure (1929) and Minute Book Garnethill Synagogue Women’s Guild 21/6/1948, 20/9/1948, 1/11/1948. There is, however, no evidence for the last claim. By 1929 there was one woman on the council. A Women’s Guild which was later formed at Garnethill, organising social events such as card afternoons and collecting money for the synagogue and for German-Jewish refugees, often felt rather neglected by the (male) leadership of the congregation and on more than one occasion threatened to disband itself.

suggestion, however, aroused little enthusiasm⁴⁰. More needed to be done and the continuing lack of commitment in the West End resulted in 1925 in the adoption of a motion to investigate the “causes of, and remedies for the apathy of the members in the congregational services and work”⁴¹. A commission was appointed, headed by Dr. Noah Morris who had proposed the motion.

Morris symbolised the combination of a successful secular scholar and traditional Jew. At the time of the motion he held the appointment of Professor of Physiology at Anderson’s College, an extra-mural medical school in Glasgow (as mentioned before, in 1937 he would be appointed to the Regius Chair of Materia Medica at the University of Glasgow⁴²). Morris was also Chairman of the Glasgow Hebrew College, founded in 1923⁴³. The Morris investigation, lasting for almost two years, heard traditionalists and supporters of change. In 1927 the commission published a report, offering a wide range of suggestions⁴⁴ which in effect tried to reconcile traditional Judaism with modern Scottish society.

On the synagogue service, the report suggested the introduction of more music and possibly an organ, while the choir should be put on a more professional footing⁴⁵. Furthermore, it was felt that the subjects of sermons should be more diverse and could also be delivered by laymen. To stimulate interest in the service, it was suggested that Jewish law, customs and ritual should be explained to the members of the congregation - an indication that knowledge of Jewish tradition in general was disappearing and that the committee had decided to tackle that problem, not by changing the service any further, but by enlightening the worshippers.

With regard to educational matters, the report contained several suggestions which highlight the problems of the congregation. More attention should be paid to boys who were past the bar mitzvah age and to girls older than 13 years of age. The problem did not seem to lie with younger boys who traditionally were taught Jewish subjects, especially Hebrew and Jewish history, in order to prepare them for the bar mitzvah ceremony, but with older boys and girls. In general, it was noted that the subject matter of the Hebrew classes needed to be updated, more attention was asked for post-Biblical history because a “great majority of our people being ignorant of any Jewish history between (the) disruption of the Jewish Nation (in the Roman era) and its

⁴⁰ SJAC, MBG 20/2/1920, 23/6/1920. With regard to the removal of the Hebrew classes, for example, two hundred notices were sent out, but it was reported that only 16 people replied as requested.

⁴¹ SJAC, MBG 17/5/1925.

⁴² Collins, Go and Learn, pp 85-86; Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 245.

⁴³ SJAC, Talmud Torah Jubilee Brochure, p. 15.

⁴⁴ SJAC, Printed report in MBG The report was first discussed at a special general meeting on 17/1/1927.

⁴⁵ See also SJAC, MBG 15/5/1927. The recently appointed chazan, the Rev. Hirshow, would undertake this task. While the introduction of more music into the service went clearly against orthodox beliefs, some committee members only expressed reservations about female participation in the choir.

present position in the world.”⁴⁶

The commission had reached the conclusion that social life within the congregation had to be stimulated. The synagogue should become a communal centre and the report suggested, for example, that boy scouts and girl guides could establish a centre at Garnethill (recently a group of Jewish scouts had been formed). Although it was given a modern form, such suggestions returned to the traditional status of the synagogue as a house of gathering as well as a place of communal worship. In addition, the ministers should regularly visit the members of the congregation, not primarily to teach them, but for social purposes.

It appears that no vote was taken on the recommendations of the report and it was never officially adopted, which could have been caused by a still growing demand to return to traditional rituals and opposition to change, but during the following years some of the ideas were put into practice. Some of these suggestions, however, could not be adopted without the cooperation of the ministers of the congregation. The report was related to the appointment of a new minister who would succeed the Rev. E.P. Phillips. Like the main author of the report, Noah Morris, the new minister had to be prepared to reconcile traditional Judaism with the modern world. Furthermore, the congregation wanted an English speaker and he should therefore be trained in Britain. He had to be prepared to play a stimulating role in education and the social life of the congregation. In addition, he had to be a diplomat as he had to reckon with a growing group of members who favoured a return to traditional synagogue ritual.

The ideal successor to Phillips, at least in the eyes of the majority of the executive, was not elected. That man was Nathan Morris, headmaster of the Talmud Torah and the principal of Glasgow's Hebrew College. He failed, however, to gain the required number of votes among the members of the congregation. The new man in the post, as was discussed before, the Rev. Simmons, had a difficult time at Garnethill. In 1929 the members expressed a “general desire” to return to the traditional way of singing of the law instead of reading, but Simmons refused⁴⁷. The minister was also not prepared to shorten the length of his sermons to twenty minutes as requested, and adding insult to injury, started to express his personal opinions on the congregation and delicate religious matters from the pulpit, which aroused outspoken protests⁴⁸.

Instead of following the call to return to traditional rituals, Simmons offered some suggestions to change the service by introducing new elements. He proposed that the Friday evening service, which he called “gloomy”, should be held at a fixed time later in the evening rather than the customary time near sunset, and that in addition to the

⁴⁶ SJAC, MBG 17/1/1927.

⁴⁷ SJAC, MBG 24/11/1929, 1/12/1929.

⁴⁸ SJAC, MBG 5/12/1929.

Saturday service, which suffered from absenteeism, a weekday service should be held “which even the most busy could attend”⁴⁹. Traditionalists could not have overlooked that in effect Simmons thereby gave his blessing to those who desecrated the sabbath by working on Saturdays. On educational matters, Simmons also proposed something new. He suggested starting a “confirmation” class for older girls. Such a class went a step further than the proposed education for older girls in the 1927 Morris report. It did not only mean a departure of the traditional practice of limiting advanced Jewish learning to boys, but the “confirmation” (as in Christian confirmation) would give girls almost a status similar to boys who had their bar mitzvah ceremony. In addition boys and possibly girls would have a special sabbath afternoon service and a study circle with lectures in English rather than in Hebrew.

These proposals were discussed at three well attended general meetings⁵⁰. As an agreement on these matters seemed far away and the opposition made the minister's position rather difficult, the leaders of the congregation twice met Simmons in between these meetings to reach a compromise. They formulated an agreement whereby the duties of the minister were outlined and some of his wishes granted. It was agreed that Simmons would start visiting the members of the congregation regularly. Nothing came of his ideas for an alternative to the sabbath service, but in order to help the members to take a “more intelligent interest”, Simmons was allowed to introduce more English into the service. It was stipulated that this should not interfere with strict orthodoxy and could be modified from time to time. The minister could also set up a post-bar mitzvah class for boys and a “confirmation” class for girls, although the proposed status of the last was not accepted (a bat chayil ceremony for girls which was similar to the bar mitzvah of boys was not instituted in Glasgow until after the Second World War).

Despite this agreement, the opposition against Simmons grew; the matter of his refusal to sing the law in a traditional way surfaced again, and his position at Garnethill became impossible. In March 1931 he knew that he had lost the support of the executive when he learned that he would have to leave Garnethill when his three year contract ran out⁵¹. He did not let it come to that. Before his contract expired, Simmons had left the congregation.

Simmons' departure marked the end of the attempts to change synagogue ritual at Garnethill. In later years some minor adjustments were made, but Garnethill was to

⁴⁹ SJAC, MBG 19/10/1930.

⁵⁰ SJAC, MBG 16/11/1930, 23/11/1930, 7/12/1930. There are no records for the meeting of 23rd November. The other two meetings were attended by respectively 86 and 92 members, which enabled the secretary to remark about the “renaissance in Jewish activities generally, as well as in the social life of the community.”

⁵¹ SJAC, MBG 29/3/1931.

remain a synagogue with a traditional way of worship. Although most of the previous alterations had been motivated by the argument that these would attract more people to the regular services, some changes had been made to adjust Jewish ritual to religious practices which prevailed in general society. The introduction of a choir, English instead of Hebrew and what was regarded as being a more decorous form of worship were examples of acculturation to British customs and habits. Some of these changes can be seen as the influence of the Reform movement in Judaism.

The Reform movement had started during the first decades of the 19th century in Germany, where it had tried to adapt Judaism to modern society and to give German Jewry an image which would favour the political emancipation and the social acceptability of Jews. Reform Judaism questioned the rabbinical tradition or Talmudic basis of Jewish customs (the Talmud or oral law was an addition to the Torah or the law which Moses had received from God; although the Talmud had been formulated by rabbis, for orthodox Jews it still had a divine character because it had been inspired by God), it favoured assimilatory changes in synagogue ritual, and later started to doubt the divine character of the Torah on the basis of modern historical and Biblical criticism. It would hold that if certain practices which seemed to distinguish Jews from other citizens could be attributed to superstition or medieval customs, their abolition was acceptable. During the 1840s the Reform movement made some inroads in Britain, but initially it did not spread widely and did not have such a radical character as in Germany and the USA⁵². At the beginning of the 20th century a Liberal movement was established in Britain, which was more radical than Reform Judaism as it went further in its rejection of the Talmud and it came closer to Christianity.

Early Reform congregations in Britain were established in London (1840) and Manchester (1856), where their foundation had taken place amidst conflicts and schisms in the local Jewish communities. Reform Jews remained a minority. On the whole during the years before the mass influx of Eastern European immigrants, British Jewry occupied an orthodox middle ground between strict or ultra-orthodoxy and Reform. This did not mean that no changes were made. Partly in response to the Reform challenge and partly in an effort to adapt themselves to the British environment, most congregations had embarked on a programme of change sanctioned by the Chief Rabbi by the 1880s. This involved building larger and more respectable synagogues, increasing efficiency of their administration, adjusting synagogue ritual, and setting up agencies designed to stimulate social and occupational integration of their members and seatholders⁵³. In Glasgow this programme was well under way as is shown by the institution of more decorum at Garnethill - the introduction of the choir

⁵² Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, p. 7; Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, p. 249.

⁵³ Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, p. 37.

and English, the omission of certain prayers, the abolition of traditional honours, the cancellation of the allocation of special honours in return for financial offerings during the synagogue service and the trend to remove occasions for noisy interruptions of the service.

Some changes at Garnethill suggest that the Reform-movement had reached Glasgow by the early 1880s. These changes went beyond the orthodox programme of adjustment and did contravene orthodox rabbinic codes. Female voices, for example, as mentioned above were introduced in the choir while this was still forbidden by Chief Rabbi Hermann Adler⁵⁴. These changes had been favoured by the leaders of the congregation, but it is difficult to say whether they were supporters of the Reform- movement. Outspoken sympathy for Reform could lead to sharp resistance and would have undermined their authority. Alterations of synagogue ritual met opposition and caused some violent demonstrations in Garnethill synagogue⁵⁵. Reformers therefore had to be careful and it took some time before they could openly admit their support for the movement.

In 1899, however, Adolph Schoenfeld declared himself to be “neither orthodox, nor ultra-orthodox, but (...) rather a reformer in many things.”⁵⁶ It appears that Reformers were to be found in the establishment of the congregation, but that the leadership was divided. In 1909, Claude Montefiore, the leader of Liberal Judaism in Britain, was invited to address a meeting of the Glasgow Jewish Literary Society and on that occasion chairman Michael Simons introduced the speaker as follows:

“A number of Jews were drifting hopelessly, helplessly away from their religion into Agnosticism, Atheism and Christianity, and the tendency to drift was growing stronger each successive year. Mr. Montefiore wished to stop them by a net which he called Liberal Judaism. Mr. Montefiore used the phrase ‘Our Judaism’, but he had not proved that he had any.”⁵⁷

Simons represented the mainstream of orthodox Jews in Glasgow who no longer regarded the adherents of Reform and Liberal Judaism as practising Jews.

Despite that attitude, many of the changes at Garnethill towards a shorter, more decorous service, which would be largely conducted in English, before the First World War can be seen as the Reform movement gaining a foothold in Glasgow. It seems as if Bertie Heilbron’s suggestions, as described above, might have been aimed at this.

⁵⁴ Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, p. 92. Compare Glasgow Evening Citizen 30/8/1910.

⁵⁵ JC 9/9/1881, 10/7/1914; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 40-41, 134- 135. In 1913 a physical confrontation in the synagogue during the High Holidays reportedly led to a Police Court action. Unfortunately the report does not give any further details.

⁵⁶ SJAC, MBG 3/12/1899.

⁵⁷ JC 24/12/1909; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 135.

Immediately after the war⁵⁸, the supporters of change continued their efforts to steer the congregation in a direction which would have led to Reform, but during the 1920s their influence diminished rapidly. The Morris investigation of the late 1920s heard the opinions of those who were said to favour Reform, but the report did not really represent a further attempt towards Reform. The departure of Simmons showed that the Reformists at Garnethill had been defeated.

Outside the membership of Garnethill synagogue, the Reform movement found little support in Glasgow. The editor of the Jewish Echo expressed an orthodox point of view when he wrote in 1928 that Reform was the road to ruin: by stimulating assimilation and encouraging people to reject the Jewish heritage it created Jewish "antisemitism"⁵⁹. The evidence suggests that the majority of his readers did not feel differently. All Glasgow congregations remained orthodox. In 1931 a meeting of the Glasgow lodge of B'nai B'rith, a Jewish organisation which paid much attention to modern secular thought, listened politely to the Rev. M.L. Perlzweig MA who spoke about the Reform movement, but moved decidedly that they supported "orthodoxy as against reform"⁶⁰. The Glasgow Beth Din, the local rabbinical court, anxiously prevented any step towards Reform, even if it was taken outside the city. When, for example, it was reported in the Jewish Echo that an Edinburgh synagogue was planning to omit the duchan with the consent of the local minister, the Beth Din reacted furiously. It was said that such a measure ran counter to God's word⁶¹. Any step off the traditional ritual path was condemned as being against the text or spirit of the Torah. In the case of the duchan, the Beth Din accompanied their condemnation with a sneer at Garnethill.

When a Reform congregation was established in Glasgow in 1931, it was not at Garnethill but in the Govanhill district. This congregation, the Progressive Synagogue, remained small, although its membership grew with the arrival of refugees from Germany after 1933. The Progressive Synagogue had great difficulties in joining communal organisations. In 1933, for example, the New Central Synagogue objected to correspondence between the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council and the Progressive Synagogue, because the orthodox did not want to regard the Progressive congregation as a Jewish organisation (eventually, they joined the Council), and similarly the Reform congregation was barred from the communal Board of Shechita⁶².

The failure of the Reform movement at Garnethill can be largely attributed to the

⁵⁸ JC 26/12/1919; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 209.

⁵⁹ JE 30/3/1928.

⁶⁰ JE 23/1/1931.

⁶¹ JE 18/11/1932, 9/12/1932; compare Daiches, Was, A pastime from time past, p. 107. This minister in Edinburgh might have been Rabbi Salis Daiches. See above.

⁶² MBGJRC 18/1/1933, 7/10/1934.

presence of a large number of immigrants who had joined that congregation, bringing their adherence to orthodox Judaism with them from Eastern Europe and quickly outnumbering the supporters of change after the First World War. After their defeat the Reformers from Garnethill did not form an independent congregation as could have been expected, and in this respect Glasgow differed from London and Manchester where Reform congregations had been founded during the 19th century by the supporters of change after similar struggles. Because of the lack of evidence, there can only be speculation about the reason why this did not happen in Glasgow. It may be that the supporters of change remained within the congregation because they did not want to give up the little influence they had left. Perhaps these events took place too late in Glasgow, half a century later than in England, and perhaps the number of Reformers in Glasgow was too small and they lacked the enthusiasm and stamina which was needed to form an independent organisation. Perhaps the circumstances in Scotland differed too much from England. In London and Manchester the Reform movement had been carried by merchants of German-Jewish origin, who formed part of relatively large German immigrant communities⁶³. In Manchester in particular⁶⁴, the foundation of a Reform congregation had been stimulated by the ties of these former German Jews with the local German community. The founders of the Manchester Reform congregation, while seeking social acceptability from non-Jews, had assimilated quickly into general society; their cultural and social aspirations and pretensions as much as the religious beliefs which they had brought with them from Germany lay at the foundation of the Manchester Reform congregation. In Glasgow these stimulants do not seem to have been strong enough to induce men like Schoenfeld and Heilbron, who both had their origins in Germany, to persevere and eventually their families moved away from Glasgow or drifted away from Judaism⁶⁵. Another reason why the Garnethill supporters of change did not establish an independent congregation could have been that the differences between the Reformers and the majority of the other members were not large enough to justify secession. And, furthermore, Glasgow was a relatively small city compared to London; in Scotland people lived closer together which perhaps made the need to compromise greater.

On the South Side of Glasgow, Garnethill had gained the reputation of being an "englisher shul" - despite the re-introduction of some traditional rituals, Garnethill was looked upon by the immigrants as the synagogue of assimilated Jews. The chazan Rev. Isaac Hirshow, who in 1925 moved from the Chevra Kadisha in the Gorbals to Garnethill, in 1950 remembered his appointment in the West End as follows:

⁶³ Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, p. 23.

⁶⁴ Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, pp. 259- 260.

⁶⁵ The actress Vivien Heilbron, for example, is a great-granddaughter of Bertie Heilbron's father, David Heilbron.

"Passers-by turned their heads and looked at the windows (of his home at 6 Abbotsford Place on the South Side). Some stopped to look into the windows: a host of friends, well-wishers and advisors kept on coming and going (...) One of my advisors, who was dead against my leaving Chevrah Kaddishah, and was openly agitating that an official protest from the Synagogue be sent to Garnethill, tried to persuade me against taking this most risky step, and says: 'Think twice, Mr. Hirshow, before you do it. What sort of Yidden are there in Garnethill, anyway? They cannot even speak Yiddish!' Another says: 'You know, to make a success there, I am afraid, you would have to take your beard off.' And a third says '(...) Garnethill does not need a Chazan.'"

(...) At the very outset one cardinal question was, by mutual agreement, tacitly admitted as settled: You let me have my beard, and I let you have your English."⁶⁶

Hirshow made an amazing step. The style of worship at Garnethill, as described by a correspondent of the Jewish Echo in 1928, distinguished itself from the other synagogues in Glasgow by its "scrupulous order keeping and punctuality" and an "atmosphere of respect and awe. (The) excessive mannerism prevailing at that Synagogue does not appeal too much to the average Jew who likes a little emotion in his prayers."⁶⁷

The difference between Garnethill and the other Glasgow orthodox synagogues showed itself in a more formal way of worship and initially also in the professions of its members. Before the Second World War there were more professional people and more university graduates at Garnethill (the University of Glasgow was situated in the catchment area of the synagogue) than among the members of the other congregations in Glasgow. After the Second World War these differences would somewhat diminish, but they had important consequences. The results were a constant rivalry between the minister at Garnethill and the South Side rabbis and the involvement of the West End congregation in what became known as the "Jacobs affair".

The epitaph "englisher shul" certainly reflected the choice of clergy at Garnethill. The unfortunate Simmons was succeeded by the Rev. Dr. I.K. Cosgrove who had been trained in England. Cosgrove wanted to bring the two worlds of traditional Judaism and modern secular society together, very much like his colleague Rabbi Salis Daiches who tried this in Edinburgh. After settling in at Garnethill during the 1930s, he won the confidence of his congregation and tried to establish himself as a leading figure in Glasgow Jewry. This brought Cosgrove into conflict with the South Side rabbis who by and large came from Eastern Europe.

⁶⁶ SJAC, Speech given by Rev. I. Hirshow MA BMus. on the occasion of his Twenty-fifth Anniversary as Reader at Garnethill Synagogue Glasgow; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 210; JE 8/12/1950. In fact, as shown on photographs, his beard was neatly trimmed.

⁶⁷ JE 21/9/1928.

Cosgrove's main rival was Rabbi Dr. Wolf Gottlieb of Queen's Park Synagogue⁶⁸. The differences between the two men are described as follows by Rabbi Jeremy Rosen, a former minister of Giffnock and Newlands Synagogue:

"Dr Cosgrove represented (...) the branch of Judaism that thought if it were to ape the Church of Scotland this would find favour in the eyes of the non-Jewish world. So Dr Cosgrove wore a dog collar."⁶⁹

Despite prejudices and resentment which are echoed in this statement, it observes correctly what separated the two rivals. Gottlieb, coming from a scholarly Continental background which had been virtually destroyed by the Nazis, was fighting very hard to maintain in Scotland what he regarded as the only correct form of Judaism. Cosgrove, on his part, saw need for adjustment while holding on to traditional Jewish law. The rivalry between Cosgrove and Gottlieb also had its roots in the earlier days of the difficult relations between the older settlers at Garnethill and the immigrant groups on the South Side, but the days when the immigrants looked up to Garnethill had gone.

Personal vanity also played its role, but on the whole the rivalry was a matter of competence. In matters of conversion, for example, the Glasgow Beth Din which consisted of the South Side rabbis and was guided by the London Beth Din of the Chief Rabbi (at that time Israel Brodie⁷⁰), had started to take a stricter line after the Second World War. As a result of war circumstances, when young people were away from home and had many opportunities to find non-Jewish partners, the number of mixed marriages in Britain as a whole had increased. Non-Jewish partners had the option of conversion to Judaism, but Britain's orthodox leaders followed by the Glasgow Beth Din disputed the sincerity of many converts, especially when it appeared that the reason for conversion was matrimonial. This could lead to the conversion being revoked. The new policy caused some resentment at Garnethill, where Cosgrove had sanctioned these conversions (which possibly had occurred more often among the in

⁶⁸ For Gottlieb's appointment see Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Golden Jubilee Brochure (1927-1977) and Queen's Park Jubilee Brochure (1956). Gottlieb was appointed in Queen's Park in 1950, where he followed Kopul Rosen who had been communal rabbi during the 1940s and Rabbi I. Goodman who came from the USA during the early 1930s and served before Rosen as minister of Queen's Park. The 1977 brochure names Goodman as the "first minister", this must be a mistake because the congregation had in 1906 appointed Mordechai Katz from Cardiff as their minister. Katz served for at least nine years; after him this congregation had several Eastern Europeans who, however, only served as Readers. According to local folklore, Goodman introduced the silk prayer shawl in Queen's Park. This prayer shawl was much smaller than the woollen prayer shawls in which the immigrants draped themselves, and was worn like a scarf. The silk prayer shawl became quickly fashionable at Garnethill too, while Daiches remembers it as being worn by some worshippers, notably the assimilated ones, in Edinburgh (Daiches, Was. A pastime of Time Past, p. 32).

⁶⁹ JE 8/2/1991.

⁷⁰ Compare Daiches, Was. A pastime of Time Past, pp. 53-54. Earlier a similar deep, but unspoken rivalry had existed between Rabbi Salis Daiches and the then Chief Rabbi, Joseph Hertz.

general more assimilated Jews in Glasgow's West End, whose children more easily engaged in a mixed marriage, than on the South Side). As a result the Garnethill congregation contested the rulings of the Glasgow Beth Din. In doing so, they also challenged the authority of the Chief Rabbi and this conflict played a role in the "Jacobs affair"⁷¹.

Rabbi Louis Jacobs was minister of the New West End Synagogue in London when he wrote his book We Have Reason to Believe. In this book he questioned the divine character of the Law (Torah), in which he had detected a human element. Although this opinion was not new, it was unusual for an orthodox rabbi to publish such views⁷². Defending himself, Jacobs wrote in a letter to friend: "(...) traditional Judaism (...) must commend itself to all who are aware of modern thought and scholarship."⁷³ The publication of the book in 1957 did not have any immediate repercussions, but two years later Jacobs became a lecturer at Jews' College and when, in 1961, he failed to succeed the principal of the college, as he had previously been promised, it appeared that this office had been closed to him because of his views. Jacobs resigned from Jews' College and in 1964 he was invited by the New West End Congregation to return as their minister. Perhaps the members of that congregation did not object to Jacobs' views, but the Chief Rabbi did and he would only grant Jacobs a certificate, which was required for the appointment, if he promised not to repeat his views on the Torah in public. Jacobs refused and the Chief Rabbi prevented his appointment. A group of New West End members broke away from the London congregation, renounced the Chief Rabbi's authority and founded the New London Synagogue with Jacobs as their minister. This affair attracted extensive coverage in the British media.

In 1966 the Garnethill congregation got involved in the affair as a result of the rivalry between their minister and the Glasgow Beth Din. When the congregation did not want to recognise certain rulings of the Glasgow Beth Din, which had been sanctioned by the Chief Rabbi, they had no option but to renounce his authority. To do so was not without precedent, but such a step was not easily taken. At a general meeting of the members of the congregation, which was attended by some three hundred members, a motion to this end was put to the vote. It failed, however, by some thirty votes to gain the required two-thirds majority. Prior to this meeting, Jacobs had been

⁷¹ Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, pp. 241-242; C. Bermant, Troubled Eden. An Anatomy of British Jewry, pp. 239-253; for Glasgow's involvement in the affair see SJAC, folder Jacobs Affair.

⁷² Compare Daiches, Was. A pastime of Time Past, pp. 12, 102-103. During the 1920s and 1930s some of the orthodox rabbis or ministers in Scotland might have had similar views or were thinking in that direction, but they did not express such thoughts nor raise any doubts about the divine character of the Torah. For these men, like Rabbi Salis Daiches in Edinburgh who of all rabbis in Scotland had received the most advanced training in secular philosophy, the idea that the Torah had been revealed to Moses by God formed the cornerstone of their beliefs and in addition they also accepted the Talmud as being inspired by God.

⁷³ Quoted in Bermant, Troubled Eden. An Anatomy of British Jewry, p.244.

in Glasgow to discuss a possible linkage between Garnethill and his congregation, but a further motion at the same general meeting to form an association with the New London Synagogue was defeated outright (186-128 votes). The leadership of the congregation was largely in favour of such an association, the Rev. Dr. Cosgrove possibly supported such a move⁷⁴, but the members of Garnethill could not be persuaded. Some forty years earlier they had closed the door to Reform and now, during the 1960s, they refused to become part of another movement which would lead them away from orthodox Judaism.

Jacobs' and his congregation's views tended to go in the direction of the American Conservative Judaism movement, which sought a middle-of-the-road position between Reform and orthodox Judaism. Conservative Judaism was not very successful in Britain, the New London Synagogue remaining in effect their only foothold, although it is an independent congregation. The significance of this episode lies in the fact that as far as is known, Garnethill was the only congregation in Britain, beside the New London Synagogue, which considered going the Conservative way. The expression of ideas similar to Jacobs' thoughts by orthodox Jews, however, was unthinkable in Glasgow during the 1920s and 1930s, and would in any case have been rejected as was experienced by the Reform congregation in Govanhill.

This is not to say that no changes took place on Glasgow's South Side. One of the first noticeable changes was the disappearance of the small synagogues, minyanim or chevroth, from the Gorbals. These small places of worship had been founded by immigrants from a certain area or town in Eastern Europe, like Odessa and Minsk, or by persons who shared the same occupation such as tailors or travellers. In addition to communal worship these places traditionally devoted much time to the study of Jewish law. When the founders died, their children mostly did not feel compelled to maintain these institutions and they were abandoned or merged into the larger synagogues⁷⁵.

Further changes appeared in the role of the clergy. As described in the previous chapter, the new appointments on the South Side mainly came from Germany and Eastern Europe. The Talmudic colleges on the Continent had a steady output of rabbis and chazanim who found employment in Britain and after 1933 their numbers were swelled by refugees from Germany and the Nazi-occupied areas. Some of them, although usually not the most distinguished rabbis, found their way to Glasgow. The Crosshill synagogue, for example, opened in 1933 to accommodate about a hundred worshippers, in 1935 appointed Rabbi Moshe Dryan from Poland⁷⁶. Usually, these clergymen had learned some English and would acquire the language soon after their

⁷⁴ Compare JE 8/5/1964. In 1964 Cosgrove supported Jacobs by emphasising that in the orthodox tradition there was room for variation of interpretation. He was the only Glasgow minister to speak out in favour of Jacobs at the time.

⁷⁵ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 211.

⁷⁶ Glasgow Evening Citizen 20/9/1933, 19/7/1935.

arrival; overall they would not hide their foreignness. There were, however, some differences between these men and their Eastern European predecessors. The newcomers represented a modern orthodox clergy which saw itself as the spiritual leadership of their congregations and although they would not regard themselves as ministers who simply conducted the synagogue services, they were part of a movement that put more emphasis on religious ceremony and dignity⁷⁷.

Some rabbinical newcomers also felt themselves to have a task in Scotland. In an article he wrote for a newspaper, Rabbi Dryan - immodestly introducing himself as "one of Great Britain's leading rabbis and Talmudic scholars"⁷⁸ - described what he saw as his duties. These lay mainly in the field of education and Jewish law; Dryan was a member of the Glasgow Beth Din since 1935. He wrote that he had come to Britain "with the aim of strengthening the religious life among Jews in this country."

In general, the task of conducting the services on the South Side was left to chazanim and laymen, but as at Garnethill they would increasingly get help from choirs, which were used to give the service propriety and to attract people to the synagogue. At first employed at special occasions and at Festivals, they quickly became fashionable in the Gorbals. In 1927, the Oxford Street Synagogue boasted in a Yiddish leaflet about the "wonderful Glasgow Boy Chazan"⁷⁹ who would lead the sabbath services with a choir conducted by the Rev. Zaludkowsky and three years later, in 1930, the Chevra Kadisha announced in an advertisement that their chazan, the Rev. A.Z. Altschul, would officiate with a choir at the High Holidays⁸⁰. Queen's Park also had a choir, but its activities seem to have lapsed during the 1930s, to be re-introduced after the Second World War. A Glasgow Hebrew Male Voice Choir was formed in the spring of 1945 and the by then well-known Glasgow Jewish musician Louis Freeman became its conductor. Although this choir had its centre at Queen's Park, Freeman and his singers performed at other synagogues too. Shortly after 1945, a boys' choir was also established at Queen's Park, to participate in the sabbath services with the purpose "to lend colour, or, when necessary, solemnity to the occasion."⁸¹

Such changes went some way in the direction which the Garnethill congregation had chosen earlier. Pollokshields synagogue underwent a similar development. In 1932 the Pollokshields leader Maurice Olsberg suggested that "services would require to be

⁷⁷ See for examples JE 29/9/1933, 13/1/1933, 8/2/1935. This movement originated more from Germany where it was inspired by Samson Raphael Hirsch. In addition to attention to ceremony and dignity, for example through the use of choirs, sermons and clerical gowns, modern orthodoxy created its own translation of prayer books with omission of some mystical prayers.

⁷⁸ SJAC, handwritten article, probably compiled in 1960 to mark the occasion of the opening of a new synagogue building in Crosshill.

⁷⁹ Leaflet in SJAC.

⁸⁰ Jewish Leader 29/8/1930.

⁸¹ SJAC, Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Jubilee Brochure (1956).

made more attractive if members were to be encouraged to come.”⁸² Subsequently he proposed changes to the services, but these were rejected by the majority of the Pollokshields members because they believed the changes would go too much in the direction of Reform. Instead, Pollokshields sought a different way to “allay the religious apathy” by promoting the social life of the congregation, improvement of the synagogue building and by insisting that preaching during the service should be better - “the members must be given something new for their money.”⁸³

In general, such adaptations were deemed necessary on the South Side because synagogue attendances were said to be dropping, but it may be that such talk was an orthodox reaction to changes in modern society which affected the Jewish population. Zevi Golombok, the editor of the Jewish Echo, noted in 1929 that the sabbath was getting a new character, on which he remarked the following:

“There are people, especially some of our young folk, whose conception of a Friday night is Gefilte Fish and other specifically Jewish savouries.”⁸⁴

The Rev. Simmons wrote in the Jewish Echo about the “Age of the Paper Calf, and many are its unwilling worshippers”⁸⁵ and two other ministers formed the Glasgow Sabbath Observance Organisation in 1941 “in an earnest endeavour to arouse and to rally our co-religionists to cherish and uphold the Sabbath day.”⁸⁶ This organisation used the following arguments to convince people not to desecrate the sabbath:

“The tragedy of modern Jewry is that in its vain attempts to assimilate to the standards of the nations around, it loses its own traditional heritage and does not succeed - because it cannot succeed - in absorbing the customs and environment of another people. Consequently it is the fate of those people who reject Jewish tradition to store up for themselves, for their children and their children’s CHILDREN not only the contemptuous hate of the non-Jew for this traditionless and spineless historical anomaly, but also permanent unhappiness, instability and infinite psychological problems, guilt feelings and inferiorities. History has proved again and again that there is no place for the Jew who abandons his tradition.”⁸⁷

In an effort to make people more familiar with the sabbath, the organisation tried to explain its main rituals and regulations, which indicates that it was feared that such

⁸² SJAC, MBP 7/2/1932.

⁸³ SJAC, MBP 21/1/1934, 24/9/1936; see also 4/11/1936, 29/11/1936.

⁸⁴ JE 2/8/1929.

⁸⁵ JE 8/1/1937.

⁸⁶ M.D. Dryan and A.L. Rubinstein, The Holy Sabbath, Glasgow, not dated, p. 1. The Rev. Rubinstein was minister of the Netherlee & Clarkston Hebrew Congregation which he eventually left for the Giffnock & Newlands synagogue.

⁸⁷ Dryan, Rubinstein, The Holy Sabbath, p. 8. The article from which this quotation is taken was based on a publication by Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch written during the 19th century.

knowledge had been lost.

Similar arguments to those which had been employed to propagate the keeping of the sabbath were used elsewhere against some of the South Side congregations which hesitantly tried to adapt the synagogue service. "People," wrote the editor of the Jewish Echo in a comment on attempts to give the service more decorum, "see the fine manner in which the services are held in churches and they wonder why the services at their own house of prayer should not be held in a similar way," but, he continued, synagogues where seemliness and "mannerism" were the order of the day (he obviously meant Garnethill) had difficulties in securing a quorum⁸⁸. Decorum was rejected as a superficial imitation and people were urged to hold on to their traditions. The Jewish Echo alternatively offered the way in which the service was conducted in the Chevra Kadisha as an example of how things should be done. There, the service was rendered in "traditional style, (...) more inspiring, more appealing than our modern choral services" - it reminded the correspondent of the newspaper of a Lithuanian or Polish synagogue at the turn of the century⁸⁹. According to this traditionalist view, the synagogue once again had to become a house of gathering, where the members of the congregation met daily for prayers, study of Jewish law, discussion and social contact - where a Jew was said to feel at home⁹⁰.

People were said to pay more attention to material than to religious values. The issue was regularly touched upon in the Jewish Echo. Golombok believed that one the "ill" effects of the First World War was a wave of selfish materialism and pleasure seeking, which reduced idealism and enthusiasm for religion. He wrote about a "general epidemic" during the last ten to twelve years striking Jewish communities as well as general society⁹¹. The link to developments in the wider society was also made by Bernard Glasser, son-in-law of Rabbi Shyne, who wrote about deplorable "assimilation towards irreligion as we find it in the non-Jewish community."⁹² The Rev. Simmons used more profound words, but he meant the same: "The spirit of the Age is squeezing the soul out of the body of Man."⁹³ In Glasgow Jewry's Year Book of 1938-1939, Rabbi Salomon Morgenstern of the Beth Yaakov Synagogue offered the following explanation:

⁸⁸ JE 12/2/1931.

⁸⁹ JE 21/9/1928. The correspondent told his readers that the members of the Chevra Kadisha belonged to "the orthodox party", implying that others, like the Garnethill membership, did not. At the reported service (on a High Holy Day) Rabbi Lurie appropriately delivered a sermon on "assimilationist tendencies".

⁹⁰ JE 12/2/1931.

⁹¹ JE 3/5/1929.

⁹² JE 18/12/1936.

⁹³ JE 8/1/1937.

"(...) the Jew (is) being influenced by wealth, independence, freedom and happiness to fall away from the path of Religion, to strive for assimilation with his gentile neighbours and even to forsake Judaism (...) On the other hand when the Jew suffers poverty, persecution and oppression he generally holds fast to the religion of his fathers."⁹⁴

In general, observers agreed that religious laxity was most widespread among the youth who were thought to be more vulnerable to the temptations of secular society. Some felt that the young were following examples set by their elders. Rabbi Lurie of the Chevra Kadisha said that "the fault really does not rest with the young men and women who fall victims to modern temptations, but with the fathers and mothers" who were indifferent towards Jewish tradition⁹⁵. Similar thoughts were expressed in Queen's Park where youthful apathy was blamed on "the lack of interest shown by parents."⁹⁶ In reponse to Bernard Glasser's observation in the Jewish Echo about the "appalling decline in Religion among our young people," the Rev. Simmons wrote that this phenomenon could in a large measure be traced to the decline of religious observance among parents and big brothers and sisters⁹⁷.

Such observations were often intended to have an alarming effect and were made to promote Jewish education, to prove the need for a certain organisation or to motivate particular changes⁹⁸, and they sometimes sound rather exaggerated. But it could not have escaped their attention that people were sometimes forced to work on Saturdays. In the pursuit of decent living standards, for example, many Jews worked on the sabbath. The majority of the people in Scotland worked on Saturdays; in industry people worked on Saturday morning. The majority of the people in the services industry, like those who worked in shops, worked all day Saturday - the busiest day of the week after the traditional Friday pay-day. Sunday was the Christian sabbath and therefore the usual day off. Jewish wage earners, entrepreneurs and businessmen who depended on economic relations with non-Jews had to work on Saturday or lose a substantial part of their income or lose their jobs. Usually occupations required attendance on Saturdays along with fellow non-Jewish workers and even Jewish employers who held post in the congregations were not always prepared to give people Saturdays off⁹⁹. But this did not mean, as was often believed, that these people would be lost to Judaism.

Working on Saturday had almost become part of a new lifestyle. Several initiatives

⁹⁴ Glasgow Jewish Year Book 1938-1939, p. 19.

⁹⁵ JE 21/9/1928.

⁹⁶ School Report 1926-1927, quoted in SJAC, Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Jubilee Brochure (1956) p. 7.

⁹⁷ JE 18/12/1936, 8/1/1937.

⁹⁸ JE 8/1/1937; SJAC, Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Jubilee Brochure (1956), pp. 10, 18.

⁹⁹ SJAC, OHP interview F. Romer.

had been directed at the immigrants and their children to adopt a lifestyle which was similar to that of the general population and these initiatives came from within the Jewish group. Initially, at the turn of the century, such initiatives were taken by the leading members of the congregation of the older settlers and they were joined by some immigrant leaders. Poor relief and assistance in finding employment and housing accommodation for immigrants had been provided by the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation during the 19th century on the condition that these immigrants would conform themselves to the standards set by the older settlers. In addition the Glasgow Jewish Naturalisation Society was formed in 1902 in order to help the immigrants to obtain British citizenship. The Society was founded by Jacob Kramrisch, a Garnethill member who had been recruiting Jewish workers from England and the Continent for Glasgow's tobacco industry¹⁰⁰. Kramrisch was also involved in the Jewish Strangers' Aid Society, which at the turn of the 20th century annually provided temporary shelter for several hundred arriving immigrants on the South Side.

Kramrisch was joined on the executive of these organisations by Bernard Glasser who had recently come to Scotland via Ireland and was secretary of the Naturalisation Society, and another immigrant, Daniel Rosenbloom who became chairman of the Aid Society. The efforts of the Naturalisation Society were aimed at the South Side, where the first public meeting was held in the Great Synagogue in South Portland Street, but apparently few immigrants used this opportunity to become British citizens. During the first year the Society was reported to have 35 members of which only 5 were naturalised. It was said that the necessity of submitting applications to the Home Secretary in London and the required fee of £5 were the main obstacles. To overcome the financial hurdle, the Society organised a scheme by which the members paid 1 shilling weekly towards the fee. The scheme was sponsored by a friendly society called the Dr. Herzl Lodge no. 12. Notably, naturalisation was advertised as becoming an "English" citizen¹⁰¹.

The involvement of the older settlers in such initiatives was partly a result of their wish to help co-religionists and was partly motivated by self-interest. The establishment feared that as long as the immigrants remained foreigners they would attract hostility which could have implications for the general position of the Jews in Glasgow. To prevent this, the immigrants had to become British citizens and the general society had to be shown that the Jews could "love"¹⁰² their country. For this

¹⁰⁰ Compare *JC* 28/5/1897. It appears that previously a Hebrew Naturalisation Society, led by Ellis Isaacs and immigrants, had been active in Glasgow, petitioning the government to reduce naturalisation fees. Which shows that such initiatives were not the prerogative of older settlers.

¹⁰¹ Collins, *Second City Jewry*, p. 105.

¹⁰² SJAC, Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Volunteer Association (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBGJVA) 24/1/1898.

purpose the Glasgow Jewish Volunteer Association was founded.

In January 1898, a group of leading Garnethill members, among whom were Adolph Schoenfeld, Ben Strump and the Rev. E.P. Phillips, decided to form an association to look after the interests of Jewish volunteers, to provide information and to further the idea of joining one of the volunteer regiments in Glasgow among the young Jewish men of the city. The Glasgow Jewish Volunteer Association remained relatively small. Although the annual subscription was low (2 shillings), the Association probably never had more than seventy members. In a first annual report, the organisation claimed that in February 1899 there were 55 Jewish volunteers spread over various regiments in the city¹⁰³. Several meetings were held to stimulate interest in the movement in the Gorbals, for example in the synagogue chambers in Main Street and the Zionist Club in Abbotsford Place, but there is little evidence to suggest that on such occasions many volunteers were enrolled. Social events, such as an annual ball and a smoking concert for the “furthering of the Volunteer movement amongst the Hebrew community”¹⁰⁴, were more successful because these events attracted larger attendances than the information meetings and a large sum of money (£18) was collected. A parade of 45 volunteers and a service in Garnethill synagogue also proved to be a success - an “unusual yet magnificent sight” with “bright uniforms, the crowded place of prayer, the Hebrew tongue (and) the devout men,” and the occasion was said to have been reported in the public press. Although “every (Jewish) volunteer present felt proud to belong to such a race,” there had been some difficulties. Some members of the Association opposed a parade in uniform as problems were expected because the authorities of each regiment, which had Jewish volunteers, had to be asked for permission to wear the uniform. That permission was eventually granted was said to “show (the) broad trend of thought which sways the minds of the powers (at) the end of the 19th century” towards the Jews¹⁰⁵.

Such events created the expectation that after the first year, during which *considerable* difficulties had to be overcome and “a lot of prejudice” had to be broken down, next year’s harvest would offer a “greater crop”¹⁰⁶. Unfortunately, the activities of the Association seem to have ceased despite a brief spell of functions at the end of 1899, after which all Jewish volunteer activity collapsed.

It is significant that no attempt was made to create a Jewish volunteer regiment. The

¹⁰³ SJAC, MBGJVA 19/2/1899. It was said that before the foundation of the Association there had been only 12 Jewish volunteers and the Association took the credit for the increase. A printed balance sheet of the same date shows an annual income from subscriptions of £1-8-0, which would suggest that no more than 14 members paid their subscription.

¹⁰⁴ Cutting from unknown newspaper in SJAC, MBGJVA.

¹⁰⁵ SJAC, MBGJVA 30/10/1898, 27/11/1898, 19/2/1899.

¹⁰⁶ SJAC, MBGJVA 19/2/1899.

purpose of the Association had been to prepare young Jewish men to carry arms to defend their country in non-Jewish regiments. In February 1898, the Rev. Phillips, who described himself as a “man of peace”, said that it was necessary for young Jewish men to be trained in order to “help our fellow countrymen defend our shores” in the event that Britain was attacked¹⁰⁷. There was, however, another and probably more important motivation to raise patriotic feelings among the Jews. During the first year of the Boer War (1899-1902), coinciding with the height in the anti-alien propaganda, the Association wanted to show Jewish “attachment to our country and Queen”, which was done by their activity, by the raising of funds for the families and dependants of “soldiers and sailors”, and by special prayers being said in Garnethill synagogue for the safety and success of the British troops in the Transvaal¹⁰⁸. At their first meeting in January 1898 Schoenfeld pointed to the patriotic spirit of the volunteers: “if this same spirit were entered into more fully, it would (have the) effect of causing (Jews) to be looked upon in a different (and) broader light by our neighbours,” and a year later the President of the Association, Bernard Wolfe, told his audience at a Gorbals’ meeting: “As we had shown ourselves clever in other things, such as law (and) music, so we would show ourselves patriotic (and) loyal.”¹⁰⁹ Michael Simons urged the Jewish volunteers to ensure that their parade in 1898 was “as representative as possible (and) to turn out as clean (and) tidy as possible”¹¹⁰ - cleanliness was also a token of respectability. It seems that the Association was successful in making such an impression on the general public, but failed to win a large support among the immigrants on Glasgow’s South Side.

Another initiative was more successful. In May 1902 the general meeting of members of the Garnethill congregation discussed the possible formation of a company of cadets, later to become the Jewish Lads’ Brigade¹¹¹. The Jewish group followed the example of the Christian Boys Brigade formed in the late 19th century to advance Christianity and discipline among the youth¹¹² as a reaction to the rise of modern society and its libertarianism. The JLB initiative was exclusively aimed at the youth. Looking back a quarter of a century later, an article on the “History and Progress” of the Glasgow company of the JLB in the Jewish Echo in 1928 related how the organisation had been founded “to instill into the rising generation habits of orderliness, cleanliness and obedience” and to keep “young lads who are at the most

¹⁰⁷ SJAC, MBGJVA 28/2/1898.

¹⁰⁸ SJAC, MBGJVA 11/12/1898; SJAC, MBG 12/11/1899.

¹⁰⁹ SJAC, MBGJVA 24/1/1898, 20/2/1899.

¹¹⁰ SJAC, MBGJVA 27/11/1898.

¹¹¹ SJAC, MBG 25/5/1902.

¹¹² Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, pp. 5-17, 90; Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p 704.

impressionable age” away from the temptations of crime and spirits¹¹³. That such temptations existed for Jewish boys at the turn of the century is evident from an anecdote told by Michael Simons in 1898 - in his function as magistrate he had the son of a South Side Jewish tailor detained on a charge of theft¹¹⁴. The initiative to form a Glasgow company was taken in an attempt to discipline such South Side boys.

It is possible that the company was first formed on the South Side in May 1903, with officers from the South Side and a chaplain from the Oxford Street synagogue¹¹⁵. Another possibility is that the initiative remained with Garnethill members. Following the discussion at the meeting in May 1902, Garnethill member David Heilbron told the executive of the United Synagogue in August that he had received a letter from London proposing the formation of a “Cadet Corps” in Glasgow¹¹⁶. It is uncertain what happened to that particular idea, but during the early stages of the JLB, Garnethill kept a high profile in the movement: a first annual inspection took place in Garnethill synagogue in June 1905, the congregation provided several officers, including Ben Strump, and subsequent Chanukah services for the JLB were held at Garnethill. There is little doubt, however, that the organisation was popular on the South Side. During its first year 125 members were enrolled and soon after new groups or companies were formed. At least one of these operated in the West End, weekly drilling exercises for example took place at Garnethill¹¹⁷.

The annual Chanukah service, which probably started in 1904, like the Volunteer parade and service a decade earlier, proved to be an occasion to show to the wider society what Jews were capable of and to refute any claims that Jews would not be “full capable of taking their proper stand amongst the various communities of the city.”¹¹⁸ The Lord Provost, city magistrates, scout leaders, officers from the Maryhill Barracks and Territorial regiments, and Christian friends were invited to the service. Although the guests of honour were not always able to attend, the services were seen as a success. Hundreds of copies of the Order of Service were printed (1500 in 1909, the year of the Slater-trail), on most occasions the synagogue was full and favourable

¹¹³ JE 1/6/1928; compare R. Livshin, “The Acculturation of the Children of Immigrant Jews in Manchester”, in D. Cesarani (ed.), The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry, Oxford, 1990, pp. 79-96, p. 84. The author of the Jewish Echo article perhaps unknowingly quoted from the Annual Report of the British JLB from 1907, published in London.

¹¹⁴ SJAC, MBG 23/1/1898.

¹¹⁵ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 83-84, 115, 173, 206; compare JC 8/5/1903. Collins, who has to rely heavily on correspondence in the Jewish Chronicle which cannot be fully trusted in this matter because of its partisanship, holds this view.

¹¹⁶ SJAC, MBUSG 6/8/1902.

¹¹⁷ SJAC, MBG 17/1/1909.

¹¹⁸ SJAC, MBG 29/5/1910; compare JE 12/8/1932. The JLB in Glasgow tried to reconcile “kilts and Jews”. In later years the JLB had a pipe band.

comments were reported in the press¹¹⁹.

The annual show of respectability was not the main objective of the JLB. What came first, were the invoking of discipline, character-building and physical training of young Jews, and the introduction of what were regarded as typically British characteristics and values, such as comradeship, through drilling, sport, games and camps. The activities in Glasgow resembled those of the national movement. The JLB belonged to a wider phenomenon in British society of which at a later stage the Jewish Girls' clubs and scout troops for Jewish boys and girls became parts. In Manchester¹²⁰, for example, immigrants children were trained and taught in a similar way by officers who tried to smooth away what one former member of the JLB described as the "rough edges of (the) shtetl" (Jewish settlement in Eastern Europe).

In Glasgow the movement in effect also helped to iron out the creases of the slums¹²¹ and during the following decades more of such groups were established in Glasgow taking a slightly new direction and concentrating on working class Jewish children. In 1937 the Glasgow Jewish Girls' Club, modelled on the Scottish Association of Girls' Clubs, was founded for girls from the ages of 12 to 18. At a promotion meeting, the speaker, Mrs. A.M. Cohen, said that hundreds of young girls of whom the majority lived in poor, overcrowded homes and were performing purely mechanical work in offices, stores or factories, were roaming the streets, left to their own devices: they "were offered no inducement to employ their leisure time in some useful occupation." The situation was even worse for unemployed girls: "if not encouraged to equip themselves for some calling in life, they would neglect both their physical and spiritual advancement."¹²²

Following another trend in general society, physical fitness became a major concern too. Since Michael Simons had organised a charity football match between Queen's Park and Third Lanark during the 1888 Glasgow exhibition, Jews had been involved in local sports as organisers, spectators and participants. For a while there even existed a Jewish football club, called Oxford Star¹²³. Some boxers and athletes did reasonably well, including runner Max Rayne and boxers Meyer Stringer and Young Goldie who

¹¹⁹ For an example see SJAC, MBG 28/11/1909, 5/12/1909, 18/12/1909, 26/12/1909. The report on the meeting was given by Bertie Heilbron. He was less satisfied with a report in the Jewish Chronicle which had allegedly managed to get the names of officials wrong. In 1909 the Lord Provost had been unable to attend (in 1906 he had already visited the annual inspection of the company), but two years later he was present again (SJAC, MBG 24/11/1911).

¹²⁰ Livshin, "The Acculturation of the Children of Immigrant Jews in Manchester", p. 84.

¹²¹ GH 30/6/1928. It may be that Abraham Zemmil, one of the members of a notorious gang called the South-Side Stickers, was Jewish. He was detained for one year in a young offenders institution for participating in streetfighting.

¹²² JE 19/11/1937.

¹²³ JE 20/1/1928.

embarked on professional careers¹²⁴. Young Jews were just as keen on sport as their counterparts in non-Jewish society. The 1930s were an age of the idealisation of youth and sport. Glasgow had many gymnasias, sport clubs and swimming pools, and the active participants in sports, such as swimming and gymnastics, were no longer confined to the middle classes as had been the case during Victorian times. There was also an explosion of football, athletics and cycling clubs. Many contemporaries were pre-occupied with health and fitness - the Empire Exhibition of 1938 in Bellahouston Park, for example, devoted a whole pavilion to physical fitness¹²⁵.

Sometimes Jews found it difficult to participate in general sporting events, because these were organised on Saturdays or because they were excluded from certain clubs¹²⁶, and occasionally this led to Jewish clubs being formed. The main reason for the foundation of Jewish sport clubs, however, was to bring young Jews together¹²⁷. At the end of the 1920s, the Bar Cochba (Glasgow) Sport Club was established for boys and girls from the Gorbals. In the suburbs the Glasgow Jewish Athletic Club (Tennis Section) provided separate facilities for the middle-class youth. Appropriately, the first premises of Bar Cochba were made available in the canteen of Sunderland's tailoring factory in Darnley Street, where "the members had to clear away the canteen equipment before they could commence."¹²⁸ During the early 1930s the club moved to the Talmud Torah school building in Turriff Street and from there to a hall at the back of the Talmud Torah premises, which was utilised as a gymnasium: "Everything has been done and attempted that will make the club more attractive to all," a leaflet said¹²⁹.

The programme of Bar Cochba consisted of physical training exercises, tumbling, vaulting and road-running. In addition, the club promised the inclusion of popular sports like boxing and wrestling, but the emphasis was on gymnastics for which annual championships were organised. Bar Cochba had different activities for boys and girls. A woman, who joined the club during the mid 1930s at the age of eleven remembers as follows:

"Parallel bars was associated with men. A typical girls' activity was walking round slowly and criss-crossing the hall - to give us posture. We also did exercises with a

¹²⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 171; JC 25/2/1910; JE 15/6/1928, 3/5/1935.

¹²⁵ P. Kinchin, J. Kinchin, N. Baxter, Glasgow's Great Exhibitions 1888, 1901, 1911, 1938, 1988, Wendlebury Bicester, 1988, p. 151.

¹²⁶ JE 7/11/1930, 28/11/1930, 19/5/1933, 26/5/1933, 2/3/1934, 6/7/1934.

¹²⁷ JE 20/4/1928, 15/4/1932.

¹²⁸ SJAC, Maccabi Souvenir Brochure; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 118. Bar Cochba can be seen as a continuation of other smaller groups, like the short lived Glasgow Zionist Cycling and Athletic Club from 1899, which tried to employ sport as one of the means to improve the physical lot of the Jewish working classes within a larger framework of Zionist activities.

¹²⁹ SJAC, leaflet Bar Cochba.

medicine ball and made tableaux with people standing on each other's knees and shoulders. We went several times per week to the Bar Cochba Club. It was near the cheder (Hebrew classes). Really a place where people got together. And in the Gorbals pond we went swimming. After the exercises we had a shower. In the shower room the older girls went first. They stripped and we youngsters felt quite embarrassed at that. We were not used to that, we were still carrying on, being younger."¹³⁰

This would suggest that the Bar Cochba Club was not only concerned with physical training, but also promoted personal hygiene because of the use of the shower room - most houses in the Gorbals had no baths.

The use of the name Bar Cochba could suggest that the founders of the club supported the Zionist ideology. On the eve of the Second World War Bar Cochba joined the World Maccabi Movement which identified itself with the Zionist movement. In 1939, Glasgow Maccabi was said to have about 1,500 members. Zevi Golombok welcomed the development in the Jewish Echo as follows:

"There was a time when physical fitness was sadly neglected by our people. Sport and physical culture were frowned upon and in certain quarters were even considered as un-Jewish."¹³¹

According to the editor, this wrong and harmful conception was now replaced by a healthier attitude and he proclaimed the aims of Maccabi which he described as using sportmanship and social activities to bring the youth to the forefront of a Jewish physical and cultural renaissance.

The Glasgow Jewish Institute also had the function to bring people together. The Institute had been founded earlier in the century as one of the many clubs offering recreation and social contact for young Jews. During the 1910s the Institute (called at that time the Jewish Young Men's Institute) stimulated its members to join the Territorial Army and encouraged them to obtain British citizenship¹³². After the First World War, there was for a while a Jewish National Institute, which fell apart in the Jewish Institute and a club ran by the Association of Jewish Ex-Service Men, later a branch of the British Legion. The Jewish Institute eventually overshadowed the ex-service men's club. During the 1930s the Institute acquired new premises next to the Great Synagogue in South Portland Street and became the most important meeting place for Glasgow Jewry with a membership over 2,000 during the second half of the

¹³⁰ SJAC, OHP interview F. Romer; see also JE 19/10/1990.

¹³¹ JE 21/4/1939; compare SJAC, MBUJYM 26/1/1939 and membership card and syllabus Glasgow Zionist Literary Circle 1924-1925. This meant a considerable change of mind from Golombok, who during 1920s had spoken against the "cult of sport". The JLB in 1939 opposed the establishment of Maccabi.

¹³² Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 171-172.

decade¹³³. The Institute overtook any other Jewish membership organisation in Glasgow (there was also the Workers' Circle and all kind of debating societies still flourished, although the heydays of groups like the Literary Society seem to have passed¹³⁴).

There were several reasons for such a Jewish institution. It served as an alternative for young Jews who found it difficult to participate in general society because of anti-Jewishness. In 1932, for example, the Jewish Echo reported that the manager of a popular dance hall had made remarks which were felt to be derogatory towards Jews¹³⁵. But the main reason was to provide a suitable meeting place for young Jews. At the opening of new premises in 1935, Rabbi Goodman said that the Institute "had its resemblance in Holy Writ in the dedication of the Wall around Jerusalem by the returned exiles under Nehemiah, for both aimed at guarding the people from the ravages of the deteriorating forces of disunity."¹³⁶ The Institute embodied a wish to keep their young people together combined with a striving for respectability and civic acceptability¹³⁷.

This attitude showed that some significant changes had taken place which concerned the organisations for Jewish youth in Glasgow. Initially, such groups had been established to bring the children of immigrants in contact with British culture. At a later stage, some class distinctions were made with the establishment of Bar Cochba and the Girls' Club, for example, concentrating on working class youth, but all such groups now provided social meeting places for Jews and increasingly these groups started to put more emphasis on Jewish culture, values and Zionism, in an attempt to preserve the youth for Judaism. On the eve of the Second World war large organisations, like the Jewish Institute, became the centres of Jewish life in Glasgow.

The JLB, for example, followed this path¹³⁸. The growing availability of alternative organisations during the 1920s and 1930s led to some decline and opposition against the local company (headed by Garnethill member Ben Strump). The JLB was being accused of being out of touch with the requirements of the day¹³⁹ and of militarism. The last accusation was a frequent claim, which was on one occasion countered by one of the officers who addressed the Glasgow company in January 1933 as follows:

¹³³ Glasgow Jewish Year Book 1937-1938, p. 39.

¹³⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 205. In 1916 the Literary Society had 432 members.

¹³⁵ JE 19/2/1932; compare MBGJRC 11/2/1932, 30/5/1932.

¹³⁶ JE 28/6/1935. The City of Glasgow Treasurer P.J. Dollan, speaking at the occasion about civic patriotism, remarked that the Jews belonged to the "well behaved" section of the population.

¹³⁷ JE 14/9/1934.

¹³⁸ JE 11/2/1938. In 1938 Strump and Bloch suggested to amalgamate the JLB with Bar Cochba.

¹³⁹ See for example an anonymous letter in in the Jewish Echo (14/1/1938) in which the correspondent noted that the uniforms of the JLB company were ill-fitting, sloppy and shabby, and that the organisation in general was old fashioned.

"The Cadet movement was not primarily a military movement, but a movement training youth in citizenship, in discipline, quickness, smartness, tidiness and self-respect. It taught youth to have regard for their country and fostered the team spirit."¹⁴⁰

The Rev. Cosgrove added some years later when he spoke at the JLB Social Club in Nicholson Street: "At this time, when the nations of the world were at loggerheads with each other, (the youth) needed to learn the lesson of 'marching in step'."¹⁴¹ That the JLB moved in the Zionist direction was shown when youngsters were told to learn from the example of the Jewish settlers in Palestine who "had not been slow in defending themselves"¹⁴² when being attacked, and very symbolically, at the end of the officer's address in January 1933 the pipeband of the Glasgow JLB played the Hatikvah.

This new direction reflected the growing fear that as a result of secular education, the attractions of non-Jewish culture and the mixing with non-Jews, many young Jews would abandon Judaism. Whether such a fear was genuine may be determined by examining the marriage patterns of Jews in Glasgow. If a growing number of Jews chose a non-Jewish partner, this may result in erosion of the Jewish population group because children from mixed marriages, where the Jewish partner did not insist on bringing the children up in a Jewish way, would eventually be lost to Judaism (orthodox Jews only regard children from a mixed marriage in which the female is Jewish as Jews). Although there is no conclusive evidence available on the number of mixed marriages in Glasgow, something can be said about this subject by taking a look at the attitude towards marriage partners and intermarriage.

Traditionally, it seems that within the group of older settlers people choose a partner of their own class or that such a partner was selected for them by their parents. In 1917, for example, Joe Samuel, the conductor of the Choral Society at Garnethill, married Amy Phillips, daughter of the minister of the congregation. He was the son of Henry Samuel, a leading figure in the congregation. Henry Samuel was son-in-law of Joseph Cohen, a wholesale tobacconist who had served the congregation as Reader. Cohen, related to the lithographic printer Emanuel Cohen and therefore also to Isaac Cohen, the first Jewish settler in Glasgow, was grandfather of Frank I. Cohen who became a Glasgow City Councillor in 1902.

After the turn of the century this pattern¹⁴³ still survived but became somewhat distorted. The sons of Benjamin Simons, who himself had married Hannah Barnett Crawcour after the death of his first wife, served the congregation after their father:

¹⁴⁰ JE 27/1/1933.

¹⁴¹ JE 12/2/1937.

¹⁴² JE 27/1/1933.

¹⁴³ For more examples see the announcements of engagements and marriages in SJAC, MBGHC 21/1/1883; SJAC, MBG 4/1/1903, 14/2/1904, 3/6/1907, 20/10/1912.

Michael Simons held all important offices and his half-brother Philip Barnett Simons, a solicitor, was Secretary of the United Synagogue, but their off-spring did not occupy similar offices. Other families of successful older settlers, like the Davis family and the Heilbrons, moved away from Glasgow or left the congregation in the third generation.

Another important change was brought about by the influx of immigrants into the Garnethill congregation. Among the immigrants living on the South Side, people usually chose a marriage partner of their own class and group. Abraham Naftalin, for example, married a daughter of David Cohen, like him an entrepreneur on the South Side. In the West End, however, immigrant children and descendants of older settlers mixed: a development which, towards the Second World War and after, was followed by a growing number of marriages between South Siders and West Enders, although many still found a partner of equal social standing¹⁴⁴.

As the distinction between older settlers and immigrants slowly disappeared, the Jewish tradition of arranged marriages was abandoned. There is some evidence which suggests that a dowry system was still functioning in 1929¹⁴⁵, but young people were more and more able to choose a partner themselves and the availability of numerous places where they could meet other Jews, like the clubs and the Institute, gave them plenty of opportunities to do so.

They also had opportunities of meeting non-Jews who could become marriage partners, but in the period before the Second World War the traditional Jewish attitude towards marrying a Gentile could form a formidable obstacle to doing so. Traditionally, Jews who married non-Jews were regarded as outcasts by the Jewish group. There is ample evidence for this in the Necropolis where the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation had acquired a plot for the burial of their dead in 1830 and which was in use for almost two decades. Just outside the wall which encircled the Jewish burial ground two Jews were buried. At least one of them - Morris Isaac Rubens - is reported as having been denied a burial in the Jewish area "on account of the deceased (...) having married a Christian woman."¹⁴⁶ In 1866 the congregation was in doubt whether to allow the burial of a Jewish man who had married a Christian and the advice was sought from the Chief Rabbi who refused permission¹⁴⁷. Almost a year later this was

¹⁴⁴ JE 19/6/1931.

¹⁴⁵ JE 3/5/1929, 10/5/1929. In that year the newspaper published some anonymous letters both condemning and defending the dowry system, which was attacked as being unworthy because a woman was married "at a price" but still seemed to have some advantages for others because it was said, for example, that a student when leaving the university needed the money to set himself up in life.

¹⁴⁶ Blair, *Biographic and Descriptive Sketches of Glasgow Necropolis*, p. 347; compare Levy, *The Origins of Glasgow Jewry*, pp. 28-30. There is some doubt about the other person buried there.

¹⁴⁷ SJAC, MBGHC 30/7/1866. In the first instance the congregation seems to have given its permission and £15 was asked for the ground.

followed by another refusal, this time for the “little girl” of Mr. V. Louis¹⁴⁸.

During the 20th century a marriage to a non-Jew was still regarded as taboo. In 1918, a woman wrote a letter to the Jewish Chronicle calling a mixed marriage a “disgrace” and when it happened the blame lay with the mothers who allowed for the “evil”¹⁴⁹ of keeping company with non-Jews. Such an attitude did not change quickly. On noticing that 46% of all marriages in Germany in 1925 which involved Jews were mixed marriages, the editor of the Jewish Echo commented that such marriages were nothing more than “infamous running over to the enemy’s camp or light-heartedly selling (off) the birth- right for a mess of pottage.”¹⁵⁰ Despite such warnings, mixed marriages did take place in Glasgow during the 20th century¹⁵¹ and it was believed that the number of mixed marriages was on the increase during the 1930s¹⁵². When such a marriage occurred, the non- Jewish partner had the option of converting to Judaism or proselytisation, but the process of conversion was long and very difficult. During the 1920s and 1930s there seem to have been some men operating in Glasgow who offered “easy” conversions. In September 1928 a correspondent of the Jewish Echo wrote about a Jewish doctor performing circumcisions on men who were about to marry Jewish women and who were under the impression that they were about to become Jews in this way. In October 1936 Rabbi Atlas of the Great Synagogue warned against a layman who portrayed himself as being a member of the clergy and who completed conversions and marriages without rabbinical authorisation. Atlas also warned against the “gross laxity prevalent in the city with reference to the matter of the proselytization”¹⁵³, thereby indicating that he believed that a significant number of conversions took place. A mixed marriage did not therefore always mean a loss to Judaism, especially not if the woman involved was Jewish and the children could be regarded as Jews. Still, suspicion towards the children of such marriages remained, as is shown in the case of Charles Mabon.

Charles Mabon was a prominent communal figure in Glasgow Jewry. He became

¹⁴⁸ SJAC, MBGHC June 1867. The child was 13 months old.

¹⁴⁹ Quoted in Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 205. The woman was referring to the case of Jewish men marrying non-Jewish girls.

¹⁵⁰ JE 16/3/1928.

¹⁵¹ Some of the persons interviewed for the Oral History Project of the SJAC say that before the Second World War occasionally some of their relatives “married out”, mostly this concerned cousins or distant relatives, and that such marriages created scandals in the family with the person involved in the marriage being rejected by his or her parents who would refuse to see them or would even “sit shiva” (the mourning for the death) for their child. They also say that such marriages started to occur in greater numbers during and after the Second World War, which seems possible because as a result of the circumstances during the war young people were often away from home for long periods, out of the direct control of their families and provided with more opportunities of meeting possible non-Jewish marriage partners.

¹⁵² JE 30/10/1931.

¹⁵³ JE 14/9/1928, 7/10/1936.

choirmaster at Garnethill sometime during the 1890s and was in any case paid as such in 1901, while he also kept the books and records of the congregation, and served as teacher in the Hebrew classes. Mabon was furthermore active in the Glasgow Hebrew Boot, Clothing and Employment Guild, one of the benevolent societies founded by the older settlers for the benefit of immigrants, and was until 1912 Vice-President of the Literary Society. In 1910 and in 1914 he launched unsuccessful ideas for the creation of a Jewish school in Glasgow¹⁵⁴. In all, an active man and it was logical that he was mentioned in an article on the history of Glasgow Jewry in the Jewish Echo in 1930¹⁵⁵. This, however, led to some less favourable reactions as nobody knew the name or the family. Rumours started and one of the stories that went round suggested that Mabon had not been Jewish at all - a damaging tale, but fortunately somebody came to the rescue of Mabon stating that his father had possibly not been Jewish, but that his mother was born Solomons (which was obviously regarded as a Jewish name) and had come from London¹⁵⁶.

Such reactions during the 1930s might suggest that mixed marriages started to appear more often than before, but there is no conclusive evidence for this. Neither is there enough statistical material on the number of circumcisions, marriages in synagogues and Jewish burials, to say anything about possible erosion of the Jewish population in Glasgow. The possibility, however, became a concern during the 1930s as was witnessed by the new direction which the activities for young Jews had taken.

The changes in the lifestyle of the Jews in Glasgow and the way in which this affected the youth were symbolised for many by the rapid decline of Yiddish. The immigrants who arrived in Glasgow after 1881 mostly came from Eastern Europe where their language had been Yiddish. A few spoke Russian or German, but hardly any knew English. Yet within one generation Yiddish was replaced by English and usually the grandchildren of the immigrants were not even able to understand the language.

Initially, the pressure to abandon Yiddish came from the older settlers. At the end of the 19th century the Jewish establishment was campaigning against the use of the language which they looked down on as bad German or "Jargon"¹⁵⁷. On the occasion of the opening of the synagogue in Gorbals' Main Street in 1892, the Rev. Simeon Singer from in London, spoke about the use of Yiddish¹⁵⁸. Two years earlier, Singer had published his relatively cheap and widely available Authorised Daily Prayerbook,

¹⁵⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 78, 91, 131, 171. In other activities this colourful man was also involved in the Esperanto-movement and a supporter of the suffragettes.

¹⁵⁵ JE 29/8/1930.

¹⁵⁶ JE 28/9/1930; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 78. Collins writes that Mabon had grown up being unaware of his Jewish background.

¹⁵⁷ SJAC, MBSPS 22/1/1902.

¹⁵⁸ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 79; compare Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, pp. 92, 256.

which had been intended for those who could read but not translate Hebrew, for use in the classroom and in general to bring uniformity to the prayers of Jews in Britain. This Hebrew-English edition was meant to replace the Hebrew-Yiddish prayerbooks which the immigrants imported. Singer remarked at the consecration of the Main Street synagogue that he could “conceive no good whatever in keeping up in Scotland for an hour longer than you can help the use of Yiddish.”¹⁵⁹

Some immigrant leaders followed this advice, but it took a considerable number of years before the South Side congregation fully adopted English. By that time part of the original congregation had moved to the Great Synagogue in South Portland Street. The synagogue employed the Yiddish speaking minister the Rev. Abraham Cantor and also made use of the services of Rabbi Abraham Shyne who still needed an interpreter when speaking to non-Jews. Some of the congregation’s leaders felt their new synagogue should have “an English Minister”¹⁶⁰ and they started to express their dissatisfaction with Cantor. As described in the previous chapter this led to his dismissal in 1902¹⁶¹. Shortly after the Cantor-episode the change from instruction in Yiddish to English was made in the Hebrew classes of the Great Synagogue and at the Talmud Torah. Just before the change, Garnethill members had become involved in the school and they had probably started to apply pressure towards such a change. Alternatively, their allies in the leadership of the Great Synagogue could have worked in this direction. Another possibility is that influential people like Rabbi Hillman stimulated the adoption of English¹⁶².

Whoever took the initiative, the most dominant factor in the decline of Yiddish was the fact that the children were educated in English; both in Jewish and in public education. As the children learned English at school, spoke English with their friends and only heard Yiddish being spoken at their homes, the change at the Talmud Torah was probably born out of necessity. The children must have found it increasingly difficult to conduct a conversation in Yiddish and this would have hampered their Jewish education. Nevertheless, the change seems to have been rather dramatic or was later believed to have been dramatic. In 1925 a former pupil of the Talmud Torah remembered “when English was first substituted for Yiddish as the official medium of instruction.” He said that on that occasion a rabbi had come to the school to protest.

¹⁵⁹ JC 16/9/1892.

¹⁶⁰ SJAC, MBSPS 27/4/1901.

¹⁶¹ SJAC, MBSPS 3/12/1899, 24/12/1899, 3/5/1900, 12/6/1900, 21/10/1901; MBUSG 21/10/1900, 25/11/1900, 13/10/1901, 5/1/1902, 12/5/1902, 20/5/1902, 6/8/1902, 2/11/1902; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 88-89.

¹⁶² Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 142-143, gives the responsibility for the change to the South Portland Street leaders as well as Hillman. He writes that Hillman had expressed some misgivings about the Hebrew classes of the South Portland Street synagogue changing to English in 1909, but that shortly after he changed his mind and urged other groups to make similar changes.

Judging from the following statement of this former pupil, the rabbi was not an easy person and must have had a loud voice - there was even some name-calling involved.

“Only when he had completely unburdened his soul did the worthy Rabbi make his departure, followed by the retinue of his disciples, who had evidently come to witness the ceremony and to aid in condemning this grave assimilatory step.”¹⁶³

More information about the status of Yiddish can be derived from unsuccessful attempts at the time which were made to create a Yiddish press in Glasgow. Both Langman and Golombok were engaged in this. In 1914 Golombok launched the Glasgow Jewish Evening Times in Yiddish, which after a few issues changed to a weekly paper and then disappeared. Apparently, there were not enough advertisers (and readers) to keep the paper going. In 1921, Golombok came back with the Jewish Voice, a monthly in Yiddish, although with some of the text (for example, an article by a Zionist leader) and adverts in English, but this magazine did not last longer than just over a year and went down because it could not get enough advertisers. This would suggest that the Yiddish audience in Glasgow was not large enough to sustain a newspaper. Shortly after, in 1928 the Jewish Echo was launched in English; this paper survived until 1992.

The early Yiddish papers already used transcribed English or Scots words. Older immigrants eventually developed a rich mixture of languages. Daiches provides the following colourful example of Scots-Yiddish from a man who got angry about people who talked during the Amidah prayer in the synagogue.

“‘Two men,’ he said, ‘vent into a poob and ordered a glass of beer. Dey hadna been in dat poob more dan vonce of twice before. Vell, day sip deir beer un’ dey sit talking un’ shmoosing (chatting). Dey sit un’ talk un’ talk. At lest de barman leans over the counter und he says to dem: “Drink op yer beer. Get oot frae here. Ye coom into ma poob vonce a year un’ ye tink ye can sit here un’ shmoos for hours as do’ ye owned the place. Ma regular customers can sit un’ talk over deir beer as long as dey like. But no’ you. Oot!” Nu, dat’s hoo it is mit a shul, I come here every veek und Hakodosh boruch hu (‘the Holy One, blessed be He’, that is God) kens me vell, un’ he don’t mind if I take it easy. But dese bleggages, dat come vonce or twice a year - no! Dey daven (pray) or dey shot op.’”¹⁶⁴

Similarly, shop signs and posters at this time often contained text made up from English words and grammar transliterated into Yiddish¹⁶⁵.

¹⁶³ Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine, nr. 1, March 1925, p. 8. According to this report, the rabbi called the headmaster a “shaigets”, a rude expression for an uncouth Gentile (the word was misspelled). The identity of the rabbi is unknown.

¹⁶⁴ Daiches, Two Worlds, pp. 119, 121.

¹⁶⁵ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 205.

There was still a wish to retain Yiddish especially among the older immigrants. The immigrants in general gained more influence in communal affairs and were able to counter the early anti-Yiddish attempts of the older settlers, but not all the new leaders supported the Eastern European language. Increasingly, it was seen as something of the past which was only used by old people. In 1919 and much later, in 1930, attempts were made to set up a Yiddish library in the Gorbals, but both attempts seem to have been unsuccessful, despite the involvement in the 1930s of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council. Eventually a public library in the area was to acquire some Yiddish books¹⁶⁶.

The wish to retain Yiddish was to a certain extent a matter of social status. The divisions among the Zionists in Glasgow provided a good example of this¹⁶⁷. The leading Zionists in the city were relatively successful businessmen and professional people, they mostly belonged to the General Zionists who favoured Hebrew as the national language and opposed Yiddish. The Socialist Zionists, or Poale Zion, however, had a strong working class following who still spoke Yiddish and their leaders found it hard to oppose the use of the language.

Nathan Louvish complained in the Jewish Leader about the lack of support for Yiddish. The "more well-to-do (show) contempt for all things connected with Yiddish," he wrote in April 1930, partly because the rich lack the knowledge about Yiddish literature and partly "because the do not want to have much to do with any Jewish matters."¹⁶⁸ This outburst was followed two weeks later in the Jewish Leader¹⁶⁹ by letters pro and contra the use of Yiddish. One correspondent hid behind the pen-name "Verbrennte Yiddishistke", maybe trying to point out that a witch hunt was being conducted against the language. An opponent wrote that the Yiddish movement was anti-religious. Louvish reacted by stressing that Hebrew was the national language of the Jews, but that Yiddish was important because of the ties with the past and Eastern European literature. It remained unclear which he preferred. English, the language in which all the correspondents wrote, was not mentioned.

The Jewish Echo by the end of the 1930s campaigned vehemently against Yiddish. Golombok saw Yiddish as the "Galuth" - the exile - language. It was connected to the past of the ghettos. Yiddish had been attached to them against their will. Now there was a renaissance of the Jewish people. This revival would lead to the creation of a national home in Palestine. Once the Jews would return to their national home, the Zionists said, they would adopt Hebrew or rather its modern spoken variation Ivrit as a daily

¹⁶⁶ MBGJRC 7/12/1930, 22/10/1931, 1/12/1932; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 216.

¹⁶⁷ JE 2/5/1930.

¹⁶⁸ Jewish Leader 25/4/1930.

¹⁶⁹ Jewish Leader 9/5/1930.

language, Hebrew had preserved the Jewish people in the past and would be part of their future. In Britain Jews were British citizens, the daily language here was English, so the Jews should speak English here, but only temporarily¹⁷⁰. This opinion was shared by the Zionist establishment in Glasgow. There were other reasons why the Zionist leaders were against Yiddish. They believed, for example, that modern Yiddish literature was anti-religious, Socialist and anti-Zionist.

These arguments were used when the Workers' Circle, the Jewish working class friendly society which had a strong membership in the Gorbals, came with a plan for a Yiddish school, following an example which had been set in London. The Jewish Echo opposed the idea. The newspaper said a Yiddish school would be out of place in "this land where Yiddish is driven out from the Jewish home, from the street, from the Jewish workshop and from business."¹⁷¹

The Workers' Circle was not able to establish a Yiddish school in Glasgow, but Yiddish was not driven out of Jewish life in the city. It was still part of Jewish working class culture. At May rallies the Labour movement invited Yiddish speakers, they had done so since the beginning of the century and continued to do this in the 1930s. On another occasion, three speakers addressed an open air meeting of the Poale Zion in August 1930. Only one of them spoke in English: Misha Louvish. The meeting was conducted in Yiddish¹⁷². In a report on a convention in Leeds in 1933, the Glasgow representative of the Workers' Circle was able to say that a "gratifying feature had been the prevalence of Yiddish, which was spoken and understood by young and old alike."¹⁷³

The situation for Yiddish was getting more difficult as the 1930s progressed. In 1930 there was also still scope in Glasgow for a theatre group of Glasgow Yiddish Amateur Players, which performed in the Tailors' Hall in Oxford Street¹⁷⁴ and were looking for a singer, elocutionists and musicians. During the same year, in April and May, a group of travelling Yiddish actors performed a series of plays in the Princess' Theatre, an occasion which was organised by Charles Dalnekoff¹⁷⁵. Two years later, in November 1932, a Yiddish theatre was opened in the Kingston Hall on Paisley Road, which could accommodate an audience of 1,000 persons. Dalnekoff became its manager. Very graciously, one of the main players told the Jewish Echo that the Glasgow audience possessed "a good understanding of and cultural taste for the real Yiddish

¹⁷⁰ JE 1/1/1937.

¹⁷¹ JE 29/4/1938.

¹⁷² JE 29/8/1930.

¹⁷³ JE 6/1/1933.

¹⁷⁴ JE 14/2/1930.

¹⁷⁵ Jewish Leader 18/4/1930. Misha Louvish, son of editor Nathan Louvish, was said to be commissioned by the Glasgow Evening Times to report of the season of Yiddish plays.

productions.”¹⁷⁶ The new theatre offered “100 laughs a minute” which must have sounded very attractive in these crisis years. The organisers promised it would be “Lebendig & Lustig”, but unfortunately the theatre did not last longer than one season. In April 1933 the Yiddish players left Glasgow¹⁷⁷.

When the Little Theatre opened in the Jewish Institute in South Portland Street in 1938, the Institute Players performed in English. This marked the watershed. Only a few amateur players continued to be active in Yiddish performances. The English Yiddish actress Anna Tzelniker found in 1944 that there was still a “small but strong” Yiddish audience in Glasgow, large enough for a London company to escape the flying bombs that hit capital at this time and visit the city on the Clyde for a brief spell. The programme at the Princess Theatre, however, had to be changed every night to accommodate this audience¹⁷⁸. As the first generation of immigrants from Eastern Europe died, Yiddish disappeared from Jewish life in Glasgow.

So modernity brought various changes for the Jewish population in Glasgow. It caused alterations being made in religious ritual and lifestyle, similar to what happened in the general population. Some changes in synagogue ritual were adaptations of Christian practices. As an incoming religion, Judaism might have felt the need to adapt Jewish customs to suit Scottish inclinations and customs. The congregation of older settlers had several reasons for ritual change. In general the older settlers were striving for respectability and having a more decorous service was part of this ambition, but the congregation also needed to accommodate the changing needs of its members and there was also the influence of the Anglo-Jewish establishment and the Reform-movement. Garnethill, however, remained an orthodox synagogue. The immigrants objected to such alterations, but eventually they also made alterations. Change was not limited to the older settlers. As in England, Jewish immigrant life in Glasgow with regard to religious habits was adapted to general customs.

At the turn of the 20th century the older settlers had taken the initiative to change the lifestyle of the immigrants and their children. The urge to conform to general society also came from within the immigrant group. Older settlers and immigrants had similar reasons for this. It was part of the process of settling down in a changing Scottish society, making a living, trying to better oneself and striving for respectability, an ambition which was often fuelled by a negative attitude towards Jews in general society. A remarkable result of this development was that Yiddish became practically obsolete.

During the 1920s and 1930s orthodox religious leaders reacted to changes in

¹⁷⁶ JE 2/5/1930.

¹⁷⁷ JE 21/10/1932, 28/10/1932, 5/11/1932, 7/4/1933.

¹⁷⁸ A. Tzelniker, Three for the Price of One, London, 1991, pp. 154, 174.

religious customs and lifestyle with alarming observations about growing religious laxity and expressions of fear that the youth might be lost to Judaism. At that time greater emphasis was laid on the Jewish character of the youth organisations. In answer to the challenges of modern times Jewish communal leaders formulated a new moral code, which was meant to stimulate cohesion within the Jewish group and in effect separated Jews from their non-Jewish environment. As a result the Jews in Glasgow in general developed a new lifestyle, adopting many British customs and habits, but still distinctively Jewish.

Chapter 4. Education of immigrant children

The preservation of Jewish life and identity require institutions where children can be taught Hebrew, religion and Jewish history. Boys, for example, have to learn to read a portion of the Torah in Hebrew during their bar mitzvah ceremony at the age of 13. Education can take place in the home by parents or private teachers, but over the centuries Jewish communities have developed a system of Hebrew classes or chadarim in which tuition takes place. In addition, well-developed Jewish communities established Talmud Torah institutions for children in the primary school age group and Talmud high schools or yeshivoth for older pupils. Sometimes Jewish schools were established where Jewish subjects were taught in addition to a general curriculum. Occasionally, Jewish education was provided at public schools during hours of religious instruction.

In Glasgow the development of Jewish education went along similar lines. Unfortunately little is known about Jewish education for children in the secondary age group in the city before 1939. Concentration will therefore be on younger children. The development of Jewish education in Glasgow can be compared to the development of Jewish education in English cities. Jewish education in England during the period between the years 1880 and 1939 mostly took place in the traditional institutions, like Hebrew class, cheder, Talmud Torah and private tuition, and at Jewish voluntary schools and during hours of religious instruction at state schools. The leaders of the various institutions carefully guarded their right to teach Judaism in their own way and as a result children were instructed in many different ways. Accordingly, there was little unity in Jewish education in England. Gartner¹ argues nevertheless that during the period between 1880 and 1914 one of the main objects of Jewish education of immigrant children in England was to adjust these children to the English environment.

There is little doubt that this adjustment took place in Jewish voluntary schools founded during the 19th century. Such schools existed, for example, in London and Manchester. The Jewish Chronicle wrote in 1883 that in these schools “we are doing our best to make Jews into Englishmen. Here we are training our youth so as to join usefully in the national life instead of adding to the national burdens.”² Livshin and Williams describe how in Manchester the Jewish school, found originally to teach the children of the older settlers, became the main instrument of the Jewish establishment for the adjustment of immigrant children to the English environment. Towards the end

¹ Gartner, The Jewish Immigrant in England, pp. 220-240.

² JC 14/9/1883.

of the 19th century the status of these schools changed. They had been established as private schools, but now found that when they submitted themselves to government inspection, they succeeded in obtaining grants like other denominational schools. In London in 1911 one out of every five Jewish children visited a Jewish school³.

After the Education Acts of the early 1870s no more of these schools were opened. Instead, Jewish children were sent to the newly founded School Board schools. Local authorities were expected to provide Jewish religious instruction to Jewish pupils at times when other pupils were receiving their religious instruction. Many Jewish children still attended Jewish educational institutions outside the normal school hours.

During the period between 1881 and 1939 the majority of immigrant children in England attended School Board and later local Education Authority schools. Alderman⁴ presents school attendance figures for London. He notes that in 1901 60% of all Jewish children in the British capital went to local School Board schools (in 1894 just over half of all Jewish children in London had gone to School Board schools, while in 1911, about 4 out of 5 Jewish children went to School Board schools). These schools sometimes had a distinctive Jewish character. One of the London School Board schools was the Old Castle Street School in the East End where in 1882 95% of the total number of pupils was Jewish. The school had especially appointed Jewish teachers. Krausz⁵ writes that at the turn of the 20th century there were four local School Board schools in Leeds which were almost exclusively attended by Jewish children. Livshin mentions a school in Manchester at this time where four-fifths of the pupils were Jewish⁶.

The development of Jewish education in Glasgow began to take shape in the middle of the 19th century and was initially limited to Hebrew classes and private tuition. The first recorded business of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation was the engagement of a clergyman in 1858 who could also act as teacher. At first, the Hebrew classes of the congregation took place on weekdays from 3 to 4pm (except on Friday) and on Sunday from 11am to 1pm. The classes were usually held in the clergyman's home or a room in the synagogue. Fees varied, sometimes they were as low as 3d. per week. Fees could be lowered in cases of financial hardship. Over the years the fees were increased.

In 1870, for example, a seatholder of the synagogue called Louis the Capmaker paid 1s. 6d. per week for his three boys to attend the congregational classes⁷ - 6d. per child per week. He had to pay this sum in addition to the usual Scottish school rates which

³ Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, p. 106.

⁴ G. Alderman, London Jewry and London Politics 1889-1986, London, 1989, p. 17.

⁵ Krausz, Leeds Jewry, pp. 11-12.

⁶ Livshin, "The Acculturation of the Children of Immigrant Jews in Manchester", p. 83.

⁷ SJAC, MBGHC 5/9/1858, 8/11/1858, 13/12/1870.

were relatively high in Glasgow, about 5d. per week, and additional school fees of at least 2d. per child per week for the general education of his children⁸. If he wanted his children to visit the Hebrew classes as well as a general school, Louis the Capmaker was thus forced to spend a considerable amount of money on education. This could be anything from 29d. per week, just over one tenth of an average working class weekly income.

Like other local non-Jewish institutions for religious education, the Hebrew classes suffered from irregular attendance. Shortly after their start, the hours of the weekday Hebrew classes were changed to two hours on two days instead of one hour on four days. The measure did not improve regular attendance. A schoolreport in 1862 complained that the children were often late, causing "great inconvenience"⁹. Teaching the children proper behaviour and discipline was an important aspect of the classes. The 1858 regulations said that "on the repeated misbehaviour of any pupil it shall be competent for the Committee to expell him"¹⁰. Apparently, only boys were taught at this stage.

The classes were divided in a junior class and a senior class. In 1862 the junior class consisted of five children and the senior class had three pupils. A limited number of subjects was taught during the early years. The junior class learned to read Hebrew prayers, while senior pupils engaged in the translation of the Torah and recited prayers. In later years Jewish children in Glasgow were also taught Hebrew grammar and Jewish history, but during these early years it was felt that it would be sufficient if the boys were able to read Hebrew¹¹.

Perhaps it was not possible to do more. The amount of time available for Jewish education was limited. The Education Act of 1872 made daily school attendance compulsory for children from the age of five to thirteen years. Although exemption was possible, most Jewish children in Glasgow went to primary school. As will be discussed below, no Jewish primary school was founded in Glasgow at this stage, which meant that the Jewish children had to visit public or private schools. Hebrew classes had to be attended after the normal school hours. During the weekend there was a little

⁸ J. Roxburgh, The School Board of Glasgow, 1873-1919, London, 1971, pp. 151-156; J. Scotland, The History of Scottish Education, London, 1969 (2 volumes), vol. II, p. 6. Roxburgh suggests that the annual weekly school rate for the poorer areas in Glasgow in 1880 was about 5d. The average weekly school fees in Scotland during this period ranged between 2d. to 3d. per child. There were marked regional and local variations. The average figure for Glasgow is unknown, but might well have been higher than the Scottish average. For a wider perspective on education in Scotland and the Glasgow School Board see also R.D. Anderson, "Education and the state in nineteenth-century Scotland", in Economic History Review, volume 36 (1983), pp. 518-534; T.R. Bone (ed.), Studies in the History of Scottish Education 1872-1939, London, 1967; and W.M. Haddow, My Seventy Years, Glasgow, 1943.

⁹ SJAC, schoolreport in MBGHC 26/1/1862.

¹⁰ SJAC, MBGHC 8/11/1858.

¹¹ SJAC, MBGHC 26/1/1862.

more time available, but on the whole this situation restricted the amount of teaching that could be done in the Hebrew classes.

With the arrival of more immigrants from Eastern Europe the number of pupils in the classes of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation increased from 8 in 1862 to 38 in 1875 and 136 in 1885. Special classes were set up for children living in the neighbourhoods near the Clyde where many immigrants settled; at first in Glassford Street and later on the South Side under the responsibility of the branch of the congregation there. Additional teachers were engaged and for the children of the poor the provision of free education was made (free education at public schools was not granted until 1892, but had been part of the Liberal election manifesto since 1885¹²). Of the total of 136 pupils in 1885, 74 were paying. Of the total of 136 pupils, 60 were taught in the original classes at Garnethill, of which 42 paid, while 76 went to the South Side classes, where only 32 paid. The fact that at Garnethill 70% of the pupils paid and on the South Side only 42%, shows the greater affluence of the seatholders of the congregation north of the Clyde¹³.

This arrangement would not last long. With the creation of new congregations on the South Side and the breakup of the United Synagogue in 1906, which divided Glasgow Jewry in a West End (the older settlers at Garnethill) and several South Side (immigrant) groups, Jewish education in Glasgow was fragmented. Each group started Hebrew classes and Jewish education became a subject of rivalry between synagogues¹⁴. Immigrants objected to the form of Judaism which was taught at Garnethill, and likewise, the immigrant classes did not have a good reputation among the older settlers. The establishment's view was reflected by the Jewish Chronicle which in the early 1880s had commented as follows on the immigrant institutions:

"(They) escaped the notice of the sanitary authorities (...) They are kept by incompetent persons, wholly unacquainted with English, who teach, or profess to teach, Hebrew and Religion. Whole classes of pale-looking children are huddled together, in violation of the most obvious laws of decency and hygiene (...)"¹⁵

Dirty, as used by the Jewish Chronicle, was synonymous with unrespectable. It was felt that the existence of the unrespectable immigrant classes which produced unrespectable Jews would harm the social position of all Jews.

In addition to these Hebrew classes, the Glasgow Zionists for a short period also had their own educational institution. The Zionist institution was called the Hebrew Higher

¹² Roxburgh, The School Board of Glasgow, pp. 163-168.

¹³ SJAC, MBGHC 25/4/1875, 24/5/1883, 15/11/1885.

¹⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 76-77, 145.

¹⁵ JC 30/1/1880.

Grade School. It was established in December 1910 in an effort to create a private school where the children would be taught in a way similar to the schools of the Glasgow School Board, the Zionist school borrowed the name of the Board's secondary schools. The choice of Hebrew in the name of the envisaged school is also significant. The Zionists had adopted Hebrew as the Jewish national language and they hoped that the children would become fluent in the language through a few hours of tuition every day and on Sunday. In addition the school had a curriculum which was to be similar to that of general schools. The envisaged school would have room for 120 to 150 pupils of both primary and secondary school age. But the attempt to found a day school failed and the Zionists had to settle for short-lived evening classes for children (from 5 to 8pm) and adults in rented tenement rooms¹⁶. Other institutions and individual persons, sometimes following the Zionist example, also set up Hebrew classes, but these were mostly short-lived too. It is possible to regard the Zionist school as an attempt to create "respectable" education facilities on the South Side.

The congregational Hebrew classes lasted longer. They were kept under close control of the synagogue committees and, as time went on, improvements were made to give the chadarim a more respectable image. In 1914, for example, the Queen's Park committee wrote to their minister, the Rev. Mordechai Katz who functioned as headmaster, to demand a rise in the standard of teaching. Greater efficiency was said to be needed and it was felt that better use could be made of the class hours (from 4.30 to 7.30pm on weekdays, except on Friday). Katz was also told to do something about the problem of absenteeism. He was asked to limit his amount of private tuition (from which he derived part of his income), so he could properly supervise the Hebrew classes as was expected of him. Following a further complaint by parents, one of Katz's teachers was ordered to stop his "extreme" punishment of pupils¹⁷. This reference to corporal punishment, which in Queen's Park lay in the power of the headmaster only, is a further indication of a hard regime obviously needed to control the children and teach them during the long school hours.

At Garnethill, meanwhile, changes were made which pointed at the direction Jewish education would take later in the 20th century. Classes became smaller and less cramped, the number of hours was brought down, more adequate classrooms were rented in the nearby Garnetbank School, and girls as well as boys began to attend the Hebrew classes. As we have seen in a previous chapter, there was a growing female involvement in the synagogue at this time - in 1910, for example, the idea was launched for a "Ceremony of Confirmation" for girls similar the the boys' bar

¹⁶ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 130-132, 143.

¹⁷ SJAC, letters Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation to the Rev. Katz 28/1/1914.

mitzvah¹⁸. Furthermore, the need for advanced studies, more attention for older boys and girls, and a study circle was felt. The congregation started to look for qualified teachers. When local candidates for posts proved unsatisfactory, the congregation decided to approach Jews' College in England for teachers. Apparently without much success, because local university students were engaged. In February 1912, medical student Noah Morris became teacher at Garnethill. In that year the classes there had 66 pupils, of which 18 were girls. In addition, on average 85 children visited the sabbath school at Garnethill¹⁹, an institution resembling the flourishing Christian Sunday schools. Of the total number of 66 pupils in the regular Hebrew classes at Garnethill, only 6 received free education. This means that 91% of all Garnethill pupils were paying fees in 1912 compared with 70% in 1885 as was mentioned above. A remarkable change which indicates the spreading of social stability and wealth among the members of the congregation.

In 1921 it was decided that new classes should be opened in the Hillhead neighbourhood to which many Garnethill members had moved, but it proved impossible to find adequate teachers, for example from Jews' College. The congregation did not want immigrant teachers. An advertisement was compiled for the Jewish Chronicle, asking for a teacher, preferably an English person. If "foreign" (synonymous with immigrant), the applicant was asked to state how long he had been resident in Britain²⁰. Sufficient progress was not made until the arrival of the Rev. Dr. I.K. Cosgrove during the 1930s²¹.

The Hebrew classes elsewhere in the city developed along similar lines. The Queen's Park congregation, dominating the suburbs on the South Side, had classes for about 80 pupils in 1909 and about 100 in 1917, later the classrooms moved to the Battlefield School and after that to the new synagogue building in 1927. There were by then, however, already indications of problems to come when the number of pupils did not rise fast enough. That year the school report said: "The Cheder (...) continues to make progress although slower than last year. This is due to various contributory causes, the chief amongst them being the lack of interest shown by parents."²²

It is possible that children from Queen's Park members were sent to other Hebrew classes. During the 1930s, the newly started Pollokshields Hebrew classes attracted pupils from outside the congregation. In 1932 the quickly growing institution moved

¹⁸ SJAC, MBG 27/2/1910.

¹⁹ SJAC, MBG 16/10/1910, 18/2/1912, 26/5/1912, 7/4/1912 and printed report 1/9/1911-31/8/1912 in MBG 30/11/1913. Unfortunately there are no figures available to compare these developments with the South Side.

²⁰ SJAC, MBG 9/1/1921-4/9/1921.

²¹ SJAC, MBG 23/5/1935.

²² Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Jubilee Brochure (1956), pp. 7, 18-19.

to classrooms in the Albert Road school²³. The attraction of Pollokshields, which may have been caused by the “better-off” image of the congregation, did not last long. In 1936 the classes had to be reorganised, because many children had left. At that stage still half of the total number of the pupils were children of parents who were not members of the congregation. The reason why pupils had left is unknown, but perhaps the classes had gained a bad reputation. There was a reported lack of cohesion in teaching methods and there appeared little coordination between teachers, resulting “in an open display of disrespect”²⁴ from pupils.

There were two other congregations in the suburbs which were possible competitors of Queen's Park. The classes of the Langside Hebrew Congregation, one of the possible competitors, had 53 children on the roll in 1937, of which 8 were girls. The pupils attended classes five times per week for one and a half hours each day. They were divided over four classes and were mostly occupied in learning Hebrew. The children were also taught about the Festivals. One of the teachers in Langside was only 16 years of age. At the same time, the Giffnock congregation, the other possible competitor, had 27 pupils, the majority of whom were girls. They were reported to follow the “Garnethill syllabus”²⁵. Here there were 3 classes, taught by females and once a week by medical student Jack Miller who had received his Jewish education at Garnethill. The pupils were mostly occupied by Hebrew and Scripture lessons, but they were also taught the meaning of Jewish customs. The Giffnock classes met twice a week for two hours on each occasion.

The development of the Hebrew classes in Glasgow from 1858 until the eve of the Second World War shows some of the limits of Jewish education. Financial resources were scarce. Parents had to make a financial sacrifice for the Jewish education of their children. Time was limited. The pupils made a sacrifice too, they lost an important part of their spare time. There was a shortage of qualified teachers. Only a few subjects could be taught. The development also shows that the leaders of the congregations controlled the Hebrew classes. Under their leadership the Hebrew classes became “respectable” institutions.

Children could also be taught by private tutors. Unfortunately, little is known about private Jewish education. At Garnethill in 1910, it was found that for their own children some school committee members hired private teachers, who were said to be

²³ SJAC, MBP 7/11/1932.

²⁴ SJAC, MBP 14/1/1936. See also MBP 2/12/1936, 26/1/1937, 27/11/1938. In 1936 there were 44 pupils. The number of pupils in previous years is unknown.

²⁵ SJAC, reports J.M. Adler 11/2/1937 & 12/2/1937. The reports were drawn up by the visiting director of the London-based umbrella organisation for Jewish education which influenced the Glasgow Jewish Education Board (see below). The fact that Giffnock followed Garnethill could be attributed to the fact that members of that congregation had moved to the Giffnock area.

three times as expensive as class teachers²⁶. The Hebrew classes were obviously seen by these committee members as a provision for children of less affluent seatholders. The provision of different types of Jewish education for rich and poor reflected the development in the wider Scottish society where class divisions had emerged in public schools between elementary and secondary education institutions.

In addition to the Hebrew classes, the Talmud Torah catered for the immigrant children on the South Side. This school was established in 1895 in a tailor's workshop at 13 Clyde Terrace. In 1897, the first year for which such information is available, just over 100 children were taught there for a few hours per day by three teachers. The curriculum contained Hebrew grammar and composition, religious instruction and history. Two years later an important change was made when the institution moved to classrooms in Gorbals Public School in Buchan Street, rented from the Glasgow School Board for 16 guineas per year. Seven classes were organised there, indicating a total number between 200 to 350 pupils. The school could only be used on weekdays. On Sundays and public holidays instruction took place in the Chevra Kadisha synagogue and later also in the Great Synagogue in South Portland Street²⁷. It is possible that the Talmud Torah was established following the example of Talmud Torah schools in England²⁸ to provide Jewish education for children who were not able to find a place in the chadarim, either because of lack of space or because their parents could not afford the fees of these Hebrew classes. Alternatively, the institution could have been founded to act as a competitor to the South Side Hebrew classes or as an instrument to help immigrant children to adjust to the Scottish environment.

First, the possibility that the Talmud Torah was intended for children who could not be placed in Hebrew classes because of a lack of space will be discussed. The exact number of schoolchildren in Glasgow, the potential pupils of the Talmud Torah, during the period between 1881 and 1939 is unknown, but there are some estimates of the number of Jewish pupils at public schools from 1914 to 1963²⁹, which can be utilised to show the possible demand for the Talmud Torah. These figures have to be treated with the greatest care. The estimates are very rough, although they seem to be more precise for 1932 and onwards³⁰. Often such figures were used in connection with an initiative in the field of Jewish education and might therefore have been made either

²⁶ SJAC, MBG 16/10/1910.

²⁷ M. Friedlander, "The History of the Talmud Torah", in Talmud Torah Jubilee Brochure (1949), pp. 12-13; SJAC, speech H.M. Langman April 1939; see also JE 28/4/1939.

²⁸ Gartner, The Jewish Immigrant in England, pp. 234-237; compare Krausz, Leeds Jewry, pp. 11-12. In Leeds the Talmud Torah was founded in 1876, providing free Jewish education.

²⁹ JC 27/3/1914 ; JE 3/5/1929, 8/8/1930, 29/8/1930, 4/3/1932, 24/3/1933, 20/9/1935; Vincent, "Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", pp. 220-231.

³⁰ For a discussion of the estimates of the 1930s see Vincent, "Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", p. 223.

too high or too low on purpose to support or reject such an initiative. Furthermore, there are figures for the number of pupils at the Talmud Torah from 1908. These also have to be treated with care because they might have been used to portray the school in a positive or negative light. These figures come from the Talmud Torah Jubilee Brochure, published in 1949³¹. They might have been based on accurate annual reports which have now been lost, but in that case it is not certain whether they present an annual high point or an annual low: at the beginning of the school year the number of pupils visiting the school was usually higher than at the end of the year and it is not certain which number is used. In addition there are various estimates of the total number of Jewish pupils at the congregational Hebrew classes and the Talmud Torah³².

At the time none of the figures indicated above were contested and we have to presume that contemporaries regarded them as accurate. These figures are produced in table 4.1. This table presents an impression of the estimated numbers of Jewish schoolchildren and pupils at the Talmud Torah and Hebrew classes. They provide an indication of the number of Jewish children in Glasgow and offer an opportunity to investigate the possible need for an institution like the Talmud Torah.

The 1914 figure in table 4.1 of 1,600 schoolchildren only concerns the Gorbals but may well include the majority of the Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow. As discussed in chapter 1, at this time many Jews in Glasgow still lived in the Gorbals, Hutchesontown and Kingston (see also table 1.2 in appendix, which shows that in a sample of the Jewish population of 1911 about one in every two Jewish families lived in these three neighbourhoods). People who had moved to the southern suburbs or lived in the West End were mostly wealthier and therefore more established persons, who if married would presumably have relatively small families. Glaswegians in neighbourhoods like the Gorbals were relatively poor, not yet well established and had larger families. It may therefore be presumed that the majority of the Jewish schoolchildren in 1914 lived in the Gorbals.

Table 4.1 shows that the estimated total number of Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow rose rapidly from 1914 to 1929 and declined slowly after that. If these estimates are correct, Jewish schoolchildren constituted about one percent of the total school population in 1931³³. If it is assumed that the total number of Jews in Glasgow was about 15,000, it can be asserted that at that time schoolchildren formed about 12% of the total Jewish population in the city. In the general, schoolchildren formed

³¹ Friedlander, "The History of the Talmud Torah", pp. 12-29.

³² JC 27/3/1914; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 142-144.

³³ The number of schoolchildren in Glasgow is set at about 184,000. See SRA, Minutes Corporation of Glasgow Education Department 5/1/1931, which mention an average attendance of 160,609 (87.3%). Compare Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 801. The Census population of Glasgow in 1931 was 1,088, 461.

about 16% of the total population of Glasgow in 1931. This suggests that there were less Jews in Glasgow than the assumed number of 15,000 or that there were relatively less Jewish schoolchildren in the city when compared to non-Jews.

The decline after 1929 might have been caused by a falling birth rate. Vincent finds that between the years 1958 and 1963 the total number of Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow dropped by about one hundred. He argues that this decline, when compared to general figures, and the fact that the number of Jewish children in primary schools between 1958 and 1963 dropped by 21% and the number of Jewish pupils in secondary schools rose by 23%, show that the birth rate figure in the Jewish population had fallen more sharply than in the general society and was accompanied by a trend among Jews to pay a lot of attention to the secondary and higher education of the children. The decline of the number of Jewish pupils in Glasgow after 1929 might therefore have been a result of a falling birth rate figure among the Jews in Glasgow³⁴.

Table 4.1 shows that the number of potential pupils for the Talmud Torah rose after 1914 and dropped after 1929. The establishment of the Talmud Torah took place before 1914, a period for which only the number of Talmud Torah pupils in 1908 is known. The number of pupils rose subsequently, keeping in step with the rise of the total number of Jewish schoolchildren, and fell after 1929 when the total number of Jewish schoolchildren dropped. Unfortunately, there are not enough figures available to enable a comparison between the number of Talmud Torah pupils and the number of children who attended chadarim. But as the number of cheder pupils never seems to have covered the number of Jewish children receiving no or private Jewish education, it is possible to conclude that there was a demand for the Talmud Torah.

This leaves the second possibility, namely that the Talmud Torah was established as a competitor of the Hebrew classes on the South Side or was regarded as an instrument to adjust immigrant children to the Scottish environment. The fact that the school was situated in the Gorbals indicates that it was meant for immigrant children and not for Garnethill children, but there were some Garnethill members among the early leaders of the Talmud Torah. They included Jacob Kramrisch who served as President of the school in 1903-1904. During the early years Garnethill members also provided financial support for the school and they organised an annual outing, which was intended improve the health of the pupils. The Garnethill members probably regarded the Talmud Torah as a good instrument for the adjustment of immigrant children.

Among the leaders of the Talmud Torah were also immigrants. It is unclear what

³⁴ Vincent, "Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", p. 226. Compare Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 794. The general birth rate in Glasgow dropped from 23.7 per 1,000 in 1925 to 19.6 per 1,000 in 1933, to rise to 19.8 per 1,000 in 1939. The Jewish birth rate for this period is unknown, but if schoolchildren constituted only 13% of the total Jewish population in Glasgow during the 1930s this would suggest that the Jewish birth rate was lower than the general figure.

their interests were. They could have shared Garnethill feelings about the education of immigrant children, but concern about the Jewish education of the children and the fear that standards which had been known in Eastern Europe would be difficult to maintain in Scotland, could also have been among their motives. It is also possible that they regarded the chadarim as inadequate. During the early years, weekly examinations at the Talmud Torah were held by learned and venerable elderly immigrants who must have felt that thereby they transferred some of their Eastern European Talmudic knowledge to the new generations and exercised some control over Jewish education.

One of the immigrant leaders of the Talmud Torah was Hillel Meir Langman. It is unknown what role he played during the early years, but it is certain that he eventually made an important contribution to the school. In 1939 a dinner was organised to celebrate his 90th birthday and his long communal service. On that occasion he spoke about his first years in Scotland. Langman, born in Lithuania, said that as a young teacher in Russia, he had met a man who “spoke of the great wealth that existed in Britain”. In 1880, Langman decided to emigrate and “pick up some of the wealth which was supposed to be so plentiful”³⁵. After staying in Dundee and Edinburgh, where he started a printing business, he came to Glasgow in 1892. According to Langman, there existed “inadequate arrangements”³⁶ for the education of Jewish children in Glasgow at that time, which led him and another man, Benjamin Louis, to organise a public meeting which would be the start of the foundation of the Talmud Torah (Langman said that Louis became its first headmaster; he himself produced a Hebrew primer for the school). He said that the Garnethill congregation did not become involved in the project until 1899; that is after the formation of the United Synagogue in which the older settlers cooperated with immigrant congregations. In 1899 Garnethill members helped the Talmud Torah to rent the classrooms in the Gorbals Public School. Langman told his audience in 1939 that shortly after the move to Buchan Street Garnethill withdrew its support. This created financial difficulties which led to rent arrears causing the temporary loss of the use of the classrooms³⁷. Langman probably meant that the Garnethill support for the school stopped with the breakup of the United Synagogue in 1906. If Langman's version of events is correct, this meant that only during the existence of the United Synagogue Garnethill members supported the school.

³⁵ SJAC, speech H.M. Langman April 1939.

³⁶ SJAC, speech H.M. Langman April 1939; compare JC 4/6/1909; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 142-145.

³⁷ Compare Talmud Torah Jubilee Brochure (1949), p. 13. The financial problems would remain. During the school year 1911-1912, shortly after the failure of the Hebrew Higher Grade School, the Talmud Torah leaders reportedly appealed for financial support from the Zionists in the city.

During the early years of the 20th century the Talmud Torah changed from Yiddish to English instruction and it is possible to recognise the hand of the Garnethill members in this. They despised Yiddish which they regarded as immigrant jargon. Alternatively, their allies in the leadership of the Great Synagogue could have worked in this direction as their Hebrew classes made a similar change at about the same time. Other possibilities are that a group of parents or influential people, like Rabbi Samuel Hillman, stimulated the adoption of English³⁸. As was discussed in the previous chapter the change seems to have been rather dramatic³⁹.

All this suggests that the Talmud Torah was meant as a competitor of the chadarim on the South Side which were regarded as “unrespectable” or “inadequate”, but it remains uncertain why the representatives of the older settlers were involved. If the Talmud Torah did not compete with the chadarim, it probably provided an educational facility for poor immigrant children who could not afford the fees of the Hebrew classes and this facility could be used to adjust the children to the Scottish environment. The teaching methods at the school may confirm this. In 1925 a former pupil of the Talmud Torah complained as follows about the teaching methods employed during the early days:

“Many were the sorrows and pains I suffered at the hands of the stern masters of the old regime. Our lessons then were indeed monotonous. For three hours, day after day, we assembled to mournfully chant portions of the Prayer Book, to the regular rhythm of the pointer beating upon the floor.”⁴⁰

Such methods, not unusual in any Scottish school, were used to keep order. This should not be surprising when the long hours are taken in consideration. The children were taught for three hours per day. During the First World War the number of hours was reduced from three to two per day, initially as a result of emergency regulations; after the war the reduction became permanent. The teaching methods, however, also helped to discipline the immigrant children.

Eventually, the Talmud Torah became the largest Jewish educational institution in Glasgow. From a pre-war peak of 376 in 1908 the number of pupils rose to about 718 in 1926⁴¹. In 1919, there were 7 classes for boys and 6 for girls. All were taught

³⁸ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 142-143, gives the credit to the South Portland Street leaders as well as Hillman. He writes that Hillman had expressed some misgivings about the Hebrew classes of the South Portland Street synagogue changing to English in 1909, but that shortly after he changed his mind and urged other groups to make similar changes.

³⁹ Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine, nr. 1, March 1925, p. 8. See chapter 3.

⁴⁰ “Reminiscences of an old pupil” in Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine, nr. 1, March 1925, pp. 7-9.

⁴¹ For the number of Talmud Torah pupils and the number of Jewish children in Glasgow see table 4.1 in appendix. Collins (Second City Jewry, pp. 213) writes that the 1926 number represented less than half of all Jewish children of the Talmud Torah age group in Glasgow.

on six days a week, Rabbi Salis Daiches from Edinburgh conducted the examinations. In 1922 the Talmud Torah amalgamated with Nathan Morris' Hebrew School. Morris became headmaster of the new institution. During the following year the school moved to the former Hutcheson Grammar School in Elgin Street (later Turriff Street) which had been purchased for £4,000. The same building also briefly housed the Jewish National Institute and a newly established Hebrew College for further education and teacher training. In addition, classes for small children were retained at Gorbals Public School and special children's Sabbath services were held, conducted by older boys. After 1926 a decline started with the school once again in a financial crisis.

During these years the subject matter at the Talmud Torah underwent little change, but there was some concern about teaching methods. In a foreword to a new primer, Langman wrote in 1931: "As soon as a child is able to read with difficulty he is introduced to the translation of Bible and Prayer Book studies, which calls for a greater knowledge than the child possesses at this stage." Langman thought this practice to be out of date and believed that pupils should be introduced to the language step by step, to be led eventually "into the Paradise of Hebrew literature."⁴²

✓ The possibility that Talmud Torah was seen as an instrument to influence immigrant children occurs also during the 1930s when the Zionists tried to lay more emphasis on secular aspects of Jewish history; this took place with the consent of some of the school's leaders. Some members of the clergy opposed this change, while others supported it. In 1935, Rabbi Goodman of Queen's Park declared: "There must be a sense of a living past. I prefer the classes to 'daven Mincha' (say the afternoon prayers) daily, than have them rattle off doubtful dates and uncritical lists of Kings of Israel."⁴³

The development of the Talmud Torah shows that the school might have been established as a competitor of the Hebrew classes of the South Side congregations, but at least since 1914 formed an extra Jewish education facility in Glasgow, in addition to the Hebrew classes of the congregations. The Talmud Torah was involved in the conflict between older settlers and immigrants and there is a strong suggestion that the school functioned as a facility for poor immigrant children and could be used to adjust these children to the Scottish environment. In later years the Talmud Torah became the largest Jewish educational institution in Glasgow. The school received support from different groups. Some of these possibly regarded it as an instrument to influence the education of Jewish children.

The Talmud Torah was aimed solely to the primary age group, with boys finishing

⁴² H.M. Langman, Hebrew Primer of Hebrew Reading and Writing with Bible Stories and Short Prayers for Jewish Children, Glasgow, 1931, p. 3.

⁴³ JE 31/5/1935.

after their bar mitzvah ceremony. Attempts were made to provide educational facilities for teenagers. In 1921 a religious society for this purpose was established⁴⁴, but this proved to be a short-lived institution; the slightly more successful Hebrew College was also intended for older students. Later, in 1932 and 1933, other small groups were found like the Glasgow Ezrath Torah and Kupeth Zedakah, which aimed at the support of Talmudic students⁴⁵. There were notably few facilities for specialist Talmudic study in Glasgow. The yeshiva, operating since the beginning of this century, remained small and lacked stability and continuity. In 1937 it offered free education on the condition that students attended regularly and punctually. Occasionally, very promising students were sent to yeshivoth in Eastern Europe.

The lack of institutions for secondary Jewish education in Glasgow, however, never received the attention which primary education got. During the 1920s, the thinking about Jewish education in Glasgow began to concentrate on the decline in the attendance numbers for Jewish education which was regarded as a result of neglect. It was feared that a growing number of Jewish children was receiving no Jewish education. Mostly, the parents were blamed. In 1921 the teacher and Zionist leader D.W. Haase wrote an article in the newly founded local magazine the Jewish Voice which provided a focus for contemporary debate and criticism. He painted a very gloomy picture: "In everything concerning Judaism, Glasgow is always at the bottom."⁴⁶ Haase wrote that while Jewish parents should strive for an education which should turn their children into good and faithful Jews, who knew Hebrew and were devoted to Zionism, there was now a general indifference. According to Haase, only a quarter of all Jewish children in Glasgow received a Jewish education.

It is significant that a Zionist like Haase entered the debate at this stage. As will be discussed in chapter 6, popular support for Zionism was growing during the early 1920s and the Zionists were able to give the discussion about Jewish education a new impetus.

Rabbi Salis Daiches from Edinburgh added to the debate in 1925 when he wrote in the Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine⁴⁷ that the Jews in Scotland lived under special circumstances. The distance from other Jewish centres caused isolation. The surrounding society was largely non-Jewish, there was no Jewish history in Scotland and there had been no persecution. Jews freely associated with non-Jews, everybody spoke the English language and many of the interests of the Jews in Scotland lay outside Judaism. For young people, Jewish life was therefore more or less artificial. Jewish

⁴⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 212-213.

⁴⁵ JE 19/8/1932, 3/2/1933.

⁴⁶ Jewish Voice, nr. 1, July 1921.

⁴⁷ Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine, nr. 1, March 1925, pp. 5-7.

education should be used to give Judaism a real meaning for young Jews.

Haase's negative comments were echoed by the leaders of the Talmud Torah. In advance of an otherwise successful meeting of the school's executive in 1929, for example, treasurer Jack Morrison, spoke about "apathy"⁴⁸ and Fred Nettler, a Zionist like Haase, added in 1934: "If parents did not realise what a Jewish education meant for their children they would come to regret it as the German Jews now regretted that they had not hung on to their Judaism."⁴⁹

Zevi Golombok, the editor of the Jewish Echo wrote in 1931 about the "alarming numbers of Jewish children who receive no Hebrew education". He blamed parents but also "our educationalists, who are at public meetings so loud in their lamentations (and who) are very slow when action is required."⁵⁰ Golombok's comments fit in his campaign about growing irreligiousness for which he held materialism responsible - the "exaggerated spirit of modernism"⁵¹. In February 1936 Golombok noted the following:

"A Jewish young man is no longer judged by his knowledge of the Torah or the number of the Talmudic volumes in which he is versed (...) but by the weekly salary he commands."⁵²

Similar comments were made by clergymen. Parents were said to be in danger of losing their children. Rabbi Dryan and the Rev. Rubinstein wrote the following:

"Jewish parents who have an earnest regard for their children's religious education - Jewish parents who honestly wish to train their children in the true Jewish way of life so that they may remain loyal to their Faith and their people, must create in their homes a true Jewish atmosphere."⁵³

Outside Scotland, similar complaints about the neglect of Jewish education were made. In September 1935, for example, the Jewish Chronicle quoted the Director of Jewish Education in London, who spoke bitterly about half of the total of 30,000 Jewish children in the British capital who did not attend Talmud Torah schools or other Jewish educational facilities⁵⁴.

⁴⁸ JE 5/4/1929, 19/4/1929.

⁴⁹ JE 7/9/1934. Hitler's rise to power and the subsequent persecution of the Jews in Germany was sometimes blamed on an alleged decline in Judaism in that country. During the 1930s this interpretation of the events in Germany became an important factor in the communal debates in Glasgow.

⁵⁰ JE 24/4/1931, 21/5/1931.

⁵¹ JE 24/2/1933.

⁵² JE 14/2/1936.

⁵³ Dryan/Rubinstein, The Holy Sabbath, pp. 6-7.

⁵⁴ JC 27/9/1935.

Did such attendance figures really reflect the neglect of Jewish education? In 1931 Max Friedlander came to Glasgow from Manchester to take up the post of headmaster of the Talmud Torah. He became one of the major exponents in the campaign about the neglect of Jewish education which he blamed on the indifference of parents. The figures as presented in table 4.1, however, show that in comparison with 1914 and 1929, during the 1930s absolute attendance figures were falling but that relatively more Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow received Jewish education. According to the estimates, children who received no^{only} (or private) Jewish education formed 62.5% of the total number of Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow in 1914; this rose to 65.2% in 1929, but fell to 62.4% in 1932 and 61.7% in 1935. The number of pupils at Friedlander's Talmud Torah was in decline since 1926, but this may not reflect a trend of growing neglect of Jewish education as was assumed at the time. The most complete set of figures in table 4.1 are from 1935. These were provided by Friedlander and he used them to illustrate the decline of Jewish education. According to Friedlander, there were 1,886 Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow. Of this total 1,344 were in the age groups of the Hebrew classes and the Talmud Torah, that is between 7 and 13 years of age, the others were either too young or too old. This means that 542 Jewish schoolchildren were not supposed to attend Jewish education. If this figure is deducted from the total of 1,166 children who received no or private education, there are 624 children left who were eligible to attend Jewish education, but who received no or private Jewish education.

This figure may even have been lower. The Talmud Torah had 313 children on its roll in 1935. In addition, according to Friedlander, 407 children visited Hebrew classes. This figure is arrived at as follows. The congregations of which Friedlander knew the number pupils were the (small) Progressive Synagogue, Queen's Park, Garnethill, Langside and South Portland Street, plus the classes of 2 private teachers. Together these had 282 pupils. Friedlander wrote that the classes which he had not included contained about 100 to 150 pupils. Consequently, 125 children were added to the number of 282 cheder pupils.

Friedlander, however, may have underestimated the number of pupils at other institutions of Jewish education. These may have included classes of the Central Synagogue and the smaller places of worship in the Gorbals, but also areas such as Crosshill, Newlands and Giffnock, and Hillington and Cardonald with quickly developing congregations. There could have been more than 100-150 pupils in the Hebrew classes there. The number of chadarim pupils could therefore be higher than Friedlander estimated. The situation would look even better when the number of Jewish pupils at public schools who received Jewish education during school hours and

children who received their Jewish education at home or from private teachers could be taken into consideration. Unfortunately, this number is unknown. In any case, the number of Jewish children in Glasgow in 1935 who should have received Jewish education but who did not get any is lower than Friedlander suggested.

The fear that Jewish education was increasingly being neglected might have been real during the 1920s and is sustained by the figures for 1914 and 1929, but the developments after 1932 point in a different direction. The remarks by Morrison, Nettler, Golombok and Friedlander about the neglect of Jewish education were not correct. In reality there might even have been an increase in the number of children in Glasgow who were receiving Jewish education during the 1930s.

Haase's and Daiches' comments about Jewish education in the 1920s were correct inasmuch as they reflected a decline in the number of children attending Jewish education. In a sense, Daiches' comments were more positive than those of the Glasgow men. Daiches recommended education because it stimulated self-knowledge and self-respect, being an inspiration for young Jews living in Scotland⁵⁵. This approach was embodied in the Glasgow Hebrew College, which proudly presented itself as the first of its kind in Britain. The College felt that the future of Jewish education in Glasgow depended on it. In 1926, the Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine wrote that Jewish education had been hampered by a fundamental defect, namely the absence of any definite aim. The College would give it a new purpose: to "instil Jewish culture into the child in the same way as British culture is instilled into a British child."⁵⁶ In 1927 the College had 26 students, four years later there were 19⁵⁷. To a certain extent the future of Jewish education in Glasgow did really depend on the College, because later it would supply many local teachers.

Friedlander might have been right when he pointed at a tendency to limit Jewish education to boys who were preparing for their bar mitzvah ceremony, which meant that older boys and girls were not attending Jewish education. Langman estimated in 1930 that some 600 girls in the right age group received no Jewish education, in 1932 this number was put at 522, while Friedlander in 1935 mentioned a figure of 478 girls⁵⁸. The growing attention for the education of girls followed similar patterns of increased attention for the role of women in Judaism and in general society.

There are several possible reasons why these comments were made. The first reason could be that these commentators looked at absolute attendance figures and simply concluded that Jewish education was neglected. The total number of pupils at

⁵⁵ Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine, nr. 1, March 1925, pp. 5-7.

⁵⁶ Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine, nr. 2, Autumn 1926, pp. 16-17.

⁵⁷ Talmud Torah Jubilee Brochure (1949) p. 17.

⁵⁸ JE 8/8/1930, 29/8/1930, 4/3/1932, 24/3/1933, 20/9/1935.

Talmud Torah, for example, was declining during the 1930s. The presence among these commentators of clergymen and Zionists may indicate a second reason. An often heard remark, repeated in 1933 by the editor of the Jewish Echo, during this period was “give us back the cheder”⁵⁹. This remark was mostly made by clergymen or persons who emphasised the importance of religion in Judaism. It means that these people believed that from an educational point of view the cheder system would work better or means that these people believed that parents would be more inclined to send their children to an old-fashioned cheder than to the modern institutions. In both cases, the remark expressed the desire to recreate circumstances which the older immigrants had known in Eastern Europe, or at least what they remembered of it. In the cheder system the clergy and the leaders of the congregations controlled the education of the children. Likewise, the Zionists propagated institutions which were under their control. During the interwar period these two groups competed for influence in Glasgow Jewry and both used the falling attendance figures as an argument to support their claims.

The talk about neglect of Jewish education surfaced in the 1920s. This era was in general a time of uncertainty. All Scottish population groups were involved in a process of reassessment of their position within the whole of the Scottish population, a process which was a result of the First World War, its consequences and further social and economic changes. As was discussed in the previous chapter, religion began to play a different role in daily life with consequences for religious education. Jews were also affected by these changes.

In addition, Jewish education in Glasgow had become a tool in a power struggle between several groups, like the clergy and the Zionists. There were many groups, including the religious establishment, the supporters of change towards a more secular Judaism and different Zionist groups. In addition, there still existed some rivalry between the congregations. The divisions between these groups were not always clear and it was possible for a person to belong to several groups at the same time.

Many groups used the allegation of neglect of Jewish education as an argument for their cause⁶⁰. Youth groups, for example, criticised the older generation in a similar way. In 1939 the United Jewish Youth Movement condemned cheder education as dry and dusty. The group resolved: “An organisation providing adult education on a mass basis was required and the magnitude of the task was recognised as demanding an

⁵⁹ JE 24/2/1933.

⁶⁰ See for example the Jewish Leader 14/3/1930, 21/11/1930. For the position of this magazine and Zionism during the 1930s see chapter 6.

entirely new technique for which there was little precedent.”⁶¹

Part of the struggle centred on a debate about tradition and modernism. By the mid-1930s there were generally two camps involved in this debate. On one side were the traditionalists, who preferred an adaptation of the cheder system, and on the other side those who wanted further change involving the Talmud Torah and Jewish religious instruction in public primary schools, which will be discussed below. In the middle of this struggle came an initiative to create more unity in Jewish education in Glasgow by establishing an umbrella organisation.

The first indication of a need being felt for more unity came from Garnethill, where the wish for a “Board of Hebrew Education for Glasgow” was expressed in 1927⁶². It remains unclear why the Garnethill members wanted such an organisation, but it is possible that it was still seen as a way to exercise influence over the education of Jewish children on the South Side; although, due to the growing presence of immigrants in the leadership of the congregation this seems less likely than it would have been in the beginning of the century. Maybe the congregation hoped to gain financially from a strong central body because it was struggling to provide facilities in the West End. Perhaps there was genuine concern about the standards of Jewish education in Glasgow, but in any case, the proposal was not followed up.

In June 1932, another step in the direction of a larger organisation was taken when a “Jewish Education Society” headed by Talmud Torah headmaster Friedlander was formed to stimulate interest in Hebrew among adults and children⁶³. It took two years before the new organisation was taking shape and two more years before it finally began to operate. In 1934 the Jewish Echo announced this initiative⁶⁴ but nothing happened until 1936. In that year, the organisation was officially formed, although there was still some doubt about its proper name⁶⁵. This finally became Glasgow Jewish Education Board. The President of the new Board was Louis Daets from the Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation, while Rabbi Benjamin Atlas, a long-serving clergyman of the Great Synagogue, was Vice-President. The Rev. I.K. Cosgrove became the Board's Honorary Secretary. Eventually all synagogues joined the new organisation, but the

⁶¹ SJAC, MBUJYM 8/1/1939. The new technique was to involve lectures, study groups, film shows and a pamphlet club.

⁶² SJAC, MBG 17/1/1927.

⁶³ Glasgow Evening Citizen 10/6/1932.

⁶⁴ JE 28/9/1934, 5/10/1934, 19/10/1934.

⁶⁵ The formation was announced in the Jewish Echo on 14th February 1936, mentioning the name “Hebrew Education Board”. This was perhaps a little premature, because the Board had not met and was not established until April (see SJAC, Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Education Board (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBGJEB) 8/3/1936, 12/3/1936, 1/4/1936). This might also indicate how education had become a campaign issue. Friedlander in 1949 claimed that the initiative for the Board had been taken by the Talmud Torah (Talmud Torah Jubilee Brochure, 1949, p. 21). The organisation was modelled on a similar institution in London, led by J.M. Adler.

absence of some congregations during the initial meetings of the Board suggest some opposition to its foundation⁶⁶.

The Board, which included Talmud Torah representatives, was to be responsible for the provision of Hebrew and religious education for all Jewish children in Glasgow, but the affiliated organisations kept their autonomy in educational matters and the Board was not allowed to interfere in the Hebrew classes. Thus, it could inspect the Hebrew classes, but only to recommend changes. In June 1936, for example, the Board noted that the four and a half hours tuition per week at Garnethill were “insufficient”⁶⁷.

However, it was not really the time available for Jewish education, but its principles which occupied the members of the Board. Two groups took part in the discussion about these principles. On one side were the religious traditionalists and on the other the more secular modernists. Rabbi Atlas belonged to the first group and he was the first to speak out. In May 1936 he insisted that the Board should discuss the principles of Jewish education. Atlas, a man with strong Continental connections who favoured Talmudic studies, wanted the local youth to be able to read Hebrew fluently, to understand and be sympathetic towards Jewish tradition and practices, to know the Torah and at the age of 13 also to have a good knowledge of the prayerbook. In addition, he felt that 13-year-old children should be introduced to the study of Rashi which should lead to further Talmudic knowledge. His emphasis was on religion. After some objections he later added that a child should also know the most important events of Jewish history. Atlas’ amended programme originally formed the basis of a pamphlet of the Board, but it encountered more opposition from the modernists whose ideas differed sharply from Atlas’ programme. The modernist group included Zionist representatives. The Zionists agreed with Atlas about Hebrew, because they regarded it as the national Jewish language, but their approach to Jewish education was completely different. Board member Misha Louvish, a young Socialist Zionist, produced a text which appealed to the parents as follows:

“In the World as it is to-day Jews dare not be ignorant. Life for us holds many dangers and difficulties. Sooner or later your children must become aware of their anomalous position in the World.”⁶⁸

This awareness was important as it formed the cornerstone of contemporary Zionist thought. To fortify the children against this discovery, Louvish wrote, they should be

⁶⁶ SJAC, MBGJEB 1/4/1936, see also MBP 26/1/1937.

⁶⁷ SJAC, MBGJEB 17/6/1936.

⁶⁸ SJAC, leaflet “To Jewish Parents A Timely Reminder”, April 1937. See also SJAC, Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Education Board (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBGJEB 13/5/1936, 17/6/1936).

taught love for the Jewish way of life, its traditions and heritage, for which six years of education were a bare minimum. Unlike Atlas' programme, there was no emphasis on religion. Louvish put the preservation of Jewish life in general first.

This more secular view on Jewish education gained the upper hand and Louvish' text was eventually published. The more secular view succeeded because there were divisions among the religious leaders. Their differences came into the open during a quarrel about the provision of prayer cards. In the autumn of 1936 the London-based Jewish Memorial Council proposed the distribution of cards containing the text of certain prayers to Jewish schoolchildren. Queen's Park Rabbi Goodman objected, because the cards would encourage children to neglect the prayerbook. The use of the cards was like Arab "prayer beads," he said. Atlas agreed. Another rabbi said the cards "smacked of Christianity"⁶⁹ - an accusation which was often made against Liberal or Reform Judaism. Cosgrove thought that the card was a good idea. When it came to a vote, the Board rejected the cards with a 5-3 majority. Shortly afterwards, however, a new meeting refused to adopt the minutes of the discussion on the cards and shortly after that they were introduced. In May 1937 treasurer Jack Karter (like his predecessor Paul Merrens, an entrepreneur who was a sponsor of the Board) was "warmly thanked for providing Prayer cards for Jewish children attending Morning Prayers"⁷⁰ at Glasgow schools. It is possible that the Board had reached a consensus on their own version of the cards, but it is more likely that the religious traditionalists had lost the dispute.

The question of the cards arose because the Board concerned itself with religious instruction of Jewish children in Glasgow schools. This issue grew in importance during the 1930s when attempts to find a Jewish day school in Glasgow ran out of steam. The idea of a Jewish day school, which in theory might have solved many problems of Jewish education and give those in charge of the school influence over the education of Jewish children, was first mentioned in Glasgow during the 19th century, but for a long period Glasgow Jewish leaders regarded the number of Jewish children in the city as too small to justify the foundation of such a school. Jewish day schools, providing secular education and Jewish studies for children in the primary school age, had been founded in England during the 19th century⁷¹, but in Scotland the situation was different. Unlike in England, the great bulk of elementary and secondary education in Scotland was from the start provided by the local authorities: the School Boards and, after 1918, the local Education Authorities.

In 1897, when the number of immigrant children was rising quickly, one of the

⁶⁹ SJAC, MBGJEB 25/11/1936.

⁷⁰ SJAC, MBGJEB 26/6/1937, see also 16/12/1936.

⁷¹ Lipman, *A History of the Jews in Britain*, p. 29.

Garnethill members suggested the establishment an entirely Jewish primary school on the South Side at a general meeting of the Garnethill congregation⁷². The school was presented as a solution for the problem of the lack of proper Jewish education facilities on the South Side. It was decided that a committee would look at the numbers involved, but nothing further was reported. The idea surfaced again in the 20th century. In September 1910 Charles Mabon suggested in a letter to the Jewish Chronicle that the Gorbals Public School in Buchan Street, where more than half of the pupils were Jewish, could be transformed to a Jewish school when Jewish pupils from other schools on the South Side would be sent there to take the place of non-Jewish children. Mabon pointed out that this way Jewish education could be provided during school hours. He wrote the following about the disadvantage of the present system for Jewish parents:

“They pay the school rate and easily obtain exemption (from Christian religious instruction for their children), but have either to allow their children to go without any religious education or have to find some other means of providing it outside of school hours at their own further expense.”⁷³

It seems that Mabon’s idea to set aside the Buchan Street school for Jewish children found favour in the eyes of some members of the Glasgow School Board, but eventually it did not gain enough support among the Jewish organisations⁷⁴. During the following years it became clear why the idea was rejected.

In 1913, Langman, by now convener of the Talmud Torah, adopted the idea of a Jewish school under the supervision of the School Board. His plan also included the purchase or rent of an empty school building in which the Talmud Torah would also find its premises to be financed by Glasgow Jewry. He used the argument that many Jewish children - about 1,000 - did not receive any Jewish education. The correspondent of the Jewish Chronicle noticed, however, that “to appeal to the (Jewish) community for funds to open and maintain it (the Jewish school) is impracticable.”⁷⁵ There was already a heavy demand on charity. Which meant that the older settlers, who were at this stage the most affluent group in Glasgow Jewry, were not prepared to finance the scheme.

During the next year the newly established Glasgow Jewish Representative Council took the idea of a Jewish school to the candidates for the forthcoming School Board elections, asking for “greater facilities from the School Board for the collective

⁷² SJAC, MBG 25/4/1897.

⁷³ JC 9/9/1910.

⁷⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 90, 130-131, 142-145, 183-188.

⁷⁵ JC 9/5/1913.

teaching of Jewish children, which has been much discussed during the past year or two.”⁷⁶ The Council pointed out that an estimated number of 1,600 Jewish primary schoolchildren in the Gorbals (in Gorbals Public School they were said to make up 62% of the total number of pupils) faced long hours of study in the evening or had to miss out on religious education. They asked for one of the public schools to be turned into a Jewish day school and premises for the Talmud Torah.

It was reported⁷⁷ that a majority of the new School Board would support the idea, but that the problem was to find enough qualified Jewish teachers for the school. This does not seem to be correct. The discussion went much deeper. The Board was controlled by representatives of the Protestant churches with one fifth of the number of Board members being Roman Catholic. The School Board members showed political interests⁷⁸ and some of them were strongly opposed to the idea of separate schools for different religious groups, including a Jewish school. The argument used by the Board members who opposed the idea was that the establishment of a Jewish school would create “sectarian ramparts”. One minister said “the division of schoolchildren on the lines of religion was one of the most vicious principles they could introduce into education. Nothing could be worse for the citizenship of the future.” Supporters of the plan said segregation “would be in the interest of the education of both of the Jewish and the Presbyterian children in (the involved) schools.” The opposition to the idea had the upper hand. It was realised that there was a certain amount of hardship “in so far as Jewish children could not attend school between nine and ten o’clock when religious instruction was given to the other scholars”⁷⁹ and they had to attend evening classes, but this did not constitute reason enough for a Jewish school. When the matter was put to the vote, the opponents of the plan had a majority and the Board decided not to set aside a school for Jewish children⁸⁰.

In 1920 the idea was discussed again, this time by the Glasgow Education Authority, the successor of the Glasgow School Board (later Education Department), after a new proposal to set aside a school for Jewish children had come from the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council in 1919⁸¹. The matter was remitted to the Committee on Teachers and Teaching which asked the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council for details and suggestions for the curriculum. The Council envisaged⁸² that the

⁷⁶ Letter quoted in JC 4/12/1914.

⁷⁷ JC 27/3/1914

⁷⁸ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, pp. 198-206; Roxburgh, The School Board of Glasgow, pp. 215-224; Haddow, My Seventy Years, p. 60.

⁷⁹ JC 4/12/1914.

⁸⁰ JC 24/4/1914, 18/12/1914, 22/1/1915.

⁸¹ SRA, DED 2.1.1, Minutes of the Education Authority of Glasgow 1919-1920, 5/6/1919; GH 6/6/1919.

⁸² SRA, DED 2.1.1, Minutes of the Education Authority of Glasgow 1919-1920, 10/6/1919, 26/8/1919.

curriculum would be similar to other schools with the exception of one and a half hours per day reserved for Jewish religious instruction. In addition the school had to be closed on Saturdays and Sundays and Jewish teachers would have to be employed. Following these suggestions the Education Authority received a delegation from the Council and during this meeting two conditions were formulated on which the establishment of a Jewish school would rest. These conditions were that the school hours would be from 9am to 4pm, with the first hour reserved for religious instruction, and secondly that the Jewish children at this school were not required to attend evening classes for further Jewish education. The Council, however, could not undertake to give any assurances about the evening classes. Apparently some organisations on the Council objected to give such an assurance. The committee therefore advised the Education Authority to take no action⁸³. In May 1920 the Education Authority discussed the matter. The opinions differed sharply. Some members opposed the idea of a Jewish school. The Rev. David McQueen, minister of the St. Vincent United Free Church of Scotland parish⁸⁴, was the strongest opponent. Did Jewish parents really desire segregation for their children, he asked, when they themselves were "quite willing to do business with the Gentiles?" He said that if they wanted to develop brotherhood, they should begin in childhood. McQueen thought that the creation of schools for different denominations was likely to "injure the community in the long run." Others felt more sympathy towards the idea of a Jewish school. They said it was unjust that when 75% of all the pupils at the Gorbals Public School were Jewish, they still had to get their Jewish education outside school hours. Some Education Authority members felt that Jewish children were penalised as compared with others by having to go to evening school for two hours per day after already having done a full day. Perhaps Jews placed restrictions upon their children which other religions did not, but they should be able to get the Jewish teaching they desired within the ordinary school hours. Education Authority member James Maxton said that it "had been said" that a Jewish school "would be a source for disseminating Bolshevism in the city" and added jokingly that there "was not the faintest hope of that."⁸⁵ The failure of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council to give assurances about the evening classes, however, proved to be the stumbling block. When the matter was put to the vote 24 members voted to take no action, 10 wanted to grant the

⁸³ SRA, DED 2.1.2, Minutes of the Education Authority of Glasgow 1920-1921, 22/1/1920, 30/3/1920, 27/4/1920. The committee also decided to hear the opinion of a Christian missionary to the Jews, but his evidence was not recorded.

⁸⁴ J.A. Lamb, The Fasti of the United Free Church of Scotland 1900-1929, London, 1956, pp. 250-251.

⁸⁵ SRA, DED 2.1.2, Minutes of the Education Authority of Glasgow 1920-1921, 6/5/1920; GH 7/5/1920. On the same day McQueen opposed unsuccessfully the idea of a special holiday for Jewish schoolchildren as requested by the Glasgow Zionist Council to celebrate the "Restoration of Palestine to the Jewish People".

application of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council and 3 members wanted further consideration of the proposal.

The Protestants, the representatives of the Church of Scotland and the other Presbyterian Churches like McQueen who so strongly opposed the idea of a Jewish school, traditionally had a strong influence on the local education authorities in Scotland and they favoured a system of state education in which they were responsible for religious education or where there would be no religious education at all⁸⁶. It was made clear that the provision of adequate education was decided by the local authority and not the religious group. There are parallels between the arguments used in 1914 and 1919-1920 against a Jewish school with ideas mooted at this time of Catholic children being integrated into the system of public education⁸⁷ which should be, at least, noted here, even although the whole subject of Catholic schools in Glasgow is a major one requiring separate treatment in its own right.

Both Catholics and Jews saw religious education as crucial in preservation of their identity. But the parallels break down a little when the relative position of the Jewish and the Roman Catholic population groups is compared. The latter numbered about 186,000 in Glasgow in 1901, compared to 6,000 Jews in the city then, and had important political ties which gave them some political influence with regard to the fortunes of the Liberal and Labour parties in the city. Also the Catholics had already for long been building up their own voluntary system of schools ever since 1816 and, therefore, this framework had to be accommodated in some way in 1872 and 1918. The Jews, on the other hand, had no existing framework of day schools. Unlike the Catholics, the Jews were not numerous enough or willing to pay for such an upkeep of a Jewish school. Nor could they provide qualified teachers of the same faith in sufficient numbers to staff schools for their children. Finally, it may be said that the problem in one sense was less pressing for Jews than Catholics. To the former all adaptations they had to make were with a predominantly Christian culture, while any adaptation by the latter would have to take account of a denominational difference which was regarded as a threat to the group's very existence. To the Jewish group, all adaptation involved some accommodation with existing public institutions, like schools, which were always going to be different in a Christian country. The conscience clause, allowing separate treatment during hours of religious instruction, was their safeguard in this respect. By 1920, men like McQueen were determined not to allow any development which could be regarded as furthering the position already enjoyed by

⁸⁶ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, pp. 11, 64, 98, 198-201.

⁸⁷ Compare Bro. Kenneth, "The Education Act, 1918, in the Making", In Innes Review, volume XIX (1968), pp. 91-128. See also T.R. Bone (ed.), Studies in the History of Scottish Education 1872-1939, London, 1967, pp. 26-64; and for a wider perspective D.M. McRoberts (ed.), Modern Scottish Catholicism 1878-1978, Glasgow, 1979.

Catholics. It was, therefore, all the more unlikely that requests for a separate Jewish school would be conceded in such an atmosphere. Episcopalians, too, had tried to maintain their own educational ethos after 1872 until 1918 but they had been constantly hampered by a lack of Episcopalian teachers due to their small numbers and had had to give up their attempt. Only the Catholics, therefore, had to be catered for.

It appears that some Jewish organisations were not prepared to meet the condition of Jewish children at the school not having to attend evening classes. There might have been objections concerning the problem of finding qualified teachers and the feasibility of funding the project, and the maintenance of a Jewish school might have been regarded as a heavy financial burden on communal resources, while five hours of religious instruction per week must have been far too little in the eyes of the Jewish religious establishment. Under these circumstances it was unlikely that the congregations and clergy would be prepared to sacrifice their Hebrew classes and thereby lose their influence over religious instruction.

Although the idea of a Jewish school returned for brief spells in 1926 and 1930 - but in that year the Representative Council could not find time to discuss the issue⁸⁸ - it would not be pursued again with some success until the 1950s. In 1950, Rabbi Gottlieb thought time had come for a Jewish day school and the Glasgow Jewish Education Board started discussions with the Glasgow Corporation Education Department about a school under the supervision of the corporation for some 200 Jewish pupils in the age group of 11-12 years with Jewish teachers, Jewish subjects and the normal curriculum⁸⁹. But nothing came of the idea.

Five years later, in October 1955, the Rev. Cosgrove promoted the idea, saying that a Jewish school "would strengthen Judaism and solve the problem of Jewish education."⁹⁰ The Glasgow Jewish Education Board decided to investigate the feasibility of such a school. In 1956 more than eight hundred questionnaires were sent to Jewish parents. ^{Fewer} than four hundred replied, but of these 315 were said to be positive about the ideal. Although, according to the Jewish Board, "apathy displayed by the community" had caused the failure of earlier plans, this response was said to be an indication of a constant and insistent demand⁹¹ for a Jewish school. The negotiations with the Corporation were re-opened. It was expected that it might take anything from five to ten years to get a school from the authorities.

When results were not forthcoming, some of the local Jewish businessmen who at this time formed the communal leadership decided to take matters in their own hand,

⁸⁸ MBGJRC 7/12/1930.

⁸⁹ SJAC, MBGJEB 9/5/1950; GH 13/5/1950.

⁹⁰ SJAC, MBGJEB 3/10/1955.

⁹¹ SJAC, MBGJEB 2/2/1956, 2/5/1956, 31/5/1956.

starting an initiative for a private school. This led to Calderwood Lodge Primary School, which opened its door on 27th August 1962. The foundation of this school in Glasgow was not an isolated event. Elsewhere in Britain, Jewish schools were opened too and during this period the number of Jewish children at Jewish day schools in the United Kingdom increased. At this time British Jewry showed a growing wish to preserve Jewish culture and identity and it appears that Glasgow merely followed this trend⁹².

The episode shows that even at that stage, with greater financial stability in the Jewish community, it was not easy to start a Jewish school. Before the Second World War the decisions of the School Board and Education Authority, Jewish divisions and problems of staffing and financial feasibility prevented the foundation of a Jewish school. A majority of the Jewish organisations in Glasgow obviously preferred the children to attend public schools rather than a Jewish school with Jewish education in the home and, if required, also taking place at Hebrew classes or the Talmud Torah. This system allowed groups like the clergy and Zionists to influence the education of the children.

During the 1930s another way of providing Jewish education received attention. This was the idea to utilise the hours of religious instruction in the public schools. The question of the prayer cards which was discussed in the Glasgow Jewish Education Board had to do with religious instruction in public schools and showed that on this subject there were also different opinions and interest groups.

When the Glasgow School Board rejected the idea of setting aside a school for Jewish children in December 1914, it suggested that facilities could be made available for religious instruction of the Jewish children during the normal hour of religious instruction from 9 to 10am in any school where the number of Jewish children warranted it⁹³. Jewish teachers would be given access to the schools for this purpose. This offer was rejected by the Representative Council. The Council said that this was because teaching materials were lacking and the expenses involved were too large, while it was also felt that the project might jeopardise the success of future proposals for a Jewish day school⁹⁴.

During the 1930s this idea was picked up again. In July 1930 Golombok re-opened the discussion in the Jewish Echo when he noticed that Jewish children in public schools were allowed to stay away from school until 9.45am - thereby missing the normal period of religious instruction. Why not use this period for Hebrew lessons?

⁹² Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, p. 239.

⁹³ JC 4/12/1914.

⁹⁴ JC 22/1/1915.

His idea was supported by the non-Jewish headmaster of the Gorbals Public School⁹⁵. During the following weeks several people reacted in the Jewish Echo. Langman wrote in support of the idea and claimed that previously a similar scheme had been set up in the Adelphi Terrace school for some 300 Jewish children, two thirds of whom had “never seen an Aleph and knew absolutely nothing of Judaism.”⁹⁶ Apparently, the scheme had collapsed. Ellis Isaacs also supported Golombok’s idea. He wrote that Jewish children should not be detained indoors after school while Gentile children were free to play and enjoy themselves in the open air. Isaacs thought that the new scheme would replace the Hebrew classes. Not surprisingly, opposition came from the clergy. The Rev. S. Bloch of the Langside synagogue felt that the scheme offered no real solution for the problems of Jewish education. He also objected to the amount of one hour a day, believing that girls needed at least 90 minutes per day. The Rev. David Jacobs of the South Portland Street synagogue reminded the readers of the Jewish Echo of the previous scheme (mentioned by Langman) which had met opposition because it damaged the cheder system. Perhaps the idea would work if it was limited to girls, he wrote, which must have meant that some Hebrew classes did not have girls among their pupils or not many, because their Jewish education was not deemed to be important or because they simply stayed away⁹⁷.

Rabbi Chaim Zirkel, the headmaster of the Talmud Torah felt that the proposal might lessen the strain on Jewish children, but that it would be impossible to create a Jewish atmosphere which predominated in the Jewish institutions. Notably, Roman Catholics used similar arguments to defend independent Catholic educational institutions. Furthermore, Zirkel argued, parents might think that enough was done in school and keep their children away from Hebrew classes and Talmud Torah. Another argument used by the clergy against the scheme was that while it offered no real solution, the scheme might weaken the plans for a Jewish school⁹⁸. An odd argument as they probably resisted the establishment of such a school. In reply, Langman reminded them that attempts to found a day school had failed because there were not enough

⁹⁵ JE 11/7/1930. The school is here called Gorbals Elementary School.

⁹⁶ JE 8/8/1930, see also JE 29/8/1930.

⁹⁷ At this time there was a general concern about the education of girls. See Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine, nr. 1, March 1925, pp. 26-27; SJAC, MBG 19/10/1930, 7/12/1930; Vincent, “Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren” pp. 223-224. Vincent raises the possibility that there were more Jewish boys registered at public schools than girls. Boys certainly completely outnumbered girls in the chadarim. Some people wanted to change this. At Garnethill, the Rev. Simmons wanted to start a special class for girls to teach them the essentials of the Jewish faith. The Hebrew College Magazine joked about a meeting of the “Hebrew College Branch of the Suffrage Union”, which met in special cushioned seats, had a dressing room where “divers powders, scents and other such conveniences” were available, but on a more serious note the magazine claimed that 4 out of a total of 8 students in a particular exam were female and did its best to stimulate girls to study.

⁹⁸ JE 18/7/1930, 25/7/1930, 1/8/1930.

teachers, which of course must have created further doubts about any such schemes requiring Jewish teachers.

The plan was not immediately successful, but a year later Golombok took the initiative for a similar scheme at Mount Florida Public School, which was attended by his own children. In October 1931, he wrote in support of the idea, using the following warning:

“There is the regrettable fact that in the present state of affairs many Jewish children in Glasgow receive no Jewish education whatsoever. This applies particularly to girls, many of whom grow up without having learned even to read the Aleph Beth. Such a rising generation renders the future of our people very gloomy. There is nothing deadlier, nothing more dangerous for the Jewish people than ignorance of Hebrew and its literature. No doubt, the growth of intermarriage in recent years is to a large extent due to this lack of Hebrew knowledge and literature.”⁹⁹

This time Golombok had carefully prepared his plan. He wrote that the scheme for Jewish education at public schools during the usual hours for religious education had been approved by the local Education Authority and had the consent of the headmaster at Mount Florida. He claimed that there were enough Jewish schoolteachers in Glasgow who knew Hebrew and could be employed at the cost of the local authorities if there was a lack of teachers. He carefully chose his words and used alarming figures, writing that as many as 2,000 out of a total number of 3,000 Jewish children, if not more, did not receive Jewish education. This estimate was definitely far too high because there were at this time probably not more than 2,000 Jewish children between the ages of 5 to 15¹⁰⁰. The mention of the education of girls would possibly diminish the resistance from the clergy (see above), while he added that the “admirable” Talmud Torah (which refused to co-operate) and the Hebrew classes of the synagogues did not stand to lose because of the large numbers involved and, furthermore, he warned: “Allow the young generation to grow up in complete ignorance (...) and you shall then require to close up your synagogues (...)” Zionist support could be gained with the emphasis on Hebrew. Parents were warned with the reference to intermarriage, that they were liable to lose their children if they did not take care of their education.

Golombok had hoped that the Mount Florida scheme for Hebrew education during periods when other pupils had religious instruction could eventually be extended to all Jewish pupils in the city, but he succeeded only in a limited number of schools which were situated in the suburbs. The Annette Street school in Govanhill with some 60 to

⁹⁹ JE 30/10/1931, see also JE 6/11/1931, 13/11/1931, 27/11/1931.

¹⁰⁰ See table 4.1 in appendix for estimated numbers of Jewish children in Glasgow. The number for 1932 was 1,955.

90 Jewish pupils was quick to follow Mount Florida's example in November 1932, the Battlefield Public School did likewise in 1935; there were similar reports about Bellahouston Academy in 1937 and a school in Hillhead in 1938. In all, hundreds of children participated in the scheme during the 1930s, at its height the scheme provided Jewish education for about 250 pupils per year¹⁰¹.

A comparison of the development of Jewish education in Glasgow with the development of Jewish education in England shows that in Scotland and in England Jewish children attended the same variety of Jewish education institutions. A Jewish school was not founded in Glasgow until the 1960s. This meant that in the period between the years 1881 and 1939 all Jewish immigrant children in Glasgow as a rule went to public schools, while in England only a majority of Jewish children depended on state schools. Some of these English state schools had a distinctive Jewish character and the question is whether a similar situation existed in Glasgow.

During the period between 1881 and 1939 the Gorbals Public School in Buchan Street had the largest concentration of Jewish pupils of all the public schools in Glasgow. The percentage of Jewish children of the total number of pupils on that school was estimated by its headmaster at 62% in 1914 and was said to be more than 60% in 1930¹⁰². The last figure was certainly too high (see below), but gives an indication of a large Jewish presence being felt.

There does not seem to have been a policy in Glasgow to concentrate Jewish children at the Gorbals Public School, the high number of Jewish immigrants in the neighbourhood inevitably causing the concentration of Jewish pupils there. The school had been opened in 1885, coinciding with the influx of Jewish immigrants in the area. From 1899 to 1923 the Gorbals Public School building housed the Talmud Torah. Jewish children in the Gorbals also attended three other public schools. Two of these schools had been built before the Gorbals Public School, one in Greenside Street (1876) and the other in Abbotsford Place (1879). Nine years after Gorbals Public School a new building was opened in Adelphi Terrace. The Abbotsford Place school was situated in a more well-to-do part of the neighbourhood. It is unknown why the number of Jewish pupils at the Gorbals Public School was the highest of these schools.

During the early years the number of Jewish pupils of Gorbals Public School rose slowly. The admission register for the years 1885-1905 shows many Jewish names, but they do not yet constitute almost two-thirds of the total number of pupils as was the case after 1905. Under the letter C for boys in this register, for example, there

¹⁰¹ JE 9/12/1932, 3/3/1933, 17/3/1933, 9/2/1934, 1/2/1935, 8/2/1935, 11/11/1938, 17/2/1939; Daily Record and Mail 6/11/1932.

¹⁰² JC 27/3/1914; JE 11/7/1930.

are 32 names which can be identified as Jewish out of a total of 94¹⁰³, the majority of which were entered after 1891. This suggests that the major increase of Jewish pupils took place after 1891.

The school's Logbook provides a similar picture. The presence of Jewish pupils, first mentioned in the Logbook on 3rd October 1887, caused problems. In 1887 the headteacher remarked that attendance figures had been considerably affected by the absence of Jewish children on the account of Jewish "festivals occurring at intervals over several weeks at this season."¹⁰⁴ During the coming years, this would be a recurring and growing phenomenon in the autumn with the Jewish New Year, Day of Atonement and Feast of Tabernacles, in December with the Festival of Dedication and in the spring during the long Passover holiday.

The presence and absence of Jewish pupils was something which the staff obviously had to get used to. Jewish children could receive permission to be absent during the normal hours of religious instruction and at Jewish Festivals. There were misunderstandings. Sometimes the children seemed to stay away without any "apparent reason". On another occasion the Day of Atonement was called the "Black Fast". And according to the Logbook, in September 1917 only the Jewish boys absented themselves¹⁰⁵. This absenteeism could cause the school problems. In 1917, for example, it was feared that the government grant would be reduced by about £50 because of an average drop in attendance of 33 pupils per day¹⁰⁶. Later, special provisions were made. In November 1922 it was decided that during the winter the school would be dismissed at 3.30pm on Fridays, so that the Jewish pupils could be at home before the sabbath started at sunset. At that time more than half of the pupils was Jewish¹⁰⁷. In addition, Jewish pupils were permitted to take bursary exams on specially arranged days when such exams had been scheduled for Saturdays or Festivals¹⁰⁸.

There are hardly any exact figures for the number of Jewish pupils at Gorbals

¹⁰³ SRA, DED 7/86/2, Admission register Gorbals Public School, vol. 1: 1885-1905. Of the 32 boys with a second name which can be positively identified as belonging to a Jewish immigrant's child, only 17 had a first name which had a Jewish connection, like Solomon, while 15 had an English first name without any Jewish reference, like James.

¹⁰⁴ SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 3/10/1887.

¹⁰⁵ SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 30/9/1914, 14/9/1917.

¹⁰⁶ SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 10/10/1917.

¹⁰⁷ SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 3/11/1922.

¹⁰⁸ JC 20/3/1914; MBGJRC 12/11/1931, 11/2/1932, 1/12/1932, 18/5/1939. In 1914 the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council had arranged alternative dates for the bursary exams with the School Board, previously individual communal leaders and clergymen had negotiated with the education authorities. During the 1930s Jewish university students were allowed to sit papers or do an exam on alternative days. They had to pay the costs of this, but in cases of financial hardship the Representative Council paid the fees.

Public School for the period between 1881 and 1939. The headmaster occasionally indicated a number of Jewish pupils in his Logbook. In 1891, for example, the school was said to have over 1,200 children on the roll of which about one out of every five pupils had been Jewish¹⁰⁹. Occasionally an exact percentage or figure is given. In 1905, the first year in which an exact figure is given, 43.4% of the total number of pupils was said to be Jewish¹¹⁰. It is unclear how the headmaster arrived at such an exact figure. Perhaps he based his figure on a count of all those pupils who had permission to be absent during the normal hours for religious instruction or who stayed away on Jewish holidays. For the years 1913 and 1914 even more detailed figures were provided in the school's Logbook, probably in relation with the proposal for a Jewish school. These figures are presented in table 4.2 (see appendix).

Table 4.2 shows a large Jewish presence at Gorbals Public School, but not as large as in some schools in London, Manchester and Leeds. The table also shows a relative larger Jewish presence in the infant division, which indicates the existence of a relatively young Jewish population in the Gorbals. Apparently many immigrants had recently arrived in the neighbourhood and it seems possible that shortly after their arrival they must have decided to settle in the city and start a family.

In later years further indications were given of the number of Jews at Gorbals Public School, but no exact figures were provided. The headmaster would, for example, give the total number of his pupils and an estimate of the number of Jewish pupils who stayed away during Jewish holidays. On the basis of these indications rough estimates can be made of the percentage of Jewish pupils in percentage of the total number of pupils. Such figures have to be treated with some care, but in general they show the development of the Jewish presence at the school between 1905 and 1937. These figures, in addition the the figures for 1905 and 1913-1914 are presented in table 4.3. This table shows that the Jewish presence at the school was never as large as in some schools in London, Manchester and Leeds. The table indicates a relatively larger Jewish presence at Gorbals Public School before the First World War than during the interwar years.

By 1923, the total number of pupils in Gorbals Public School had fallen to 993. During the 1930s there would on average be about 900 pupils on the roll. This means that in relative terms and in absolute numbers there were less Jewish schoolchildren in Gorbals Public School during the interwar years than before the First World War. The decline of the number of Jewish pupils at Gorbals Public School could have been caused by several factors. Among the most likely reasons must be the decline of the number of Jews in the neighbourhood as a result of Jewish population movement out of

¹⁰⁹ SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 9/10/1891.

¹¹⁰ SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 11/1/1905.

the Gorbals, a falling birth rate and possibly intermarriage. Furthermore, parents could have preferred other schools, or they might have decided not to keep their children away from school on Jewish holidays or ask for exemption from normal religious education, which might previously have marked pupils as being Jewish.

The presence of Jewish pupils had other effects than attendance. In 1892, a summary of a very positive Inspector's Report said that the classes were well taught to a level of general excellence, although the inspector believed that for the first Standard in "Reading more attention should be given to proper phrasing and accent, and the writing and figuring should be better,"¹¹¹ which might be an indication that immigrant children had to struggle to master some aspects of the English language. The report did not mention the presence of Jewish children. In 1913, however, His Majesty's Inspector had to be informed that his envisaged visit would take place on a Jewish holiday when a large number of children were expected to be absent¹¹².

On two occasions the headmaster of the Gorbals Public School made a statement about the achievements of Jewish pupils. In 1903, Alex Cameron, then headmaster, wrote a letter to the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration, testifying to the point that Jewish pupils were exceedingly bright, clever and quick. In addition to their receptiveness, they had polite manners and showed a good conduct¹¹³. The letter was handed to the commission by Julius Pinto, a Jewish representative from Glasgow who tried to give a positive impression of Glasgow Jewry, and may therefore be regarded as biased. It shows, however, that the Glasgow Jewish establishment believed in the importance of education and stimulating children to learn, in general, but also as part of their adjustment to the Scottish environment. Pinto, added that every year on average almost two hundred adults joined evening classes. Some young men, Pinto said, "were scarcely able to read a single word of English, and (...) now hold responsible honorary positions in the community, secretaries, etc., with a great amount of credit to themselves."¹¹⁴ That Jews were keen to learn was admitted by Commission member Major W.E. Evans-Gordon MP who said the "intensive desire of Jewish people to give their children a good education is well known."¹¹⁵

Pinto's statement was also meant to show how respectable the Jews were. Education

¹¹¹ Quoted in SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School pp. 114-116.

¹¹² SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 9/11/1913.

¹¹³ Reports from Commissioners, Inspectors, and others: Alien Immigration (Royal Commission), vol. II, 20884-20890.

¹¹⁴ Reports from Commissioners, Inspectors, and others: Alien Immigration (Royal Commission), vol. II, 20890. Compare JC 31/1/1893; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 70, 171, 205. There were different classes for adults from the 1890s onwards. The Jewish Literary Society (which had 432 members in 1916), for example, organised evening classes where people could learn English.

¹¹⁵ Reports from Commissioners, Inspectors, and others: Alien Immigration (Royal Commission), vol. II, 13343.

was highly valued in Scottish society. Shopkeepers, small employers and skilled workers shared a profound belief in the value of good education as a means to better oneself and to give children an opportunity of a more secure social position. Pinto wanted to show that Jews held the same values. Perhaps his words reflected the attitude of many Jewish parents in Glasgow. Jewish parents were generally regarded as being willing to make sacrifices for their children's education and to have a strong sense of pride in the achievements of their children¹¹⁶.

In 1930, J. Mackinlay, then headmaster of Gorbals Public School, spoke about the abilities of his Jewish pupils during an interview with the Jewish Echo. He said the children performed almost without exception to a very high standard and some had outstanding abilities. Mackinlay thought they were particularly good in mathematics, but he added the following comment:

"Regarding other subjects, I should say that many of them are handicapped in early life in English, owing to the fact that a number of the parents are of foreign birth and consequently English is not freely spoken in the home atmosphere. In spelling, particularly, this makes itself evident and yet they overcome this handicap very quickly, I am pleased to say."¹¹⁷

There were, or at least had been, other problems for Jewish pupils which Mackinlay did not mention. During earlier years, notably before the First World War, many arrived at the school at a comparatively later age than non-Jewish children. They often came to the school on arrival from Eastern Europe or after having lived elsewhere in the city or the United Kingdom, which could mean they were behind in education. But this problem was not limited to the time before the First World War when the large influx of Jewish immigrants took place. The Admission Register of Gorbals Public School shows for example that during the early 1920s, half of all the Jewish girls who were enrolled in the Gorbals Public School were older than the normal starting age. According to the same register, only a very few of these girls left the school when they reached the minimum school leaving age to start work, which means that Mackinlay was correct in saying that they managed to catch up with the others. Most of the Jewish girls at Gorbals Public School during the 1920s went to

¹¹⁶ Compare Smout, A Century of the Scottish People, p. 242; Collins, Go and Learn, pp. 81-83.

¹¹⁷ JE 11/7/1930; compare SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 21/8/1923, 22/9/1933. As proof of how efficiently the children overcame this handicap, Mackinlay said that he knew of some girls who graduated with honours in English and that 50% of the children in the "verse-speaking" classes (where "pure English" was said to be spoken) were Jewish. During the interview he also said that more than 60% of all his pupils were Jewish. This percentage seems too high. The school logbook indicates a percentage of 57% in 1923 and only 33% in 1933. If Mackinlay's figure is correct that means that relatively less Jewish children took part in the verse-speaking classes. This could suggest the existence of language problems because some Jewish children were not able to speak "pure English".

other schools or attended further education institutions in the city¹¹⁸. Leaving school at the minimum age might indicate that the parents or the girls themselves did not favour further education, possibly because they had not done very well at school or because parents thought that further education was not useful for girls. Or it might mean that they were needed to help in the home or a business or had otherwise go to work to supplement the family income. The fact that many girls were kept at school emphasises the importance which was given to education.

Certainly not all Jewish parents could afford to keep their children at school. An example of a girl who might have done well if she had been allowed to stay on was Rose Rosenthal, a pupil teacher at Gorbals Public School in 1894. Pupil teachers were paid older pupils, like 14-year-olds, who helped the adult staff with several practical tasks in the classroom and who were working towards entering a teacher training college. There were at the time several hundred of these apprentices in Glasgow and they supplied most of the recruits for the teaching profession in primary schools. The teacher pupil led a hard life with long working hours and many dropped out¹¹⁹. Rose Rosenthal worked as a pupil teacher in the spring of 1894, when she was absent from school during the Passover week as were the other Jewish children. At the beginning of the new school year in August, however, she did not return to school and the headmaster decided not to continue her service¹²⁰. It took more than thirty years before a Jewish teacher was appointed at the Gorbals Public School and when the first two arrived during the 1920s they were university graduates¹²¹.

Headmaster Mackinlay stressed in 1930 that there were good relations between Jews and non-Jews at his school. "At no time have we found signs of bitterness between the children over religious differences," he told the Jewish Echo¹²², adding

¹¹⁸ SRA, DED 7/86/2, Admission Register Gorbals Public School, girls, 1919-1937. The sample periods were 20/9/1921-27/3/1922 and 9/1/1924-19/8/1924. During these periods 80 girls were registered of whom at least 32 were Jewish. The older Jewish girls came from Russia (2), Newcastle (2), Edinburgh (5), Cumbernauld, Clydebank and other neighbourhoods in Glasgow. One girl died, one left for Russia, one went to the USA, one emigrated to Ireland, one moved to London, another to Manchester, and one moved to a Scottish town; 23 went to other schools in Glasgow (often in the suburbs). Two started work.

¹¹⁹ Bone, Studies in the History of Scottish Education 1872-1939, pp. 191-199; Roxburgh, The School Board of Glasgow, pp. 200-214.

¹²⁰ SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 27/4/1894, 4/5/1894, 13/8/1894, 14/8/1894.

¹²¹ SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 28/9/1928 contains the first mention of a Jewish teacher who applied for a position at the school. This was Miss Dora Stelmach MA. She was soon joined by Sam Bernstein BSc whose place was later taken by Miss Tessa Lewis. Miss Lewis later went to Mount Florida school. Neither the school logbook nor the minutes of the Education Authority (Education Department after May 1930) show a special policy to appoint Jewish teachers in this school which had so many Jewish pupils. It is possible that the teachers mentioned above were former pupils of Gorbals Public School. It took until after the Second World War before the first Jewish headmaster was appointed. This was Carl Caplan who became head at the Greenfield School in Govan. See JE 18/10/1991. The development of Jewish graduates will be discussed below.

¹²² JE 11/7/1930.

that the children were probably not aware of the differences. This latter statement can be questioned. Children must have been aware of the fact that Jewish pupils were allowed to stay away during the first hour of religious instruction and on Jewish holidays. There is further evidence that children felt some differences, although they probably did not understand them. There was, for example, a well-known rhyme on the occasion of St Patrick's Day or an Orange march: "Are you a Billy (Protestant) or a Dan (Catholic) or an Old Tin Can (Jew),"¹²³ which caused fear because the wrong answer could lead to a beating up. There are no reports in the school logbook of violence directed against Jewish children, however, which suggests Mackinlay's views were accurate or simply reflected the situation in his school.

There were reports in the Jewish Echo in 1931 about problems with Jewish pupils in public schools. In some schools, where Jewish religious education was not provided, Jewish pupils came to school and waited outside or played in the hall during normal religious education. This started to cause problems, possibly because of the noise or disruption they might have created¹²⁴. In an unnamed South Side school, the situation grew worse when jackets were stolen from the area where Jewish children had played and the Jewish pupils were accused of theft. The school's headmaster was reported to have said: "They should not render themselves liable to suspicion."¹²⁵ If true, this was a rather tactless remark.

In general Jewish children did well in primary education in Glasgow. Vincent, when writing about the post-war period¹²⁶, attributes the success to the Jewish tradition of learning. Many young Jews were trained in verbal and abstract reasoning. Such training took place in the institutions for Jewish education or at home. The development of Jewish education in Glasgow suggests that a large majority of Jewish children in the city underwent this training. Jewish success in general education - which does not mean that all Jews were successful in primary education and were allowed to attend secondary and further education¹²⁷ - was also a result of the fact that no Jewish school was founded in Glasgow before 1962. Immigrant children went to public schools and the availability of good local education enabled quite a few successful Jewish pupils to continue their study, creating a relatively high number of Jewish students at university level in the 1930s.

¹²³ See for example Smout, A Century of the Scottish People, p. 48; compare T.C. Smout, S. Wood, Scottish Voices 1745-1960, London, 1991 (paperback edition), pp. 50-51.

¹²⁴ JE 23/1/1931, 21/5/1931, 5/6/1931.

¹²⁵ JE 16/10/1931.

¹²⁶ P. Vincent, "The Measured Intelligence of Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", in The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. VIII, nr. 1, June 1966, pp. 92-108, pp. 106-107.

¹²⁷ Compare for example H. Denton (with Wilson J.C.), The Happy Land, Edinburgh, 1981, pp. 49, 99; R. Glasser, Growing Up in the Gorbals, London, 1987 (paperback edition), p. 30. Denton dislikes school, Glasser was forced to go to work.

Whether a successful Jewish secondary school pupil went to university depended very much on the parents. Those with socially ambitious or more prosperous parents had a greater chance of taking advantage of the opportunities to continue their education. How these circumstances further influenced Jewish participation in higher education will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

As was shown in the first chapter, at a time when English universities still required Jews to take oaths which ran against their religion, Scottish institutions were freely admitting Jewish students. Originally Jewish students came to Scottish universities from England or abroad, but during the 19th century sons of Jewish settlers, like Asher Asher and Samuel Levenston, went to Glasgow University.

In the academic year 1911-1912 the number of Jewish students at the university was large enough for the foundation of a Glasgow University Jewish Society. The initiative was taken by a group of about five or six students who had previously been engaged in the Glasgow Young Men's Zionist Cultural Association. The Society was inaugurated in February 1912 when its first secretary Law student Alex Easterman spoke on "The mission of the Jews." Another founder member was Medicine student Noah Morris. During the following years the Society organised discussions, a library and provided information for foreign students. Its delegates took part in the organisation of the Beilis meeting in 1913 (Easterman took an active role in the establishment of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council and would be its first secretary, his successor in the student group being Louis Wainstein who later also served as secretary of the Representative Council). To show its Zionist sympathy, the Society protested against the Hilfsverein deutschen Juden which had decided to make German the exclusive medium of instruction at the Haifa Polytechnic at the cost of Hebrew, which was regarded by Zionists as the national language¹²⁸. During the First World War there was a drop in activities, but in November 1918 the Society was resuscitated during a meeting to which students from the extra-mural colleges were also invited.

Later, on the occasion of its golden jubilee, Easterman recalled how during the early days of the Society there had been some opposition against the establishment of the group. There were fears of segregation, domination by the Zionists and the influence of politics. In reality, according to Easterman, the object of the Society was to stimulate intellectual interest in Jewish philosophy, tradition and history¹²⁹. The peak of the activities and events of the organisation lay in the 1920s when, in 1928, about 90%

¹²⁸ Edinburgh University Jewish Society Magazine, number 1, March 1923, pp 2, 4. In this magazine the then vice-president of the Glasgow Society recalled the early history of that group. The Edinburgh Society had been founded in 1911.

¹²⁹ Hadardar, Magazine of the Glasgow Jewish Student Society, number 12, December 1961, pp. 20-21; see also JE 10/3/1961.

of all Jewish students in Glasgow were said to have been a member of the Society. In the same year the Society joined the British Zionist Federation¹³⁰, adopting a stronger Zionist image. During the 1930s the activity of Society became very political, although still social in character, following trends in the wider society. Shortly before 1939 the activity of the Society got bogged down in disunity¹³¹. Throughout these years the society elected distinguished figures as Honorary President, including the non-Jewish Professor in Hebrew W.B. Stevenson in 1911 and the Scottish Nationalist MP Winnie Ewing in 1981¹³².

Prior to the First World war, the number of Jewish graduates at Glasgow University had not not been more than twenty, but after 1918 this number increased rapidly. From the beginning of the war onwards substantially more Jewish students enrolled at Gilmorehill, still mostly men but during the 1920s Jewish women also started university studies¹³³. The number of female Jewish students would, however, remain relatively low. During the 1930s women made up 10% of the total of Jewish students at Glasgow University, while 22% of all students there were females. Compared to the number of Jewish female students in English universities, there were relatively ^{fewer} Jewish female students in Glasgow¹³⁴. This situation did not change until the 1940s.

In the academic year 1936-1937 there were 102 Jewish students at the Glasgow University out of a total of 4,542 students, a percentage of 2.64%. This was lower than in Leeds (7.2%), Liverpool (3.9%) and Manchester (3.7%), but higher than in Oxford and Cambridge¹³⁵. When Glasgow is compared with Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester, it should be noted that with the exception of Leeds, these English cities had a larger Jewish population in the 19th century and thus a slightly longer history of Jewish students at its universities. The Jewish population in Leeds was proportionally the largest in Britain, which might have caused the high percentage of Jewish students there. The English universities also attracted more foreign Jewish students. When this is taken into consideration, it is possible to say that Glasgow had a relatively large Jewish student group. This group consisted largely of local immigrant children.

¹³⁰ JE 7/10/1932.

¹³¹ See JE 9/11/1928, 16/11/1928, 18/1/1929 for the origins of the debate.

¹³² JE 24/12/1981. See also 70 Years, Glasgow, 1981, a commemorative brochure on the 70th anniversary of this society.

¹³³ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 175, 207, 220, 224. According to Collins, 32 Jewish medical students matriculated between 1895 and 1925. He does not supply figures for other faculties.

¹³⁴ The Jewish Yearbook 1938 p. 365; compare Collins, Go and Learn, p. 86.

¹³⁵ G. Block, H. Schwab, "Jewish Students: A Survey of their Position at the Universities of Britain", in The Jewish Yearbook 1938, pp. 365-374, pp. 366-371; compare G.D.M. Block, "Jewish students at the Universities of Great Britain and Ireland - excluding London, 1936-1939", in Sociological Review, 34 (3 & 4), 1942, pp. 183-197. The survey did not include London. Two colleges in Newcastle, affiliated to Durham University, also had a higher percentage.

If it is assumed that the Jewish population in Glasgow in 1937 numbered about 15,000 and the total number of inhabitants of the city is put at 1,119,863¹³⁶, Jews constituted about 1.3% of the total population of the city. They formed 2.64% of the total student population at the Glasgow University in 1936-1937. In other words, relatively more Jews studied in the city than non-Jews. The academic year 1936-1937, however, showed a relatively low total number (4,542) of students when compared to ten years earlier or immediately after the war. This might affect the percentage of Jewish students. In 1928-1929 there had been 5,496 students and in 1946-1947 there would be 5,688¹³⁷. If the 1928-1929 total number is used rather than the 1936-1937 number, the percentage of Jewish students (if their total remained at 102) would be 1.86% - lower than the figure of 2.64% mentioned above but still relatively high when compared to the percentage of Jews in the total population of Glasgow. There is therefore little doubt that in comparison more Jews went to the university than non-Jews. Again, if the adjusted figures are used, it is possible to say that one out of every 198 Glaswegians went to study at Gilmorehill, while one out of every 148 Jews went there.

In 1936-1937, out of the total of 102 Jewish students in Glasgow 70 took Medicine or Dentistry, 14 Arts, 8 Law and 10 studied Science and Engineering. Although an equal number studied Medicine in Leeds, it appears that the concentration of Jewish students in Glasgow on Medicine was proportionally larger than elsewhere in the UK. The choice of Jewish students at Glasgow University can also be compared to the choice of non-Jewish students. This comparison is made in table 4.4 (see appendix).

Table 4.4 shows that relatively very many Jewish students in Glasgow in 1936-1937 had chosen Medicine. This was not an exceptional year. During the years 1935 to 1939 14% of all Jewish males in the age group between 19 and 24 years in Glasgow studied Medicine¹³⁸. A majority of Jewish students before the First World War had taken Medicine. In 1929 68.4% of all passing university exams mentioned in an honours list in the Jewish Echo concerned Medicine and in 1935 this percentage stood at 68.2%¹³⁹, compared to the figure of 68.6% in 1936-1937. Table 4.4 therefore emphasises a quite consistent one-sidedness of the subject choice of Jewish students in Glasgow. Two out of three Jewish students studied Medicine, with comparatively less

¹³⁶ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 26. This is the estimated population of the Municipal Burgh of Glasgow in 1937.

¹³⁷ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 901. In 1938-1939 there were 4,771 students.

¹³⁸ Collins, Go and Learn, p. 88. Collins does not mention the number of foreign Jewish students in this group. He also does not give a source for the estimate of the size of the Jewish male population between 19 and 24 during these years.

¹³⁹ JE 29/3/1929, 19/4/1929, 18/6/1929, 5/7/1929, 18/10/1929, 12/8/1935.

in Art, Law and Science, and very little in Engineering.

Collins mentions some reasons¹⁴⁰ why so many Jewish students in Glasgow had chosen Medicine. Jews had a tradition of respect for medicine and the physician, he writes. In Scotland, there was an important academic tradition in Medicine. Jewish doctors were able to work as general practitioners in the wider society where doctors in general enjoyed a high social status. The profession thus offered good employment prospects and chances for social advancement. Contrary to Medicine, Law and Engineering seemed to offer less opportunities. The predominantly Protestant legal and engineering firms were traditionally not prepared to employ persons with a different religion such as Catholics or Jews.

That more Jewish students in Scotland choose Medicine than their co-religionists in England, could also be explained by the traditional reputation of Scottish Medicine and the absence of religious tests at Scottish universities and medical schools, as they had existed in England, which had attracted Jewish medical students to Scotland since the 18th century. The choice of Medicine was not a phenomenon which appeared first during the 1930s.

Although the subject choice of Jewish students may seem different, in their motivation to select a certain study they did not differ much from non-Jewish students who came from a similar social background. A remarkable aspect of the Jewish students in Glasgow in general was the social status of their family. Before 1938 about one third of all Jewish students came from the Gorbals and in the year 1938-1939 80 out of the total of 102 received a scholarship. When compared to non-Jewish students in the city a relatively large percentage of the Jewish students came from groups like artisans, small business men and unskilled workers - the percentage of Jewish students from these groups lay about 10% higher than among the non-Jewish students¹⁴¹. Unfortunately, there are no figures available about income, but a large number of grants suggests that incomes of parents of Jewish students in general were not very high. Grants, like those from the Carnegie Trust, paid for study expenses, but they did not cover these completely. Parents and students still had to make sacrifices and it is obvious that those in higher income groups would find this easier than the poorer families.

In the 19th century, Scottish society had offered a limited number of students of humble origins the opportunity of higher education. At the end of the century, the Glasgow University had become the most working class in character of the Scottish universities with after 1910 almost one out of every four students there having a working class background. The number of opportunities were still growing. In 1900

¹⁴⁰ Collins, Go and Learn, pp. 81-97.

¹⁴¹ See also Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 224.

there were about 6,000 places at Scottish universities, in the 1938 this amount had increased to 10,000. In Glasgow the total number of matriculated students grew from 2,916 in 1913-1914 to 5,496 in 1928-1929 - a growth of 88% while the total population of the city increased by just 38%¹⁴².

Students from working class backgrounds in Glasgow usually choose the Arts faculty and opted for a career as a teacher¹⁴³. This choice was probably motivated by a wish for secure future employment in a profession which offered some social standing. Working class Catholic students often opted for the Arts course, which was relatively short and offered good employment prospects for teaching at Catholic schools. There was in Glasgow, however, no specific demand for Jewish teachers. Jewish students largely choose Medicine and in doing so they also selected a study direction which would lead to secured employment and social standing. The result of the choice of study would be a move into the professions and a significant change in Jewish occupations which will be discussed in the following chapter.

During the period between 1880 and 1939 the development of the traditional institutions of Jewish education in Glasgow followed a pattern similar to the development of such institutions in England. Congregations organised Hebrew classes for the education of the children of their members. The time available for teaching and the lack of financial resources limited this form of Jewish education. These classes often had a bad reputation. The older settlers tried to change the image of the classes. The middle class leaders of some immigrant congregations tried to improve their classes too, following the example of the older settlers but also to confirm their own social status.

Next to the Hebrew classes there was a Talmud Torah school. This institution might have been established for the purpose of teaching immigrant children, to give them the basics of Jewish education. Eventually, the Talmud Torah became the largest institution of Jewish education in Glasgow. Some Jewish educational institutions in England were used as instruments to adjust immigrant children to the British environment. The teaching methods and the change from Yiddish to English at some of the Hebrew classes of the congregations and the Talmud Torah and suggest that these institutions had also taken over that role. Like Protestant Sunday schools in the 19th century¹⁴⁴, these institutions had a great influence on the development of working class children. In these aspects of Jewish education, the striving for respectability and civic acceptability can be recognised.

¹⁴² Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, pp. 901, 799.

¹⁴³ For the working class element in universities see Smout, A Century of the Scottish People, pp. 216-217, 223-224, 242. For the 19th century see R.D. Anderson, Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland, Oxford, 1983, p. 152.

¹⁴⁴ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, p. 131.

In the 20th century more emphasis was laid on the preservation of Judaism in a reaction to changes in the modern society. As Judaism was defined differently by groups in Glasgow Jewry, like the traditional clergy and the more secular Zionists, there was not a common objective for Jewish education. Attempts to create more unity in Jewish education in Glasgow were therefore unsuccessful. Rivalry remained. Initiatives to establish a Jewish day school also failed, partly as a result of this disunity and partly because of opposition within the local education authorities.

One of the main differences between Jewish education in Glasgow and in England during the period between 1881 and 1939 was that there was not a Jewish school in Glasgow like the Jewish schools which existed in the major Jewish centres in England. This was because the situation was so different in Scotland. In England the schools were still being provided mainly by the voluntary, that is religious, sector up to the early 1900s, not by the publicly funded School Boards. It was natural, therefore, in such a context for some voluntarily provided Jewish schools to have emerged to ensure educational provision. In Scotland by contrast, the emphasis ever since 1872 had been for education to be provided by publicly funded Board schools. Given that no voluntarily-provided Jewish day schools existed before 1872 in Glasgow (for the reasons mentioned earlier) it was highly unlikely that any such would be felt to be needed after 1872.

Consequently, all Jewish immigrant children in Scotland went to public primary schools. There are some parallels here with poor Roman Catholic Irish immigrants before 1872. During the 19th century an increasing number of Roman Catholic schools had been founded in Glasgow maintained by a combination of voluntary funds and government grants, but many Catholic children were still unprovided for. Like the Jews later, some Catholic children attended public schools. After 1872 the Catholic voluntary schools continued and expanded and when these were incorporated into the state system in 1918, the local authorities became responsible for financing religious education at these schools. The Glasgow School Board was prepared at least to offer the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council the opportunity to organise religious instruction during school hours, but this opportunity was not taken. For the reasons stated earlier no separate system of Jewish schools had been set up. As a result the Jewish immigrant children in Glasgow were integrated in the public education system.

There were in Glasgow no schools with a distinctive Jewish character as there were in London, Manchester and Leeds. Even in Gorbals Public School, where Jewish pupils for a while formed a majority, they never completely outnumbered non-Jewish pupils. The Jewish pupils in Glasgow in general seem to have done reasonably well. There was not a negative reaction by non-Jews. Some envy among non-Jews about

some special priveleges which Jewish pupils enjoyed in connection with their religion existed, but there is very little evidence of hostility.

Integration into the Scottish education system stimulated upward social mobility among the immigrant children. Many profited from the opportunities which Scottish education offered them. Jewish students in Glasgow during the 1930s seem to have done relatively well compared to Jewish students in England. Attendance at well run local authority schools with well qualified staff had given them a better educational foundation than if they had to rely on Jewish schools.

Chapter 5. Occupations and welfare activity

Jewish immigrants in Glasgow found occupations within the changing framework of the Scottish economy. There were short-term fluctuations, but during the years between 1880 and 1939 the economy also underwent some fundamental changes to which all population groups had to make adjustments, including the immigrants. In manufacturing in Glasgow, for example, the traditional staple industries like the textile industry were replaced during the 19th century by new industries such as shipbuilding, engineering and a wide range of associated manufacturing and service industries. In general the new staple industries went into decline after the First World War. Production methods also changed. There was a tendency towards larger production units, but small firms remained numerous. In the clothing industry, for example, firms with 25-99 employees were still dominant in 1951¹. Such firms offered many employment opportunities for Jews.

Compared to the rest of Scotland and England the distributive trades in Glasgow were relatively strong, but in the city's modern business history success and failure went hand in hand. The pattern was set during the 19th century when the pace of commercial growth² favoured social mobility, creating openings for businessmen, often well-educated young men in possession of the right family connections and financial support. Newcomers were able to make their entry to the market, profiting from the greater demand for goods caused by expanding industry, urban growth and rising living standards, first of the middle class population and later of the working classes. The insecure nature of trade, however, caused many bankruptcies, but these also facilitated the entry for newcomers as they were able to take the places in the market which had become vacant.

Participation in Glasgow's economy made immigrants a part of the general life of the city. The following example of Abraham Goldberg shows how an immigrant's fate was tied up with that of the city. At the turn of the 20th century Goldberg bought his first bale of cloth in Glasgow. He took it to his room-and-kitchen home in Gorbals' Main Street and started making it up into piece-goods for sale to wholesalers. This proved to be the start of a multi-million pound business. He established the firm

¹ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, pp. 136-137, 356-359; A. Slaven, S. Checkland (ed.), Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography 1860-1960, Aberdeen, 1986, 1990, II, pp. 329-336, 411-414.

² See N. Morgan, "Enterprise and Industry", in History Today, vol. 40, May 1990, pp. 34-40; H.B. Peebles, "A Study in Failure: J. & G. Thomson and Shipbuilding at Clydebank, 1871-1890", in Scottish Historical Review, volume LXIX (1990), pp. 22-48; R.G. Rodger, "Business Failure in Scotland, 1839-1913", in Business History, volume XVII (1985), pp. 75-99; A. Slaven, S. Checkland (ed.), Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, I, pp. 147, 297; II, pp. 329-330; A. Slaven, The Development of the West of Scotland: 1750-1960; London, 1975, pp. 134, 139.

A. Goldberg & Sons plc. and within two generations this firm was one of the largest retailers in Scotland, having been developed into a modern department store. During the early 1920s Goldberg acquired premises in Candleriggs and a little more than a decade later he established a very successful public company. By 1989 the firm owned large stores all over Scotland and several retail chains with an estimated value of £32m. - that is, if an unsuccessful take-over bid by Black Leisure was anything to go by. By that stage there was little about the firm which was specifically Jewish. The disc jockey in the Wrygge's shop in Glasgow's Argyle Street played the same loud pop music which was so much in vogue as elsewhere in the late 1980s. But the firm was also one of the first high street retailers to get into financial difficulties during the recession that hit Britain early in the 1990s and A. Goldberg & Sons disappeared into receivership.

It is not only success or failure that gives a measure of how the immigrants were integrated into Glasgow's economy. The kinds of activity and their occupations provide further measures of how they found their place. The traditional concentration of Jews in certain occupations is well documented and on this aspect of economic activity Glasgow can be compared to English cities. Gartner and Pollins³ have found that during the period between 1881 and 1939 Jewish immigrants in England were mostly occupied in the clothing, tobacco and furniture industries or in the retail trade where they worked either as hawkers or as shopkeepers. The concentration in so few occupations followed a pattern set by the older Jewish settlers in England but also reflected the structure of Jewish occupations in Eastern Europe. Some occupations in England were actually closed to Jews, while others were not regarded as suitable by Jews.

There were some local differences. In London the pattern had been set by the older settlers, some of whom had risen to the high echelons of trade and finance. Underneath this top there were groups of smaller businessmen and a large workforce, for example in cigar-making and clothing. Lipman⁴ notes that during the 1880s in London about one in every two of immigrant workers was employed in the clothing industry. A fifth of all immigrants in the British capital was occupied in hawking and general dealing, but by the 1880s Jewish hawking in London was already in decline with former hawkers finding employment in workshops or settling down as shopkeepers. Other immigrants in London were mostly occupied in the tobacco and furniture industries or in some smaller trades.

³ Gartner, The Jewish Immigrant in England, pp. 57-99; H. Pollins, Economic History of the Jews in England, East Brunswick, New Jersey, 1982, pp. 142-145, 151, 238.

⁴ Lipman, Social History of the Jews in England, pp. 79-82, 106-108.

Williams⁵ finds that 57% of all Jews with an occupation in Manchester in 1871 were employed in the clothing and furniture industries, including at least half of all the Jewish immigrant workers of this city. Furthermore, 8% of all Jews with an occupation in this city were hawkers. In addition, Manchester had a significant Jewish work force in the waterproofing industry. Both hawking and waterproofing involved mostly immigrants. Writing on Leeds at the turn of the 20th century, Buckman and Krausz⁶ also find most immigrants employed in the clothing and furniture industries with an additional section in the brushmaking trade. Kokosalakis⁷ writes that before 1939 immigrants in Liverpool were usually employed in the clothing and furniture industries and in picture frame making, but he notes at the turn of the century hawking provided subsistence for relatively more immigrants in Liverpool than in Leeds and Manchester. He explains the prominence of Jewish hawking in Liverpool as a result of the city's economic character. Liverpool was an important port and lacked a large manufacturing industry. It must be noticed that in London, Leeds and Manchester, workshop owners and employees still had the opportunity to take up hawking during slack times in order to raise their incomes.

This occupational distribution meant that in the years before the First World War many immigrants in England found employment in the so-called "sweated trades", notably in the garment-making sector of the clothing industry. They worked in small, often Jewish-owned workshops which were usually based in people's homes where piece work was carried out. When immigrants tried to move out of sweated labour, they often became workshop owners. Immigrant workshop owners and shopkeepers formed a new middle class in Anglo-Jewry. In London, Liverpool and Manchester Jewish workshops in the clothing trade were usually small, with less than 20 employees, while in Leeds production units were generally larger.

There were social tensions in the immigrant population. In Leeds, where there were many Jewish house-owners with Jewish tenants, hostility between landlords and tenants fuelled conflicts between employers and workers. Kershen and Williams⁸ find, however, that in other English cities the ties of kinship, culture and religion generally mediated between the social antagonists. Immigrant employers and workers, for

⁵ Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, pp. 273-277.

⁶ J. Buckman, Immigrants and the Class Struggle. The Jewish Immigrant in Leeds 1880-1914, Manchester, 1983, pp. 54, 159-162; Krausz, Leeds Jewry, pp. 13-18, 28-30. See for an example of a very successful Jewish entrepreneur in Leeds: E.M. Sigsworth, Montague Burton. The Tailor of Taste, Manchester, 1990.

⁷ Kokosalakis, Ethnic Identity and Religion, pp. 124-128. Compare Gartner, The Jewish Immigrant in England, p. 60.

⁸ A. Kershen, "Trade Unionism amongst the Jewish Tailoring Workers of London and Leeds, 1875-1915", in Cesarani, The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry, pp. 34-52; B. Williams, "'East and West': Class and Community in Manchester Jewry, 1850-1914", in Cesarani, The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry, pp. 15-33.

example, found each other in conflicts with the elite of the older settlers. The different groups also influenced each other through Jewish charity and self-help. In general, this welfare activity stimulated independence, making Jewish immigrants less dependent on the host society and ultimately also less dependent on the Jewish group. Immigrants received, for example, grants or loans with which they could set up a small business and become independent retailers or manufacturers.

The questions to be examined are therefore whether the older Jewish settlers in Glasgow set a pattern of economic activity pattern before 1880, whether the Eastern European immigrants were concentrated in occupations like in the clothing industry, furniture manufacturing and hawking, and whether this changed with the new developments in Glasgow's economy. The First World War is used here as the watershed between the first period in which the settlement of immigrants coincided with the rise of the staple industries in clothing, shipbuilding and engineering, and the second period during which the immigrant settlement took on a more permanent character and which was characterised by the decline of the staple industries. Furthermore, the relations between different social groups and the welfare activity of these groups will have to be reviewed.

First the economic activity and occupations of the older settlers will be reviewed. As discussed in the first chapter, during the first half of the 19th century Jewish settlers in Glasgow had been small shopkeepers and manufacturers, like opticians, instrument-makers or jewellers, stationers, furriers and furniture-makers, who were in general able to move into larger retail and wholesale and manufacturing. David Davis, for example, the first-known President of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation, had established an optical and mathematical instrument business in Glasgow by 1831 after settling in Glasgow in 1823, which after his retirement in the 1840s was continued by his sons Edward and Henry. Edward Davis left an estate of £145,000 when he died in 1911⁹, an indication of the wealth which the family had collected. Henry Davis was also a house owner. David Davis' rival in the Jewish congregation was Jonas Michael, who headed a firm of agents, auctioneers and furniture warehousemen in Candleriggs. His family seems to have disappeared quite suddenly from the congregational records, allowing for the possibility of business failure. These men formed the establishment of the congregation, but it seems likely that other Jews in Glasgow were occupied in similar, though perhaps less large scale enterprises.

Serving the middle class demand, the Jewish retailers followed their clients towards the more fashionable West End when possible. Emanuel Cohen, a grandson of Isaac Cohen, the first Jewish settler in Glasgow, for example, was able to move his

⁹ Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, pp. 17-18, 54-55. Out of this estate, £50,000 was donated to Scottish hospitals.

stationery and printing business to North Hanover Street and the more fashionable Buchanan Street by the mid-1870s¹⁰. Another retailer in Buchanan Street at that time was tobacconist Morris Cohen, son of Joseph Cohen who had been Reader in the synagogue and founder of the business. J. Cohen & Son in Buchanan Street is described as “importers of cigars, pipe manufacturers, and fancy good merchants”, but the firm also imported sponges and, later, chamois-leather¹¹. Morris Cohen married a Jewish girl from Manchester and the couple had two sons and a daughter. One of the sons was Frank Cohen, the later Glasgow Town Councillor. Samuel Samuel, a cousin of Frank Cohen, also moved and expanded his business. His firm had been established by Henry Samuel (son-in-law of Joseph Cohen) in the middle of the 19th century and was one of the oldest manufacturing furriers in Glasgow still operating in 1914 (P. Levy & Co. had advertised in 1817 as the “only fur manufacturer in Scotland”¹² but had not survived). In the years between 1850 and 1914 the Samuel workshop and showroom moved from the neighbourhood of the Tron near the High Street to the more fashionable Newton Terrace in Sauchiehall Street.

Samuel mainly served middle-class customers, but he did not restrict his business to this group. In the Glasgow Annual of 1914¹³, Henry Samuel offered to darken sable and marten skins to richer shades when they had been faded by wear, while the firm also advertised to restore and to transform clothes “to new designs”. It boasted the “speciality of adapting fur garments to suit the passing changes of fashions,” which must have appealed to clients who could not afford a new fur coat or hat.

The furniture trade was also an area for Jewish entrepreneurs in which they were able to expand into large-scale manufacturing. S.L. Abrahams, another leader of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation, created a furniture business which was continued and expanded by his son Louis who was born in Glasgow in 1862. The Abrahams' factory in Duntocher was said to have eventually imported workers who were housed in a building locally known as “Abraham's Land”¹⁴. It is not known how many of these workers were Jewish. During the 1930s the firm was known for its woodcarving, notably in mantlepieces¹⁵.

¹⁰ See for example his labels on the cover of the minute books of the congregation (SJAC, MBGHC and MBGHPhS).

¹¹ The Bailie 5/8/1903 ; Post Office Glasgow Directory 1902, 1910; SJAC, Garnethill Communal Register (1911).

¹² Glasgow Chronicle 28/1/1817.

¹³ Glasgow Annual 1914, p. 87.

¹⁴ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 150.

¹⁵ JE 25/4/1930. Louis Abrahams died in 1930. For twenty years he headed the Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society and the Jewish Board of Guardians, providing charity to poor (immigrant) Jews some of whom he might have offered employment in his factory. His brother-in-law was Ben Strump, an immigrant who became a Garnethill leader. Strump was also in the furniture business. In this sense Abrahams and Strump formed a link between the older settlers and the new immigrants.

Some Jews, like Isaac Cohen who was credited with introducing the silk hat to Scotland, might have introduced a novelty to the Scottish market. Other Jewish businessmen were able to profit from new developments. Benjamin Simons and his son Michael of the firm Simons, Jacob & Co. belonged to this group. Their successful wholesale fruit trading firm had been established in Glasgow during the 1840s by Benjamin Simons¹⁶. His son Michael¹⁷ expanded the firm. They were able to profit from a combination of growing incomes in the general population which stimulated demand for fruit, new technology for storing fruit and the availability of cheaper and faster transport facilities. The younger Simons became the most successful Jewish businessman in Scotland.

Michael Simons was born in London in 1842¹⁸, a few years before his family moved to Scotland. He received his education at Glasgow High School and learned the fruit trade as an apprentice in the local firm of Syme, Simons & Smith before entering his father's business. Michael's contribution lay initially mostly in the increase of the import of oranges, while at a later stage he expanded the whole range of products. He also improved storage and distribution methods. In 1883, the firm built an extensive purpose-built warehouse and salesroom in Candleriggs for some £22,000. This large oblong building consisted of five storeys and a basement arranged so that, by means of an open central space, light was conveyed from the large glass-covered roof to all parts of the interior. To simplify the process of speedy loading and unloading of carts, vans, and lorries, a cartway passage ran through the entire centre of the building, with the entrance in Brunswick Street and the exit in Candleriggs (some 300 feet). The value of the building in 1926 was £91,000. It breathed Glasgow's enterprising spirit of the late 19th century. After his father's death in 1891, the management of the company was completely in the hands of Michael Simons (in 1894 he became the sole partner in the firm). Michael Simons belonged to the city's commercial elite and became one of its leaders and a respected public figure¹⁹. The success of his business and public career was to a large extent the result of his administrative skills.

Michael Simons' sons initially chose not to join the family business. The reason for this might have been a family quarrel. Morgan²⁰ suggests that Michael Simons refused to delegate business responsibilities to his sons. This seems likely because Simons in general proved to be a rather single-minded leader. The sons founded their own fruit

¹⁶ The Bailie 29/12/1880.

¹⁷ In Checkland, Slaven, Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, II, p. 330, he is called Joseph by mistake. On the same page and elsewhere (II, pp. 384-387) he is correctly called Michael. This entry contains another mistake. The Glasgow Hebrew Congregation did not move to Garnethill in 1877 as stated (II, p. 387); the synagogue at Garnethill was not consecrated until 1879. See chapter 2.

¹⁸ For his biography see Checkland, Slaven, Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, II, pp. 384-387.

¹⁹ For Simons' public career see chapter 6.

²⁰ Checkland, Slaven, Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, II, p. 386.

broking firm and competed with their father. They were, however, never as successful²¹ as Michael Simons whom they (re)joined in 1919. Two years later Michael Simons began to withdraw from the business which was then reformed into a limited liability company with two sons as the major shareholders (£14,000 each, with Michael Simons holding shares to the value of £7,000). Simons died in 1926 leaving only a relatively modest estate of £24,496 - a large part of his money had been bequeathed before his death.

With the exception of an involvement in the Cold Storage Co. (discussed below) and a stake in a theatre company (to be discussed in the following chapter), Michael Simons had no business interests outside the family firm. From an early stage he did not limit his business contacts to Jews. In this he probably differed from his father. The name Syme, Simons & Smith, the firm where Michael Simons served his apprenticeship, suggest that he was involved in a largely non-Jewish enterprise, while Benjamin Simons' partners in Simons Jacobs & Co. were all Jewish. Michael Simons had closer business relations with non-Jews. One of these was the fruit retailer Malcolm Campbell. Simons financed some of his ventures²².

The failure of the Scottish Cold Storage & Ice Co. also shows the extension of Simons' business contacts. The firm was incorporated in 1896 with a capital of £100,000. Simons was chairman. There were no other Jews involved. One of the other founders was David Tullis, the chairman of an engineering firm. At a time the demand for cold storage facilities and ice-making must have seemed inexhaustible, matching the developments in retailing like the expanding Malcolm Campbell shops. Shareholders were attracted by the prospect of profits of 10 to 50%²³. The new company acquired the warehouses in George Street which had since 1873 belonged to Benjamin Simons and converted these into cold storage places. In 1900 plans were made to further increase the capacity of the firm, but six years later the Cold Storage Co. was forced into voluntary liquidation²⁴ during a period of economic recession.

There were other leading Jewish businessmen in Glasgow. The merchant broker Samuel Morris, for example, who presided over the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation almost continuously from 1860 until his death in 1895, was a commercial agent in the city²⁵ with an office in St. Vincent Street. Little is known about his transactions.

²¹ Compare Scottish Record office, West Register House Edinburgh, Court Of Session papers (cited hereafter as WRH, CS), 318/1907/298, the sequestration papers of Benjamin Simons, one of the sons, who went bankrupt in 1902 after three years in business.

²² Checkland, Slaven, Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, II, pp. 330, 352-354. Campbell, a freemason, became Master of the Jewish Lodge Montefiore.

²³ The Bailie 19/2/1896.

²⁴ Checkland, Slaven, Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, II, pp. 385-386, 471. The assets were sold to the Union Cold Storage Co.

²⁵ Levy, The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, p. 58, writes that he was a wellknown merchant.

The Morris family had established their business in Glasgow during the first half of the 19th century. Samuel Morris' brother Isidor was among the bankrupts of Lewis, Joseph and Isidor Morris, importers of foreign ("fancy") goods who met insolvency in 1848. After this debacle, Samuel Morris seems to have done well; when he died in March 1895 he left an estate valued at £62,304²⁶, the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation received a legacy of £3,000 from his estate which was used to build to pulpit discussed in chapter 2.

The fate of bankruptcy also struck Gustav Jacobi, the sole partner in Jacoby Meyer & Co., exporters of dry goods and chemicals. His sequestration documents show a medium-sized company in the early 1880s with an office in Hutcheson Street and agents in different countries, some of whom were Jewish. Among Jacobi's foreign contacts were for example Moses Pimenta in Oran and Dies Cohen in Gibraltar. Of his employees only mercantile clerk Felix Ludwig Meyer and traveller Gustav Reiss are mentioned. The majority of his debtors and creditors appears not to be Jewish. Jacobi first ran into trouble in the late 1860s or early 1870s. On that occasion his household furniture was valued at £100 (when an inventory was made up in 1881 this was worth £120) which does not make him a particularly rich man. When the petition for bankruptcy was granted in the early 1880s, Jacobi's stocks contained £1,017 worth of goods with some materials estimated at £3,662 in the hands of manufacturers (bleachers and finishers in the textile industry). In addition to the sums still due from his agents the total inventory amounted to £21,708 while his liabilities came to £29,192. It appears that just over a year later (22nd December 1882) Jacobi was discharged. Jacobi's business record over the years 1874 to 1881 shows total sales of £607,922 indicating quite a large turnover of goods. During these years Jacobi paid £13,181 interest which would suggest that he often depended on loans to make his acquisitions. In salaries he paid £9,159²⁷. It seems that Gustav Jacobi was not particularly wealthy or poor, but a medium-sized merchant who traded with Jews and non-Jews in specialised goods while employing only a small staff in Glasgow.

Behind these merchants, wholesalers, manufacturers and retailers stood a large group of small businessmen, small workshop owners and workers. A number of Jews operated independently as hawkers²⁸. Quite a few of these hawkers were glaziers. It was

²⁶ University of Glasgow Archives, Business Records Centre, Index Calendar of Confirmations, UGD 174/20 (cited hereafter as University of Glasgow Archives, UGD). For the use of this source to measure status and wealth see N.J. Morgan, M.S. Moss, "Listing the Wealthy in Scotland", in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, volume LIX (November 1986) pp. 189-195.

²⁷ WRH, CS 318/1888/140.

²⁸ As well as the word hawker, people in this kind of occupation which involved selling goods from door to door in Glasgow or elsewhere in Scotland, travelling either by foot, public transport or otherwise, were also called pedlars or travellers. The last word was often used by somebody who sought to improve the status of this profession.

relatively easy to start as a glazier because materials like glass and a cutting diamond were easy to come by and to carry. There is evidence of a such a glazier in 1875: a “poor man” who had lost his diamond. Another hawker was Elias Birnbaum who was helped by the congregation to buy goods early in 1876²⁹. Others worked as small masters or employees in the clothing industry: in 1876 the Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society provided Morris Cohen with a security for a loan to acquire a new Singer Sewing Machine³⁰. The regular occurrence of such people in communal records³¹ suggest a substantial group of small businessmen, workshop owners and workers in Glasgow before the 1880s. Like the Jews in larger businesses, they suffered from the fluctuations in the Scottish economy. Collins registers at least 17 Jewish bankruptcies in Glasgow during the period between 1848 and 1881³². Among these 17 were 6 general agents or merchants, 4 opticians, watchmakers or jewellers, 3 picture frame makers, 2 clothiers, 1 cigarette-maker or tobacconist, and 1 embroidered goods manufacturer.

The Jewish population in Glasgow thus had struggling, poorer elements, but on the whole was solidly enough based to help these elements out of the resources of those who were more successful. For this purpose the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation distributed charity. In addition the Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society had been founded in the middle of the 19th century. Jews who had run into financial problems could apply to these institutions for help.

When an applicant was considered for financial support, the congregation or the Society first investigated the case. This happened, for example, after a Mrs. Dunn of 132 South Wellington Street asked for help in February 1880. Two officers of the Society visited the woman and it was resolved to give her 18 shillings to enable her to pay the rates. Two weeks later her husband, Isaac Dunn, was “to get a little stock to earn a living for his family,” which meant that he received £1 to buy goods from a wholesaler in order to hawk them. Isaac Dunn was not very successful in this. In September 1880 he asked for a loan to allow him to travel to Germany where he had prospects of receiving assistance from his family. It is not sure whether he went to Germany. In January 1881 he was back in Glasgow, because it was reported that he had fallen and staved his foot, as a result of which he could not conduct his business. He was

²⁹ SJAC, MBGHPHS 14/11/1875, 2/1/1876.

³⁰ SJAC, MBGHPHS 19/1/1876.

³¹ SJAC, MBGHC 1872 and onwards; SJAC, MBGHPHS 1875 and onwards.

³² Collins, *Second City Jewry*, pp. 112, 241. Collins found for the period between 1848 and 1913 in total 81 bankruptcies in Scotland concerning persons who could be identified as Jewish. There must have been more cases involving people who cannot be identified as Jewish because of Anglicised names but who might have been Jewish (see for example WRH, CS 319/1911/4070, sequestration papers of Isaac Lewis). Of the 81, 53 had a business in Glasgow. Of these 53, 17 went bankrupt before 1881, 36 in 1881 and later.

given 5 shillings per week for a period of four weeks, in addition to 10 shillings already received and the promise of a pair of boots for when he was well again. As in the case of a number of other families, the Society provided Dunn with some coal. In February Dunn again appealed for help. He now lived in Thistle Street (Gorbals), was unwell and had pawned his merchandise. He needed 10 shillings for his taxes. In May of the same year Mrs. Dunn applied for £1 for stock and 5 shillings for a hawkers license³³.

Not every applicant was helped. As noticed earlier, the congregation and Society members, like their fellow Victorians, made a distinction between “deserving” poor and people who were blamed for having brought poverty on themselves. There was also a group of “casual” poor (persons who were believed to have come to Glasgow just to look for financial support) who mostly applied unsuccessfully to the Philanthropic Society for help. In severe cases these people were sent away. During the period between 1875 and 1881, the Society in 57 instances sent people (individuals or families) away from the city. On 20th March 1881, for example, the committee of the Society resolved the following.

“The Levy family (10 in number) having sailed for America on (F)riday last in the ‘State of America’. The Treasurer having expended the sum of £2.10.6 (in addition to the £5 voted on a previous meeting) for bedding utensils for voyage and a little money with them - the Committee approved of what the Treasurer had done - and the Committee tendered their thanks to Mr. M. Simons in getting the passage for the family on the reduced rate of £10 and also to Mr. M.T. (Morris) Cohen for getting a part of the money among his friends.”³⁴

Visits, such as the investigation after Mrs. Dunn’s first claim, were also intended to show the recipients of charity what was seen by the establishment as a respectable way of life. While the Jewish establishment had genuine humanitarian motives for charity to poor Jews (which form an important aspect of Judaism), they also made their efforts to preserve a positive image of Jews in general society by keeping their people away from general institutions of charity. In doing so, the Jewish establishment differed only slightly from the general middle classes who combined charity with instruction during this period, stimulating self-support and independence³⁵.

In total, the Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society dealt with at least 160 cases during the period between 1875 and 1881. The cases were not evenly divided over these years. During the financial year which ended on 10th October 1880, for example, 67 cases were dealt with, involving a total outlay of at least £163. Of this

³³ SJAC, MBGHPHS 1/2/1880, 15/2/1880, 19/9/1880, 2/1/1881, 23/1/1881, 27/2/1881, 8/5/1881.

³⁴ SJAC, MBGHPHS 20/3/1881.

³⁵ Compare Smout, *A Century of the Scottish People*, pp. 31, 51, 118.

sum the largest part went to resident poor (£68), the casual poor received only £10, while in all another £10 was spent on fares. Furthermore, £23 was given out in loans, £15 to buy stock, £10 for rents, and £27 for other purposes³⁶. It was believed that the relatively large number of applicants had been a result of a trade depression. This presumption seems to be correct, at this time a depression followed a period of expansionist years from 1872 to 1876. The depression was symbolised by the failure of the City of Glasgow Bank in 1878³⁷. During the following winter, in total about 14,000 persons in Glasgow applied for poor relief³⁸. It is in this light, that the 67 cases of the Hebrew Philanthropic Society must be viewed. It is possible that the Society was not able to do more. During this period some Jews were inmates of Glasgow's poorhouses³⁹, an idea which was anathema to the Jewish establishment but which accentuates the diversity of the participation in the Scottish economy by Jews before 1881.

In short, social structure of Glasgow Jewry before the 1880s resembled a pyramid. At the top of the pyramid stood a small group of wealthy merchants and manufacturers. Unlike the situation in England, these men were not involved in finance. Underneath the top was a larger group of shopkeepers, wholesalers and manufacturers. Occasionally, men were able to rise into the top echelon, but they could also become the victims of economic depressions. Below this group there were numerous small retailers, hawkers, workshop owners and workers. The ranks of this third group were constantly reinforced by newcomers as much as persons who fell out of the second group. In this group an unknown number of people worked for Jewish employers. At the bottom of the third group were the poor who mostly relied on Jewish charity. Unfortunately there is not enough evidence to analyse the occupations of the people in the third group. The older settlers helped new arrivals to make a living in Glasgow. The relation between the two groups was one of benevolence with the newcomers as beneficiaries. In this welfare activity a striving for respectability and acceptability can be seen at work.

It is difficult to provide an exact picture of Jewish occupations during the period 1881-1914. Nevertheless for this period data is available from which a picture can be constructed. It is a partial image built up from occasional snapshots, but it does indicate broad trends as can be seen from the following evidence.

Collins notes some details about the occupations of Jewish residents in the Gorbals according to Census Enumerator's books of 1881⁴⁰. Out of a total of 76 heads of

³⁶ SJAC, Printed Financial Statement for the year 5/10/1879-10/10/1880 in MBGHPhS.

³⁷ Slaven, The Development of the West of Scotland, p. 55.

³⁸ Worsdall, The Glasgow Tenement. A Way of Life, Edinburgh, 1979, p.10. For a wider perspective on the Scottish poor laws see I. Levitt, Poverty and Welfare in Scotland, 1890-1948, Edinburgh, 1988.

³⁹ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 45.

⁴⁰ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 222

households (which could be a family head or an independent person), 27 persons were working in the clothing industry and retail. The others included 20 hawkers, 8 picture frame makers, 5 jewellers, 6 general dealers, 4 glaziers and joiners, 3 shopkeepers, while 3 persons had a non-specified occupation. When these figures are compared to the Census returns of 1891⁴¹, it appears that almost half of all the Jews in the Gorbals who had been in Glasgow before 1881 and were still there in 1891, were working in the clothing industry, namely 17 out of a total of 36 heads of households. Others in this group included 13 hawkers, 3 shopkeepers, 1 jeweller, 1 picture frame maker and 1 box maker. Most Jews in the Gorbals can be regarded as immigrants rather than older settlers. The importance of the clothing industry as a means of making a living for the early immigrants is evident. In addition probably quite a few of the hawkers travelled with drapery, while others carried picture frames or jewellery. The shopkeepers were probably a butcher, a grocer and a baker who catered for Jewish as well as non-Jewish customers.

A similar picture of immigrants predominantly manufacturing and selling clothing arises from the total Census Enumerator's books for the Gorbals area in 1891⁴². Out of a total of 401 persons with an occupation, 195 worked in the clothing industry and retail, including 7 shoemakers, 6 capmakers and 3 furriers. The other occupations included 116 hawkers, 18 picture frame makers or dealers, and 13 general dealers. Furthermore, 8 worked in the tobacco industry and retail, 8 in jewellery, 6 domestic servants, 6 tin and blacksmiths, 5 messenger boys, 4 bakers, 4 grocers, 4 teachers and ministers, 3 butchers, and 2 paper box makers. In addition, there was a bookseller, a glazier, a manual labourer, an umbrella maker, a joiner, a printer, a painter, and a miner. The figure of 401 also includes a converted Jew who worked in the neighbourhood as a Christian missionary to the Jews.

In short, the Census Enumerator's books for 1891 show that half of all the Jewish immigrants in the Gorbals were declared to be making a living in the clothing industry, while probably many more than a half profited from this activity, either directly involved or as hawkers or as caterers for the population in the Gorbals. The

⁴¹ Scottish Record Office Edinburgh, New Register House, Census of Scotland 1891 Enumerator's Books (cited hereafter as Census Enumerator's Book 1891).

⁴² Census Enumerator's Books 1891; compare Collins, *Second City Jewry*, p. 223. Collins arrives at a total number of 337 of Jewish residents in the Gorbals who mentioned an occupation which differs substantially from the figure of 401. This difference might be due to the fact that I have added to the people in the Gorbals (276 families) people who lived on the edge of the Gorbals in the adjacent neighbourhoods of Hutchesontown (3 families) and Blythwood (11 families). But the difference might also be caused because Collins does not include some people who mentioned an occupation, either because he could not positively identify them as Jewish or because of other reasons. I have included all people I could identify as Jewish (see Introduction) who mentioned an occupation, from an 11-year-old picture frame maker to a pensioner. In addition there were 12 persons who did not mention an occupation, although they presumably had one. These are not included in the figure of 401.

Jewish presence had also attracted the missionary. Compared to 1881, the occupations in the immigrant population in 1891 were more concentrated in clothing and hawking, while there seems to have been some decline in the numbers of glaziers and jewellers.

The Census Enumerator's books of 1891 can be compared to the Valuation Rolls of the same year. Out of a possible total of almost 300 Jewish families in the Gorbals area, only 145 appear in the Valuation Rolls⁴³. This means that the others were simply not registered or were lodgers or had moved on between the dates that the Census and Valuation Rolls were made up and were therefore not registered on the Valuation Rolls. The heads of households of the 145 families which did appear included 55 hawkers, 39 persons with an occupation in the clothing industry and retail (of which 1 was a capmaker and 1 a shoemaker), 15 picture frame makers and dealers, 8 general dealers, 5 bakers, 4 jewellers, 3 grocers, 3 tin and blacksmiths, 3 manual labourers, 2 teachers and ministers, 2 butchers, 2 worked in the tobacco industry and retail, plus a dairyman, a glazier, a joiner, and a bookseller.

The Valuation Rolls possibly show the more settled element within the immigrant population inasmuch as these 145 families had not moved on, were able to rent a house and were not lodgers. The relatively low number of family heads working in the clothing industry and the large number of independent workers like hawkers and other manufacturers, like the picture frame makers, on the Valuation Rolls might suggest that this group formed the nucleus of a new immigrant middle class. A comparison of family names in the Census Enumerators books for 1881 and 1891 and the Valuation Rolls for 1891 indicates that this middle class was initially made up from people who had settled in Glasgow before 1881.

This immigrant middle class reappears in the Glasgow entries of the Commercial Directory of the Jews in Great Britain of 1894. There, workshop owners and shopkeepers in the Gorbals represent almost half of all the registered Jewish businesses in the city. The Directory lists 109 businesses, of which almost half were situated on the South Side of Glasgow, a quarter in the old city centre (near the High Street) and Blythswood, an eighth in the new city centre (Buchanan Street-Sauchiehall Street) and another eighth further into the West End, including areas such as Cowcaddens and Hillhead. The emphasis is on small retail and clothing. The 109 registered businesses were active in 117 occupations, including 53 in retail and small manufacturing (of which 17 were instrumentmakers, watchmakers, opticians and jewellers and 7 tobacconists), 48 in the clothing industry and retail, 6 larger

⁴³ Scottish Record Office Edinburgh, New Register House, Glasgow Valuation Rolls 1891 (cited hereafter as Valuation Rolls 1891).

merchants, 6 bakers and butchers, 3 money exchangers⁴⁴, and 1 solicitor.

The solicitor was Philip B. Simons, step-brother of Michael Simons, of the firm Dickie & Simons in St. Vincent Street. The three money exchangers worked from the Broomielaw quay on the Clyde. The bakers and butchers probably catered mostly for the Jewish population. The businesses which were situated in the new city centre and neighbourhoods like Hillhead served a predominantly non-Jewish middle class, while the clients for businesses in the old city centre came from a more working class but still mainly non-Jewish background.

The workshops on the South Side in the Directory can be compared to the 29 Jewish master tailors in Glasgow mentioned in 1888 by Julius Pinto to the House of Lords committee on “sweating”⁴⁵. Half of these 29 tailors had a workshop on the South Side. They employed on average nine Jewish males to every non-Jewish male (and one Jewish female to every two non-Jewish females; the women mostly working in relatively unskilled and low-pay jobs). In total, the 29 Jewish workshop owners in Glasgow in 1888 were said to have employed just under 400 persons, including almost 180 Jews. By comparison, the Census of 1891 showed that about two hundred Jews in the Gorbals found an occupation in the clothing industry, which indicates either an expansion of the industry in the period between 1888 and 1891 involving Jewish workers or a large Jewish presence in the clothing industry outside these workshops.

The large Jewish presence in the clothing industry and among drapery hawkers can be explained. In England, Jews had traditionally been active in the trade in second-hand clothing, mostly for the working classes, while a few worked as bespoke tailors supplying a middle class market. With the general rise of income, working class demand for second-hand clothing dropped to be replaced with cheap ready-made clothing. Many Jews found employment in the ready-made clothing production and trade. The older Jewish settlers and the early immigrants who moved from England to Glasgow during the 1870s brought the Jewish clothing trade with them and in Glasgow they found a growing market for their products⁴⁶. Also, the need to cut production costs in the 1880s encouraged the development of closely-knit production units such as the ready-made clothing trade with its sweatshops manned by people anxious to get work like the immigrants arriving from Eastern Europe.

In Glasgow, ready-made clothes were initially supplied to retailers by wholesale

⁴⁴ No moneylenders are mentioned either here or above in Census Enumerator’s books and Valuation Rolls. This is not say that no Jews in Glasgow was active as such. See for example SJAC, MBGHC 9/2/1896 on the occasion of the refusal of a seat in the synagogue to somebody who was accused of “scandalous” moneylending.

⁴⁵ House of Lords, Sessional Papers (cited hereafter as Sessional Papers 1888), session 1888, vol. VIII, Appendix A. For a discussion of “sweating” see below.

⁴⁶ Checkland, Slaven, Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, I, p. 411; W.H. Fraser, The Coming of the Mass Market 1850-1914, London, 1981, pp. 58-65, 175-192.

warehouses. These large manufacturers^{obtained} their parts from the small, often family-based workshops. As was shown in the example of Abraham Goldberg at the beginning of this chapter, the threshold for entry into this business was low. A workshop owner needed little capital (often a small loan). The part-work, which in general required few skills, could be carried out at home. After completion, wholesalers turned the parts into garments or found other sub-contractors to do so. Wholesalers could sell the ready-made clothing from their premises, supply shops and in addition provide hawkers with goods. The hawkers formed an important outlet for this industry. Immigrants were able to take up hawking as they often received their goods on credit or with financial help from fellow immigrants or the congregation.

As a whole, the clothing trade expanded during the second half of the 19th century, mostly until 1914 with a few firms booming in 1920. In the 20th century the demand for labour in the clothing industry dropped⁴⁷. The industry changed. During the Boer War and the First World War this industry produced uniforms for the army and the volunteer movement. Some wholesalers and workshops did very well out of this change, but others suffered from the war circumstances. After the war department stores took over the retail role of wholesalers, new markets were found and increasingly retail and manufacturing required larger capital investments. As a result some of the smaller workshops disappeared to be replaced by larger factories. The developments during the First World War probably stimulated factory production. After 1920 price falls occurred and wholesale went into decline. Within the clothing industry there were, however, important divisions and differences. With regard to outerwear, for example, individual tailors provided working men before the First World War still with clothing suited to their status and income⁴⁸. Their role was taken over by larger manufacturers who expanded the outerwear trade with a factory rather than workshop style of production and sold directly to larger retailers and department stores. In addition, the Scottish Cooperative shops supplied working class people with clothing. The workforce in the production section of the outerwear clothing industry - with a majority of women producing gentlemen and ladies garments - grew more than tenfold in the period between 1900 and 1937.

As was noticed above, hawking provided an important outlet of the clothing industry. Most Jewish hawkers bought and sold on credit. Increasingly, the Scottish working classes bought new clothes, being able to do so as a result of rising incomes, with a system of payment by instalments allowing people to acquire clothing without having to save up for a long period on forehand. The price of a good suit at the beginning of the

⁴⁷ Census of Scotland 1911, I, pp. 46-47. The number of people employed in the industry was reported to have dropped from 23,257 in 1901 to 20,626 in 1911.

⁴⁸ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, pp. 255, 374-375.

20th century could be as high as 35 to 55 shillings, for many workers more than a week's wages, and the customer could pay up in small weekly amounts. Julius Pinto offered the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration in 1903 the following explanation.

"The instalment system prevails in Glasgow and in Scotland generally. (The pedlar gets his money) at the rate of 1s. or 6d. a week, and has to be repaid for the additional risks he runs. It is a very foolish idea on the part of the working man to buy his clothes by that method (...) but there is a thriftless class who cannot manage to save up sufficiently to enable them to buy for ready cash, and they resort to this means."⁴⁹

This was the second occasion on which Pinto provided a picture of Jewish involvement in the clothing industry. Fifteen years before his appearance before the Royal Commission he had given his testimony to the House of Lords. In 1888 and in 1903 Pinto wanted to offer a respectable image of the Jewish population and his contempt for the "thriftless" class (he mainly meant Irish immigrants) was born out of this wish. Pinto might have been a tailor who preferred to do business for ready cash, but he must have known that hawking and the credit trade provided many Jewish immigrants with the means to earn a living and therefore stimulated the clothing industry in general. The industry attracted people, with some Scottish firms importing workers. On such an occasion early in the 1870s, Julius Pinto himself and a number of other Jewish tailors were brought from London to Scotland⁵⁰.

To round off this review of immigrant occupations before 1914 it is necessary to look at the other industries where Jews found employment. Picture frame making has already been mentioned. In this sector Jews provided also some of the photographers for pictures which were increasingly used to decorate working class living rooms. There was a fierce competition in this trade. Louis Saul Langfier, for example, a "photographic artist", was forced out of business in 1905 by the competition opposite his studio in Sauchiehall Street⁵¹.

In the tobacco industry in Glasgow immigrants were initially employed to make cigarettes. Their involvement was largely due to Jacob Kramrisch, who told the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration in 1903 that he had come to Britain with his

⁴⁹ Reports from Commissioners, Inspectors, and others: Alien Immigration (hereafter cited as Royal Commission 1903), II, 20905-20913.

⁵⁰ Gartner, The Jewish Immigrant in England, p. 92. On a similar occasion in 1893 a Jewish firm called Freeman transferred its production and staff from Dundee to Glasgow. Compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 151. Collins mentions several capmakers who set up their own businesses after the Feingold factory which employed them closed. Two of the capmakers, Solomon Meadow and Solomon Collins, had spent a number of years in London before they came to Glasgow, possibly on the initiative of Feingold. Solomon Collins set up a workshop with a few machinists in cramped conditions in Gorbals' Oxford Street; later he was able to move to a factory in Barrhead.

⁵¹ WRH, CS 319/1911/4080.

parents thirty years earlier⁵². He started to work for John Players & Sons in Nottingham in 1882. Six years later he moved to Glasgow as the manager of the cigarette department of Stephen Mitchell & Sons. In 1901 Mitchell joined two other companies to form the Imperial Tobacco Company, an initiative to enable the three to compete with the expanding American tobacco industry⁵³.

According to Kramrisch, the British cigarette industry in 1882 was still in its infancy. It had been necessary to import foreign labour, because British workers did not take to cigarette making. While at a later stage Scottish companies contracted mostly Jewish immigrants from England, the foreign cigarette workers initially came from the Jewish population in Germany and Russia. Contractors had been sent to Russia and Kramrisch himself had travelled to Hamburg to inspect the workers. Before Mitchell, he said, cigarette manufacturing in Scotland had been insignificant, but now - 1903 - he employed 160 males, all foreign Jews, and 100 females, half of whom were Jewish. In the allied trades, such as packing, finishing and box-making, another 600 people found employment, but here the emphasis was on non-Jews. Other tobacco companies in Glasgow also employed foreigners.

At this stage cigarettes were mostly hand-made, although some machinery was in use. Kramrisch said that the cigarette spills, the outercases for the filling of tobacco, were made by boys and girls. Otherwise there was no sub-division of labour: one person made the cigarette. Skilled and precise work, like the cutting and mixing of tobacco, was done by males. The situation as described by Kramrisch would not exist for long. With the introduction of new machinery during the following years, the number of employees in the cigarette industry dropped significantly⁵⁴.

Outside the industry, a number of Jews made a living at home or in small workshops by making cigarettes for local tobacconists. Benjamin Abrahams, for example, had started such a business with Bernard Fisch. The two cigarette manufacturers opened their workshop in 52 Main Street, Gorbals, probably in 1896. They were later joined by a Mr. Bank with whom Fisch had been in business earlier in Edinburgh. Abrahams provided their capital, a sum of £130. They found competition with the bigger firms too difficult and became insolvent in 1900⁵⁵. The company was sold to others who continued the business under a new name.

A Jewish tobacconist who manufactured his own brand of cigarettes was Benjamin Kaplan, who was already mentioned in chapter 1. He started his business in March

⁵² Royal Commission 1903, II, 21716-21734; compare 17865, the evidence of Joseph Prag, a councillor from St. Pancras who said that an immigrant Jew had opened Players.

⁵³ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 280.

⁵⁴ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 280; compare Census of Scotland 1911, I, p. 47. The number of females employed in the industry dropped from almost 2,000 in 1901 to 1,002 in 1911.

⁵⁵ WRH, CS 318/1911/15. The petition was filed by an Italian confectioner in the Saltmarket.

1898 after working as a manager in the cigar department of Bell. He had shops in Bridge Street, Main Street, Argyle Street, New City Road and Anderston. Kaplan manufactured his own brand: "Kaplan's Diamond Crop Cigarettes" employing members of his family and machinery (which was valued at £200). He sold the shop in Bridge Street (the "Southern Cigar Depot") to his nephew Nathan Kaplan, the son of two Russian immigrants who had arrived in Glasgow before 1896⁵⁶. Benjamin Kaplan sold the shop in order to gain capital and start a wholesale business, but he went bankrupt. Nathan Kaplan left for South Africa in 1903. The shops were sold to other immigrants who continued the business. Nathan's sister Fanny Kaplan was at this time also involved in the tobacco business. Her firm was registered at 549 Sauchiehall Street⁵⁷. She had started in South Portland Street, possibly with help from uncle Benjamin Kaplan (both mentioned the shop in Argyle Street and it is possible that the two firms were one in reality). She ran a few shops, for which she made cigarettes with the help of some employees. Tobacco was bought from a Mr. Max London, who also provided loans to expand the business. She did not succeed in expanding the company and met the same fate as her uncle.

There is little evidence of large numbers of immigrant tobacconists and cigarette makers in the occupation figures given above in the Census Enumerator's books for 1881 and 1891 and the directory of Jewish businesses in 1894. It is possible that most of the immigrant tobacco workers came after 1894 and started their businesses after leaving the companies which employed them. They may have left because they were laid off because of the mechanisation of production or because they preferred to run their own business. It appears that although they carried on in this retail sector, this type of cigarette manufacturing eventually could not compete with the cheaper production of the larger companies. In later years, only a few tobacconists carried their own brand. Still, their ventures demonstrate their business acumen and inventiveness and their readiness to see an opportunity and take it.

As the example of the Jewish tobacconists shows, immigrant workers were eager to go into retail and start their own business. There was a large body of immigrant retailers. A few of them went into jewellery, stationery and furniture, like the older settlers had done, but the majority entered different areas. They could become grocers, butchers and bakers, catering initially for the Jewish immigrant population⁵⁸.

⁵⁶ SJAC, photographs Kaplan. Nathan's father, Aaron Kaplan, died in Glasgow in 1896. The parents had married in Russia on 20/8/1873. The family must therefore have arrived in Glasgow between 1873 and 1896. There were 8 children. Nathan Kaplan was registered in the Post Office Glasgow Directory as a tobacconist in Bridge Street from 1899 to 1902.

⁵⁷ WRH, CS 318/1903/196.

⁵⁸ See, for example, Royal Commission 1903, II, 20894. Julius Pinto said that 14 Jewish butchers and poulterers in Glasgow provided meat for an estimated Jewish population of 6,000.

and then trying to expand their business. There were plenty of opportunities for small shops which required little starting capital. Glasgow traditionally had a high number of small shops per head of population when compared to other British cities. The concentration of people, the consumption habits and the policy of the local authorities favoured small shops which provided the daily needs of the population. These shops tended to be smaller than, for example, clothing and furniture shops and jewellers, and initially also had less to fear from competition of larger co-operation shops and department stores⁵⁹. But in times of economic recession, the smaller shops easily fell victim to the bad times. This created, of course, new opportunities for others. After 1900 the larger retail shops won ground. By 1950 there were 18 department stores in Glasgow, with at least two large Jewish stores, namely Links' and Goldberg's. When hit by the recession Jewish shopkeepers often turned to hawking, an occupation in which they might have been involved before opening a shop. In bad times there was also the possibility to leave Glasgow or even to return to Russia⁶⁰. It is unknown how many immigrants returned. In bad times hawkers tended to pawn their goods while in good times they often became shopkeepers while shopkeepers went into larger retail and wholesale.

A number of immigrants went into the drink trade. To run public houses was not a completely new development. Jews traditionally did so in the Pale of Settlement and during the 1850s Henry Levy, one of the trustees of the synagogue, had owned the Shakespeare Saloon in Saltmarket⁶¹. With the increase of the number of Jewish retailers in general, the number of Jewish publicans also rose early in the 20th century. In Rubin's study on wartime regulations on the retailing trade⁶² there appear at least five Jews among the sixteen applications to open a refreshment shop in the period between February and April 1918. These five planned to sell light ales and aerated waters, which meant that they were not to serve hard liquor. The five shops were situated in working class areas.

Others were involved in the drink trade as merchants and eventually as distillers. Henry Levy of the Shakespeare Saloon preferred to describe himself as a wine merchant and his example was followed by Garnethill member David Heilbron. Little details are known about Heilbron's early business activities⁶³. He had settled in

⁵⁹ Cunison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, pp. 356-359, 362.

⁶⁰ See for example SJAC, Printed report 1/9/1911-31/8/1912 in MBG; F. Leipman, The Long Journey Home. The Memoirs of Flora Leipman, London, 1987, pp. 11-17.

⁶¹ SJAC, MBGHC 17/9/1858.

⁶² G.R. Rubin, "Race, retailing and Wartime Regulation: The Retail Business (Licensing) Order 1918", in Immigrants & Minorities, vol. 7, nr. 2, July 1988, pp. 184-205.

⁶³ SRA, D-OWP 19/8, 23/1/1879. In 1879 he asked for permission to have a store and warehouse built in connection with his house in 6 Rose Street, Garnethill, valued at £300. This must have been near the start of his business.

Glasgow before the 1880s and became an important Jewish communal leader, chairing public meetings, serving on the Garnethill executive and being President of the Jewish Board of Guardians. He eventually built up a large business which was formed into a limited company in May 1918⁶⁴, called David Heilbron & Sons Ltd. He traded in wines and liqueurs and also developed an interest in whisky-distilling, eventually producing the Hilburn label. David Heilbron & Sons Ltd. was formed with a capital of £60,000 with shares allotted to Heilbron and three sons, who were appointed as directors. One year later the fourth son, Isidor (later Sir Ian) who pursued an academic career in the Sciences, acquired shares from David Heilbron and shortly after he too became director.

In the beginning of the 20th century Heilbron associated himself with Michael Simons as co-owner of several theatres. Simons withdrew himself from business after the First World War and it is possible that Heilbron at this stage was also planning to leave his business in favour of his sons, who themselves held shares in several Scottish hotels and owned property and a glass works in Glasgow. Heilbron's sons do not appear to have been willing to carry on the business for long. Within three years from its establishment, two new directors from outside the family were appointed as directors and shares were sold. The company was eventually wound up in 1926. In the meantime, David Heilbron had formed another limited liability company in April 1922⁶⁵, possibly on the distilling side of his business. This involved two non-Jewish shareholders, one of whom was the distiller John Armstrong. Eventually this company was incorporated into Ainslie & Heilbron (Distillers) Ltd. David Heilbron died in April 1929, leaving an estate of £82,401⁶⁶.

There was a small number of Jewish house owners in Glasgow⁶⁷. In 1861 two Jewish house owners together owned 16 houses. In 1881, 12 Jews owned 66 houses in Glasgow (of which 42 were owned by fruitbroker Benjamin Simons and formed part of his warehouses). The occupations of these house-owners included jewellers, merchants and a manufacturer. In 1911, 22 Jews owned 351 houses in Glasgow, but among these 22 there were many owner-occupiers (including 11 women). The large house-owners let their property mostly to non-Jewish tenants. They were jeweller Henry Davis, a descendant of the Davis-family who owned 16 houses, Charles Jacobs who owned 19, jeweller Abraham Jacobson who owned 54, and warehouseman or wholesaler Pinkus Levy who together with his wife Rebecca possessed 239 houses.

⁶⁴ West Register House (Edinburgh), Dissolved Company Files (cited hereafter as WRH, BT), WRH, BT-2 10055.

⁶⁵ WRH, BT-2 12147.

⁶⁶ University of Glasgow Archives, UGD 174/62. Compare JE 24/4/1929. His estate was valued at £82,401. The Jewish Echo reported that he left an estate of £78,204.

⁶⁷ Valuation Rolls 1861, 1881 and 1911.

It is not possible to say exactly how the distribution of Jewish occupations compared to that of the general population because the total number of Jews in each occupation is not known. They were almost certainly missing from some occupations. In 1903 Pinto told the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration that Jews did not work in Glasgow's traditional staple industries⁶⁸ and there is no reason to doubt his statement; skilled engineering occupations, for example, tended to be the preserve of native Scots. Fifteen years earlier Pinto had explained to the commission of the House of Lords that at that time in the tailoring business there were no Jewish trousermakers and only one Jewish vestmaker⁶⁹. Whether Jews did not work in such occupations by choice or discrimination is not clear. The statement in 1888 went on to say that the Jewish mastertailors in Glasgow employed non-Jews as well as Jews, which might imply that non-Jewish mastertailors did not employ as many Jews as non-Jews. In 1903 Pinto was obviously trying to prevent the impression that Jewish immigrants in general competed with non-Jews for jobs. In 1888 he was referring to the clothing trade but he possibly had the same in mind. In any case, Pinto did not provide figures.

It is, however, possible to arrive at a picture of the distribution of Jewish immigrant occupations in a more roundabout way. The Census of 1891⁷⁰ gives a summary of the occupations of the inhabitants of Glasgow. The total number of immigrants in each occupation is unknown, but the entries in the Census Enumerator's books for the Gorbals for 1891 and the Commercial Directory of the Jews in Great Britain of 1894 provide some figures upon which an indication of Jewish share in each occupation can be based.

The Census first divides occupations into six professional classes (professional, domestic, commercial, agricultural, industrial and unoccupied/non-productive). There were very few Jews in the professional, domestic and agricultural classes. These three classes in total provided employment for some 40,000 persons (male and female). The commercial class contained more than 43,000 persons. The 109 Jewish businessowners of the 1894 directory and 155 immigrants with a small business in the Census returns for the Gorbals of 1891 (116 hawkers, 18 picture frame makers or dealers, 13 general dealers, and 8 jewellers) belonged to this class, which in each case amounts only to a very small percentage. A more precise figure can be supplied for the number of hawkers: among the 1,416 hawkers and streetsellers there were at least 116 Jewish immigrants, which constitutes 8%.

The Census of 1911 also provides figures for the principal occupations in Glasgow,

⁶⁸ Royal Commission 1903, II, 20896.

⁶⁹ Sessional Papers 1888, 26107-26206.

⁷⁰ Census of Scotland 1891, Edinburgh, 1891, 2 volumes, II, part XV, pp. 363-379. The figures are for the parliamentary burgh.

while it is more precise on the occupations of foreigners in Scotland than the Census of previous years⁷¹. The majority of the Jewish immigrants in Glasgow came from Russia and they were not yet naturalised by 1911. In this census they belong to the category of "Russian and Polish foreigners in Scotland". In total there were 11,032 Russian and Polish foreigners registered in Scotland in 1911 and of these 6,520 were males. Of the total number of males 5,924 had stated an occupation. The Census shows that the Russian and Poles in Scotland were concentrated in a relatively small number of occupations. The figures on these occupations can be utilised to provide a rough indication of the occupations of Jewish immigrants in Glasgow. The largest section of Russian and Polish foreigners was employed in mining: 2,611 men. In addition to these miners there were 661 Russian and Poles working in the iron and other metal manufacture. The majority described as miners and workers in the iron and other metal manufacture were as a rule not Jewish⁷². If the numbers of miners and workers in the iron and other metal manufacture are deducted, the Census notes in total 2,652 otherwise occupied Russian and Polish men in Scotland in 1911. Jewish immigrants belonging to this group were likely to be found among the Russian and Polish tailors: 687 men. Or among the commercial travellers (a category which included hawkers): 304 men; or among the workers in furniture manufacture: 283 men. In addition there were 65 drapers and 32 brokers. The tobacco industry and retail employed 59 Russian and Polish men. Other occupations which involved small numbers of Russian and Poles included opticians, watchmakers and jewellers (40), clergymen (33 men), printers and booksellers (25), teachers (19), waterproof makers (14), photographers (13), furriers (6) and moneydealers (2).

Of the 4,512 Russian and Polish females in Scotland in 1911, 650 had stated an occupation. The largest number are described as tailors and dressmakers: 279 women. A large number were shopkeepers: 69, while 61 women were employed as domestic servant. The tobacco industry employed 36 Russian and Polish women. The other occupations included 18 hawkers, 14 drapers, and 6 brokers. The total number of women with an occupation was very low. A number of women possibly worked at home and had failed to mention an occupation, which does not rule out that they participated in workshops which were often situated in tenements or work which was taken home. These figures therefore do not provide enough information upon which conclusions about the occupations of female Jewish immigrants can be based.

⁷¹ Census of Scotland 1911, I (part 2, City of Glasgow), pp. 46-77; vol. III, pp. IX- XV, 43-61. It can be noted that in the period between 1891 and 1911 the total number of people employed in Glasgow dropped, while the number of Russian and Polish foreigners in the city rose.

⁷² See K. Lunn, "Reactions to Lithuanian and Polish Immigrants in the Lanarkshire Coalfield", in K. Lunn (ed.), Hosts Immigrants and Minorities. Historical Responses to newcomers in British Society 1870-1914, Folkstone, 1980, pp.308-342.

A few suggestions about the occupations of Jewish immigrants in Glasgow can be derived from the figures on male foreigners in the Census of 1911, but the question is how many of the total number of 2,652 Russian and Polish men in Scotland who were not miners or workers in the iron and other metal manufacture were Jewish immigrants in Glasgow. We can presume that the majority of these men was Jewish but not that they all lived in Glasgow. Non-Jewish miners and workers in the iron and other metal manufacture usually lived in mining villages and near iron and steel works situated outside or at the edge of cities, while Jews usually settled in the cities. The Census notes that 4,757 Russians and Poles were enumerated in the city of Glasgow and 721 in the city of Edinburgh. In other words, the number of Russian and Poles in Glasgow was almost seven times higher than in Edinburgh. If all these Russian and Poles in Glasgow and Edinburgh were Jewish and there were only insignificant Jewish settlements elsewhere in Scotland, we may presume that almost seven out of every eight Jewish immigrants in Scotland lived in Glasgow. That could mean, very roughly, that out of the total 2,652 Russian and Polish men in the Census of 1911 who were not miners or workers in the iron and other metal manufacture, about 2,300 were Jewish immigrant males in Glasgow.

If similar calculations are made concerning the number of tailors, commercial travellers and workers in the furniture manufacture, it can be said that among these 2,300 men there were about 600 tailors, about 270 commercial travellers and about 250 workers in the furniture industry (similarly, there might have been about 240 tailors and dressmakers among the female Jewish immigrants in Glasgow in 1911). By comparison, the Census notes that the clothing industry in Glasgow employed 10,472 men, while there were 4,042 commercial travellers and 9,417 workers in the furniture industry.

These figures remain necessarily very impressionistic, but they nevertheless give some indication of the concentration of Jewish immigrant males in certain occupations and their percentage in the total of each occupation in Glasgow in 1911. The 600 tailors represent 26% of all immigrant occupations, but less than 6% of all the workers in the local clothing industry; the 270 commercial travellers make up 12% of all immigrant occupations, but less than 7% of all commercial travellers; and the 250 workers in furniture manufacture form 11% of all immigrant occupations, but less than 3% of the total number of workers in furniture manufacture.

To finish this review of Jewish occupations before the First World War, it can be said that, in comparison with the period before 1881, the presence of Jews in the clothing industry and retail in the period between 1880 and 1914 was very large. These occupations provided room for unskilled workers, but this is not to say that all Jewish immigrants in these occupations started as unskilled workers. Some must have

had special skills, which they had learned in Eastern Europe or on their way to Scotland. These people were, for example, brought here by tailoring firms. Even in the smallest tenement-based workshop there was at least one person needed who knew how to cut cloth and make up parts for garments - skills which were not learned overnight. As we shall see below, even in the clothing industry where thresholds were low, some capital was needed to start a business. Some immigrants brought some capital with them. People with skills and capital were among the first Jewish workshop owners in Glasgow and they eventually provided employment for the more destitute immigrants who also arrived in Glasgow. For those who could not find employment in the workshops, hawking the goods which were manufactured there proved to be another means to make a living in Scotland⁷³.

Many immigrants were dreaming of success, but even if they did not all become great entrepreneurs what is remarkable is the large number who gained an independent status at an early stage. Many changed their status from employee to employer, workshop owner or shopkeeper. We have already seen tailors like Julius Pinto and tobacconists like Benjamin Kaplan, succeeding at least temporarily in this. They either left a job to start a workshop or became an employer after being made redundant. Beginnings were usually small. Of the 29 mastertailors mentioned by Julius Pinto in 1888⁷⁴ 19 used tenement rooms as workshops, 3 had workshops joined to a home and 11 used workshops which were not connected to a home or factories elsewhere in the city. They employed just under 400 workers, including almost 180 Jews. Of the total number of Jewish employees about half was female. Of the non-Jewish employees not more than a dozen were males. On average these tailors employed thirteen persons, but 17 of them remained under this average. Pinto told the commission of the House of Lords that since he had made the lists, two mastertailors had ceased to be master and that one was about to leave Glasgow. The 29 mastertailors had on average been in Britain for just over 17 years (from 6 to 36 years), of which they had on average spent just over 12 years in Glasgow (from 2 to 18 years). In other words, it took workshop owners like the mastertailors in this example, some twelve years to build a small home-based business, which could be terminated by the vicissitudes of the Scottish economy.

Business success was often short-lived; both Pinto⁷⁵ and Kaplan went bankrupt. Economic growth was not evenly divided, trade depressions and strikes made many

⁷³ Census of Scotland 1911, I, p. 46. The number of hawkers (male commercial travellers) was reported to have risen from 3,598 in 1901 to 4,042 in 1911. As the total number of employees in Glasgow dropped, hawking apparently provided a relatively larger section of the population with the means to earn a living. During the same period also the number of shoemakers and cabinetmakers fell.

⁷⁴ Sessional Papers 1888, 26107-26206, Appendix A.

⁷⁵ For Pinto's bankruptcy see WRH, CS 318/1910/240.

victims⁷⁶. Collins' total number of 81 Jewish bankruptcies in Scotland before 1913 mentioned above includes 36 in Glasgow after 1881. Of these, 11 concerned a business in the clothing industry. Furthermore, there were 7 general merchants, 5 jewellers, 4 tobacconists, 3, furniture manufacturers and dealers, and a picture frame maker, a broker, a photographer, a baker, an advertisement contractor and an unknown business.

On 26 of these 36 sequestrations more information can be gained⁷⁷. The 26 cases involved 7 clothing firms, 6 general merchants, 4 jewellers, 3 furniture dealers, 3 tobacconists, 1 picture frame maker, 1 broker and 1 advertising contractor. The average debt or liabilities of the firms involved was £2,944 (from £107 to £29,192). This figure is based on a total of 18 firms where the total debt was clear. The debt of 14 firms was under this average, which in general allows for the conclusion that most were rather small businesses. The contacts of the firms, where identification is possible, concerned in 28 cases a Jew as the major contact and in 2 cases a number of Jews, while in 7 cases this concerned a non-Jew as the major contact and in 5 cases a number of non-Jews. This would suggest that these small businesses mostly dealt with Jewish business partners. The following examples illustrate different occupations.

Abraham Bernstein⁷⁸, a general merchant with premises in Candleriggs and Govan, had been struggling for four years, often failing to pay his bills, when he became insolvent and was charged in June 1904 with having pawned 58 pairs of boots and shoes while being in a process of sequestration. The pawnbroker involved explained to the Sheriff Court that traders like Bernstein who were hard pressed often pawned their goods, to redeem and sell them afterwards. Bernstein's liabilities amounted to £504 and he obviously operated in the small retail sector. Sam Getlin⁷⁹, a clothier in Cowcaddens Street, was only marginally better off. He made a statement in 1904, explaining how he had started the business. Seven years earlier he had arrived from Russia and found employment as a presser. In 1902 he bought a shop from his brother-in-law with a loan from his sister (he had two sisters in Glasgow). Subsequently he sent for his parents and two brothers in Russia and rented a house for

⁷⁶ Slaven, The Development of the West of Scotland, pp. 155-158, 178-179. M.S. Moss, J.R. Hume, "Business Failure in Scotland 1839-1913", in Business History, volume XXV (1983), number 1, figure 1, shows peaks in the number of sequestrations in Scotland during the following years: 1878-1880, 1885-1888, in 1892-1894, 1899-1901, 1904-1905 and 1908-1910, indicating periods of economic recession.

⁷⁷ See WRH, CS 318/1893/323, 318/1892/293, 318/1913/254, 318/1893/341, 318/1916/212, 318/1916/2, 318/1907/1, 318/1907/289, 319/1911/2838, 318/1907/287, 318/1911/15, 318/1906/30, 318/1898/132, 318/1926/98, 318/1906/119, 318/1903/169, 318/1888/140, 318/1903/196, 318/1904/160, 318/1905/158, 308/1907/153, 318/1922/192, 318/1906/251, 318/1898/336, 318/1914/210, 318/1890/282. The other files contain little or no information.

⁷⁸ WRH, CS 318/1906/30; Evening Dispatch 1/6/1904.

⁷⁹ WRH, CS 318/1906/119.

them, Getlin himself lodging with a sister in Maryhill Road. One brother started work as a drapery hawker. The family income enabled them to make outings to Dunoon. Getlin said that he made £2 and 10 shillings per week out of his shop. Without realising, however, he had built up debts and got into trouble. He could not read and another man kept his books. This man, so claimed Getlin, proved to be untrustworthy. The liabilities amounted to £583.

Isaac Salberg⁸⁰, a drapery and jewellery hawker from Thistle Street who was mentioned in chapter 1, was charged in 1892 with failing to keep books for the last three years. At the Sheriff Court an accountant testified that Salberg (who said himself that he could neither read nor write) had kept books, in which he recorded his sales in the country and in Glasgow and the instalments he had received. According to the accountant's statement, the bankrupt "had no shop and no assistant. (His books) were similar to those kept by other travelling drapers. Bankrupt (Salberg), like other travelling drapers, lost heavily by the railway strike and the strike of furnace men (Dixon's Iron Works)."⁸¹ The sheriff found him not guilty as there was no intention to defraud. Salberg's debts amounted to £368.

Lazarus Teplitzky and Jacob Shapera⁸², two partners in a jewellers business, provide an example of a firm which suffered only a temporary setback. In 1891 they became insolvent, with liabilities of £1,454. Their joint assests and inventories came to £218, indicating that these were not very poor men. Teplitzky declared that he had been in business for four years, the last one and a half of which with Shapera. They sold jewellery to travellers and directly to the public, but since the strikes which had also crippled Salberg, their clients failed to pay their debts. In total 632 were still outstanding, amounting to £1223, and they could not be recovered as the debtors had moved from the registered addresses. These debts point at a large number of customers and relatively small sales. In one year, Teplitzky and Shapera were able to recoup their losses and later they were able to acquire property in the Gorbals which they rented out to Jewish tenants⁸³. Their firm successfully made the step from small retail to larger wholesale.

Success in business was therefore mostly small, often temporary and gained after working for many years. This process created self-made men who worked or had worked themselves and had established special relations with their employees. Once successful, many Jewish businessmen took a leading role in Jewish communal life with their status within the Jewish population confirming their position in general society.

⁸⁰ WRH, CS 318/1893/323.

⁸¹ Evening Dispatch 4/6/1892.

⁸² WRH, CS 318/1893/341.

⁸³ Valuation Rolls 1911. This concerned only a small amount of houses.

Such Jewish leaders were not satisfied to operate from behind the scenes and in their political outlook they were rather anti-Socialist. The furrier Fred Nettler, for example, celebrated in 1938 the twentieth anniversary of his involvement in the trade. His employees presented him with a bust by Benno Schotz, after which Nettler thanked his staff by saying that “they worked in harmony, not only with him, but with one another.”⁸⁴

The example of the Heilbron family points at another trend. David Heilbron's success in business enabled his sons to choose public or academic careers. As time went on, other immigrants, who were less successful or operated on a lower economic level but who were able and prepared to make sacrifices, could also offer their children an opportunity to further education. Such opportunities were initially mostly taken by the younger sons, while the older sons stayed in business.

How did the non-Jewish population in Glasgow react to the Jewish immigrants entering Scottish labour and business before 1914? The evidence suggests that influx of immigrant labour was initially greeted with hostility. During the 1880s, for example, anti-alien agitation in the Glasgow Trades Council demanded legislation to stop immigration of foreign labourers to Britain⁸⁵. This mainly concerned non-Jewish Eastern European miners who found employment in Scotland and Jewish immigrant workers in the clothing industry. Many immigrants were not union members and the trade unions in general opposed non-union labour, but the reaction shows more than just opposition to non-union labour. In 1892 the president of the Glasgow Trades council spoke at the annual Trade Union Congress in Glasgow about the “enormous immigration of destitute aliens” who “take work at any price” as a result of which “the tailoring and kindred trades (...) have been practically ruined.”⁸⁶ The reaction to the influx of immigrant labour shows fear of unemployment, unfair competition and pressure on wage rates.

⁸⁴ JE 21/1/1938; compare B. Schotz, Bronze in My Blood, p. 161; Benno Schotz Portrait Sculpture, Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum exhibition catalogue, Glasgow, 1978, p. 18. Nettler had been started in business by his mother-in-law when he arrived in Glasgow as a young man from Russia. The firm reportedly had about 150 employees. The bust was presented by Mr. J. Isaacs who had worked in the firm for 20 years.

⁸⁵ Glasgow United Trades' Council Report 1887-88, p. 9; Glasgow United Trades' Council report 1888-89, p. 12. Compare J. Buckman, “Alien Working-Class response: the Leeds Jewish tailors, 1880-1914”, in K. Lunn, Hosts Immigrants and Minorities. Historical Responses to Newcomers in British Society 1870-1914, Folkstone, 1980, p. 222-262, pp. 223-224. In 1888 the Trade Union Congress passed a resolution tabled by representatives of Edinburgh tailors deploring the fact that Britain had become “the refuge of all the rubbish of the central countries of Europe”. The resolution was seconded by Keir Hardie.

⁸⁶ Quoted in I. Finstein, “Jewish Immigration in British Party Politics in the 1890s”, in A. Newman (rapporteur), Migration and Settlement. Proceedings of the Anglo-American Jewish Historical Conference, London, 1971, pp. 128-144, p. 136. Compare TUC Annual Report 1892, pp. 29, 54, TUC Annual Report 1893, p. 92; A. Tuckett, The Scottish Trades Union Congress: the First 80 years, Edinburgh, 1986, p. 47. The President was John Hodge, founder of the Steel Smelters' Association and the Labour Party. In 1916 he became the first Minister of Labour in Britain.

At the same time the first Jewish trade union representatives made their entry in the Glasgow Trades Council. In 1891 two Jews sat on the Council, one representing the Tailors' Machinists and Pressers and the other the Tobacco Pipe Makers, later the Cigarette Workers. During the following years these trades would often be represented by Jews and they would also hold positions in the Council. In 1910-1911 Emanuel Shinwell, representing the Clothiers' Operatives (previously Tailors' Amalgamated Jewish Branch), served as Vice-President⁸⁷. As the immigrants began to participate in the trade unions and the movement itself took its modern shape, the trade union anti-alien agitation largely disappeared⁸⁸. It must be noted that although the Jewish workers were concentrated in the clothing, tobacco and furniture, their percentage of the total work force in these trades was low.

The popular press at this time presented several caricatures of Jews. They were often portrayed as rich and mean old men who talked funny, pronouncing their w's as v's and so on. There was an idea that they made money in an unfair way, for example as money lenders and pawnbrokers. According to The Eagle most money lenders in Glasgow were Jewish and they charged exorbitant interest rates: "the people who get into their clutches are bled to the uttermost farthing without mercy."⁸⁹ It is possible that the allegations about Jewish moneylenders were more a result of the stereotype of Jews as usurers than the real situation in Glasgow. It should be noted that the older settlers had not been active in finance. Immigrants, however, were working as pawnbrokers and "money exchangers" and were involved with the credit trade in hawking and shopkeeping.

Alternatively, Jews were portrayed as sweaters who profited from the labour of working men and women⁹⁰. In 1888 Pinto denied accusations that Jewish tailors were involved in "sweating" when he gave his evidence to the House of Lords. In a memorandum he described sweating as follows: "the taking out of work from a wholesale manufacturer or shopkeeper by a contractor, who lets it to a sub-contractor, who in his turn employs men and women to do the work, the contractor or middleman deriving a profit by this transaction without himself performing any share

⁸⁷ Glasgow United Trades' Council Reports 1890-91, 1894-95, 1903-1904, Annual Report of the Glasgow Trades Council 1905-1906-1907, Glasgow Trades' Council Annual report 1912-1913-1914, Compare Glasgow Trades and Labour Council. Annual Report 1926-1927. The first Jewish representative of Shop Assistants sat on the Council in 1914, another represented the British Seafarers (this was Shinwell who later became President, see chapter 6). In 1926-1927 Jewish trade representatives were members of the executive of the Council and the Industrial Committee.

⁸⁸ K. Lunn, "Reactions to Lithuanian and Polish Immigrants in the Lanarkshire Coalfield, 1880-1914", pp. 308-342. Working class anti-alien sentiments never completely disappeared, see for example JE 24/4/1929, 31/1/1930, 14/11/1930.

⁸⁹ The Eagle 24/6/1909. Compare The Bailie 16/6/1909; The Expositor, number 1 (not dated, possibly 1887).

⁹⁰ The Eagle 28/1/1909.

of the work” by getting the work done at a much cheaper rate than normal⁹¹. It seems that he was not correct. Several accusations about Jewish sweaters were made before the House of Lords commission⁹².

The House of Lords investigation followed reports in the Lancet on the practice in Britain. In June 1888 the medical magazine published its report on Glasgow⁹³. The Report was mainly concerned with the health of workers. It was said that their health had to suffer because of cost-cutting (for the same reason girls sometimes went without pay). It had found that some clothing industry workers, Jews and non-Jews, worked in “degraded localities”. An example was given of a workshop with a “comparatively respectable appearance” where 4 males and 4 females made up parts for uniforms in a tenement room. But more often “overworked, poor, half-starved” workers were employed in ill-ventilated, insufficiently lighted, over-crowded, overheated, and badly drained” environments. The workshops were also inhabited by dirty, ill-clad children, sleeping on filthy bedding in apartments without any decent sanitary facilities. They were surrounded by drunken neighbours, violence and vice.

It is difficult to judge whether such examples reflected a general situation, but despite Pinto’s denial there surely were Jewish sweatshop owners in Glasgow. In the poorer quarters of the city, production in such small workplaces under cramped and cost-cutting conditions, was the norm, just to maintain profitability. As a result of the investigations inspection was improved, but it seems that the practice of taking work home for wholesalers did not disappear before the First World War. In any case, Jews kept a reputation as sweaters⁹⁴.

During the early years of the 20th century there were also complaints about Jews retailers taking over from non-Jews by unfair competition. The Eagle commented in 1909 on a decision of the Town Council to allow hawkers to put their barrows in East Clyde Street to sell second-hand goods. “Unscrupulous” Jewish aliens had taken advantages, according to the magazine, by putting up more than one barrow which was a “glaring injustice” to the shopkeepers who pay rent and taxes.”⁹⁵ Complaints from non-Jewish shopkeepers about Jews trading on Sunday also reflected this idea of unfair competition. In 1906 the Scottish Shopkeepers’ and Assistants’ Union protested

⁹¹ Sessional Papers 1888, Appendix A.

⁹² Sessional Papers 1888, vol. VIII, 25628-25746, 25868, 25944, 25947, 26142; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 60.

⁹³ “Report of the Lancet Special Sanitary Commission on the Sweating System in Glasgow”, in Lancet 30/6/1888, pp. 1313-1314.

⁹⁴ See for example JE 6/2/1931. The Jewish Echo reported about a Bailie who, after having heard about the low salary of a girl who had been caught stealing, asked whether the girl was “employed in a Jewish shop?”

⁹⁵ The Eagle 7/1/1909.

about Jews trading on Sunday⁹⁶. At the same time, Jews like other foreigners were associated with the unlicensed sale of alcohol, gambling and bad language in refreshment shops, a sentiment echoed by Town Clerk John Lindsay ten years later when he offered his opinion that aliens formed a “very undesirable class to conduct such refreshment shops”⁹⁷.

While the popular press pictured Jews as rich men, the Jewish workforce in reality had to suffer during downturns in the economy. They found that the sectors in which were most involved, like the clothing industry, had a seasonal character with periods of a high demand for labour and with slack times. The tobacco industry underwent a process of mechanisation and redundancies (for skilled male workers). The furniture trade also had its ups and downs. Little is known about the wages of Jewish workers. Julius Pinto and Jacob Kramrisch presented the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration in 1903⁹⁸ with some figures for the clothing and tobacco industry, but the question is whether they provide a real indication of the wages which were earned in these industries.

According to Pinto, wages during the 1870s ranged from 35 shillings to £2 per week for a first class tailor and an experienced presser. Females employed as buttonholers and machinists could make 10 to 12 shillings per week (a male machinist up to £2 per week). They worked for about 53 to 60 hours per week. Of the situation in 1903, Pinto said that a first class tailor could make 12 to 15 shillings per day if they could make 8 to ten garments a day (with a possible 6-days weekly salary of 72 shillings to £4). Pressers in busy times earned £3 to £3 and 15 shillings per week. Female machinists earned in 1903 from 15 to 25 shillings per week. Pinto believed that in comparison with the 1870s more piece-work was done in 1903.

These figures may have been distorted by Pinto's wish to present a favourable picture. Obviously, he was talking about busy times in the industry. During the slack season, workers often went without pay. The average wages in Scotland's industry in 1900⁹⁹ were about 36 shillings per week for a craftsman and 22 to 28 shillings per week for a specialised apprentice or machine-minder. In shipbuilding weekly wages

⁹⁶ GH 18/5/1906. Compare JC 11/5/1906; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 96-113, 153-154. The matter returned regularly until the 1930s. See, for example, JE 14/1/1934, 15/5/1936, 14/10/1938.

⁹⁷ Letter Sir John Lindsay to Scottish Office, quoted in G.R Rubin, “Race, Retailing and Wartime Regulation: The Retail Business (Licensing) Order 1918”, p. 194.

⁹⁸ Royal Commission 1903, vol. II, 20896-20897, 21717.

⁹⁹ R.H. Campbell, The Rise and Fall of Scottish Industry, 1707-1939, Edinburgh, 1980, p. 90; Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 592 ; R. Rodger, “Employment, wages and poverty in the Scottish Cities 1841-1914”, in G. Gordon (ed.), Perspectives of the Scottish City, Aberdeen, 1985, pp. 25-63; Slaven, The Development of the West of Scotland, p. 256; Smout, A Century of the Scottish People, pp. 99, 112-113; J.H. Treble, Urban Poverty in Britain 1830-1914, London, 1979, pp. 13-50. Treble (p. 35) mentions that Pinto's figures might have reflected the situation during the busy season in the clothing industry, but not the slack times.

rose from 25 to 30 shillings per week for a skilled worker and from 12 to 16 shillings for a general labourer in 1866 to 41 shillings for a skilled worker and 23 shillings and 6 pence for a general labourer in 1914. Semi- and unskilled workers were paid at lower rates and these workers were in the majority in the clothing industry. Pinto's figures seem therefore too high.

Kramrisch, while giving his evidence to the 1903 Royal Commission, was perhaps more realistic when he put the average weekly wage for a male cigarette maker at 32 shillings and at 17 shillings for a female, adding that he did not consider such wages as low. All in all, it is not possible to say exactly how the immigrant worker's income compared to the earnings of other workers but the evidence suggests that they were not higher.

An indication of poverty occurring among the Jewish workers was the spread of tuberculosis, an illness strongly linked to deprivation. In 1916 the Glasgow Jewish Board of Guardians took an initiative to create a consumptive fund¹⁰⁰. £3,000 had to be collected with which consumptive Jews could be helped to emigrate from Glasgow to countries where they could possibly get cured. This appears a rather draconian measure but it might have worked. According to Collins, ten years after the First World War Jews in Glasgow showed a "lower incidence of TB than their non-Jewish neighbours"¹⁰¹

During the period between 1880 and 1914 the Jewish poor in Glasgow were mostly helped by Jewish organisations, few applied to the local authorities¹⁰². By the time of the First World War there existed a network of Jewish charity and welfare institutions. Some had been founded by the older settlers and others were established by immigrants. In general they reflected the social differences within the Jewish

¹⁰⁰ JC 13/10/1916.

¹⁰¹ K.E. Collins, "The Jews of Glasgow: Aspects of Health and Welfare 1790-1920", in History Teaching Review Year Book, volume 5, 1991, pp. 31-37, p. 35; Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 195. Compare JE 9/3/1934. In March 1934 the Jewish Board of Guardians in Glasgow used tuberculosis when it called for donations for its Passover Relief Fund. A list was presented of 29 cases from a week in which the Board spent £190 in relief and in which on one day no less than 156 had applied for help. Of the 29 published cases, 5 involved a consumptive person or family. This suggests that tuberculosis was still widely spread among Jews.

¹⁰² Census of Scotland 1911, vol. III, p. XV. Compare Royal Commission 1903, vol. II, 20895; Collins, "The Jews of Glasgow: Aspects of Health and Welfare", pp. 34-35. As was mentioned in chapter 1, the number of Jews applying for parish relief was relatively low. Pinto said in 1903 that during the previous year (1902) 28 Jews had applied for relief. He was probably correct. Later the number of Jewish applicants rose to about five per month. As was said earlier, only a few Jews ended up in poorhouses. The 1911 census mentions, for example, that 13 Russian and Polish nationals stayed in Glasgow's poorhouses, some of these persons may have been Jews. Out of the total of 13, 2 were females. Furthermore, 35 (all females) stayed in a lunatic asylum and 9 in prison (no females, in 1903 Pinto said that during the period of 3 years between 1/6/1899 and 31/5/1902 18 Jews had been incarcerated in Duke Street Prison and 24 in Barlinnie Prison). Collins writes that in 1914 Merryflatts poorhouse served kosher food, which suggests a significant number of Jewish inmates.

group.

The oldest institution was the Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society which by the time of the First World War had changed into the Glasgow Jewish Board of Guardians. The Board, which was based in Garnethill synagogue, took over the task of the Society to distribute charity among the Jewish poor, with an emphasis on “deserving” poor. This usually took place on a week to week basis and after an investigation of the circumstances. The Board continued the policy of the Philanthropic Society to provide applicants where possible with a sum of about £1 to buy goods or equipment which enabled them to start a business. Other measures included financial rewards for employers who took on an immigrant during the first weeks of employment, or financial assistance for the needy during short periods with rent and tax payments.

During the 1890s, when the number of Jews leaving the Pale of Settlement grew, the Board was unable to cope with the influx of immigrants and an appeal was made in the form of a relief fund¹⁰³. Julius Pinto provided the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration in 1903 with some figures on the number of immigrants in Glasgow who received help from the Board of Guardians¹⁰⁴. The figures concerned the years between 1897 and 1901. It is not known whether these years were exceptional, but Pinto claimed that after 1901 the total amount of relief was significantly reduced. In 1898, the year with the highest number of cases, the Board spent £417 on a total of 376 cases, 100 of which were so-called new cases which indicate that they had made their first appeal for relief in 1898. In 1901, the Board helped in 234 cases (160 new) after assisting 286 in 1900 and 201 in 1899. In 1902, for which no further figures were provided, the Board spent £346. The number of cases seems to be fluctuating, which must have been a result of the changes in the influx of immigrants and the situation of the Scottish economy. Pinto's claim of a reduction after 1901 might only reflect the money outlay. The Jewish Encyclopedia¹⁰⁵ of 1903 states that the Board on average dealt with about 400 cases per year.

The Board was an organisation which for a long period remained in the hands of the older settlers. In 1906, with the breakup of the United Synagogue, the older settlers feared to lose control over Jewish poor relief. A meeting was held during which the

¹⁰³ GH 30/1/1892, 6/2/1892, 13/2/1892, 20/2/1892, 23/4/1892. The appeal was made during a public meeting on the persecution of the Jews in Russia during which local dignitaries and church leaders spoke. During the following months £2,432 was collected in Glasgow (compare Collins, “The Jews of Glasgow: Aspects of Health and Welfare”, p. 33. He writes that despite the fundraising effort the Glasgow Board of Guardians had to appeal to the Russian Relief Fund in London for support). The list of donations provide an indication of the economic position of the Glasgow Jewish establishment. Large donations came from Morris and Simons (£200 and £100), followed by Davis, Wolffe, Heilbron, Frankenburg and Schoenfeld (£25-£15). Some of the more wealthy older settlers contributed £10, while some immigrant workshop owners and shopkeepers made smaller contributions.

¹⁰⁴ Royal Commission 1903, II, 20930.

¹⁰⁵ Jewish Encyclopedia, 1903, pp. 676-677.

following was decided:

“It was resolved to communicate with the remaining Glasgow Hebrew charitable institutions in order that a permanent conjoint Committee be formed for the more complete co-ordination of the several existing agencies, so as to effectively prevent waste and overlapping without impairing the separate individualities of the various institutions.”¹⁰⁶

In the coordination efforts which followed some immigrant leaders, like Daniel Rosenbloom, co-operated with the Garnethill group, but the initiative failed.

It was a matter of time until the immigrants gained a greater say in the Board. In 1909 the organisation was again not able to cope with the number of applications; possibly when its income dropped as a result of losses in shechita or a decline in individual donations, or because of a growing number of applications. During the following year the Board was reorganised and a new council of the Board was formed¹⁰⁷, involving immigrant leaders. In 1911 the Board of Guardians moved its premises to the Gorbals, symbolising the new immigrant influence. In addition to the Board, the Glasgow Hebrew Boot, Clothing and Employment Assistance Guild (For Young People) - later Hebrew Boot and Clothing Guild had been founded in December 1906 at Garnethill and immigrant leaders also found their place in the organisation¹⁰⁸.

In 1915-1916 the number of cases of the Jewish Board of Guardians rose by more than a third during a depression in the tailoring trade¹⁰⁹. At this stage a number of loans was supplied to help people to overcome the slack period¹¹⁰. With the provision of these loans unemployed workers were encouraged to start in business. In order to carry out the administration of this relief, the organisation required professional staff rather than voluntary officers recruited from the establishment ranks who had hitherto carried out the work. In this, the Board followed the example of the Protestant relief organisations in Glasgow which were changing their policies and methods at this time¹¹¹.

Collins argues that the provision of Jewish poor relief was often a response to

¹⁰⁶ JE 24/4/1931.

¹⁰⁷ SJAC, MBG 28/11/1909, 9/1/1910.

¹⁰⁸ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 155-157.

¹⁰⁹ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 194.

¹¹⁰ Compare Jewish Encyclopedia, 1903, pp. 676-677. The provision of loans was not new, but the emphasis on loans which had to be repaid rather than handouts to help people to find a living seems greater at this stage. In addition, a Glasgow Hebrew Benevolent Loan Society provided loans (in 1901 some 200), see below.

¹¹¹ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, pp. 198-201.

Christian missionary activity among the Jews¹¹². The missionaries offered the poor Jews shelter, medicine and food, expecting that these Jews would join in their prayers and listen to sermons and hoping that they would convert to Christianity. The missionary activity was not only directed at Jews. Protestant 19th century evangelism aimed at the Protestant working classes took the form of missionary work and often went hand in hand with social work and medical care. The Glasgow Medical Mission in Gorbals' Oxford Street, for example, was founded in 1867, well before the settlement of Jewish immigrants in that neighbourhood¹¹³. By the 1880s, many missions had been established, like a mission to the Italians, and others to seamen, to the city, to France and so on¹¹⁴. Only some smaller Christian groups did target the Jews in the Gorbals. Among these was the Glasgow Jewish Evangelical Mission with its Hebrew Christian House in Abbotsford Place. These missionaries helped ill Jews with hospital admissions. In response, some Jewish organisations were founded, including the Glasgow Jewish Sick Visiting Association and the Glasgow Hebrew Sick Society, founded in 1878. These missions became a source of controversy between some Jewish and Christian leaders¹¹⁵. It would be wrong to tie up all Jewish welfare work with missionary activity.

In addition to the welfare institutions of the older settlers and the missions, the immigrants established a large number of self-help organisations. They included the benevolent and friendly societies, the oldest of which was formed in 1886¹¹⁶. This was the "Sons of Isaac". The society came into being on the initiative of tailors who had settled in Glasgow in the early 1870s. One of the founders of the Sons of Isaac was Jacob Samuels, the man who in 1882 took over the presidency of the taylor minyán in Commerce Street and who together with Julius Pinto successfully sought a closer association with the Garnethill congregation.

The first aim of the benevolent and friendly societies was to provide material support in times of distress - the Sons of Isaac guaranteed for example income during the time of mourning (shiva). They did so more open-handedly than the institutions of

¹¹² Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 21, 64, 72-73, 103-104, 159, 188, see especially p. 103; Collins, "The Jews of Glasgow: Aspects of Health and Welfare", p. 35.

¹¹³ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, p. 17.

¹¹⁴ Brown, The Social History of Religion in Scotland, pp. 132, 145, 181; see for example Post Office Glasgow Directory 1886-1887 which lists a variety of missions.

¹¹⁵ Post Office Glasgow Directory 1906-1907, p. 140. Compare Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, pp. 682, 743; F. Levison, Christian and Jews. The Life of Leon Levison 1881-1936, Edinburgh, 1989, pp. 32-39, 201, 236. The controversy concerned the number of converted Jews. According to Levison well over a hundred Jews converted to Christianity in Scotland during the years 1903-1935. In 1952-1953 the Gorbals mission claimed success amongst non-Protestant groups when it stated that among its members 43% was Catholic and 12% Jewish and Muslim (the rest was Protestant). Such claims were disputed by Jews, see for example JE 22/7/1948.

¹¹⁶ Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 43, 49, 104-105.

the older settlers. The members of a society paid weekly contributions, rather than depend on donations of the establishment. A short-lived Free Loan Society, in which the members paid 1 penny per week, was founded in 1888. In this the societies sought to encourage thrift¹¹⁷. At the same time the friendly societies helped the immigrants to adjust to the surrounding society. With their regulations and decorum, the societies taught immigrants, for example, order and discipline in the conduct of public affairs.

In this activity the Jewish immigrants were just like the Protestants and Roman Catholics. Each local group sought to establish a local network of philanthropic and self-help agencies which would cater for the members of the local group at the various stages of their life and give them the means and stability needed to cope with modern, industrial life¹¹⁸. The Jewish societies eventually borrowed much symbolism from their non-Jewish counterparts, including regulations, colourful regalia and decorum, but a large number chose names with a Jewish reference and they affiliated themselves to the larger Jewish masonic orders in Britain. The Glasgow Lord Rothschild Lodge No. 18 at the beginning of the 20th century, for example, was affiliated to the Grand Order of Israel. In 1913 the society held weekly meetings on Sunday in the Diamond's Hall in South Portland Street. Its two hundred members paid a weekly contribution of 11 pence at that time, in return for which they received sick allowance and doctor's help when needed. In comparison with the Sons of Isaac there were more regulations. The membership card¹¹⁹ of that society ruled that ill members had to be examined by a (non-Jewish) doctor with a practice in the Gorbals and would not receive benefit until the doctor's certificate had reached the secretary (J. Rosenbloom). The doctor's permission was also required for patients to go out. A member would be fined if he was found working when supposed to be ill at home or when he was seen at "any place of amusement or at any house but his home."

The largest of the benevolent societies was the Glasgow Hebrew Public Burial Society with a membership of 993 in 1912-1913. Its members paid weekly contributions from 1 penny upwards. The 993 members together paid an annual sum of £236 in 1913, which results in an average amount of just over 1 penny per week per member indicating a low average income among the members of the society. Income was also derived from donations at special occasions, such as weddings. This was more

¹¹⁷ JC 27/10/1911; compare Jewish Leader 11/4/1930. In 1930 H. Fierstein, secretary of the Glasgow Friendly Saving, Loan and Sharing Society, said that his society had been established for "encouraging thrift" among Glasgow Jewry.

¹¹⁸ B. Aspinwall, "The Welfare State within the State: The Saint Vincent de Paul Society in Glasgow, 1848-1920" in W.J. Sheils, D. Wood (ed.), Studies in Church History, volume XXIII (1986), Voluntary Religion, pp. 445-459; C.G. Brown, "Religion, Class and Church growth", in W.H. Fraser, R.J. Morris (ed.), People and Society in Scotland. Volume II, 1830-1914, Edinburgh, 1990, pp. 310-335. For a wider perspective see T. Gallagher, Glasgow: The Uncasy Peace, Manchester, 1987.

¹¹⁹ SJAC, friendly society member's contribution card Ch. Frank (1913).

in line with the Talmudic principle of charity, which favoured donations at such occasions. A third way to collect money was through appeals to the members, as when a mortuary had to be built¹²⁰. The low average weekly payment and the various ways in which the society got its income suggest that its membership consisted mostly of poor people. The immigrants obviously joined the society because the costs of death, including shiva and burial costs, were high. The death rate was equally high. In the year 1912-1913 the society buried 56 people (22 adults, 27 children and 7 premature-born babies). Since its inception in 1908 the society reported in 1913 to have buried in total 118 adults and 238 children (an annual average of 71 persons).

The importance of the benevolent and friendly societies in Glasgow Jewry was illustrated when the Treasurer of the Burial Society, Joseph Hallside, became the first President of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council in 1914. Hallside was an ordinary tailor, but his position in the Burial Society made him a successful candidate for the Council's first presidency. Hallside was possibly also President of the Glasgow branch of the Jewish Tailors, Machinists and Pressers Union, an amalgamation of several local Jewish groups¹²¹. The societies and unions offered working men opportunities for office. Their success shows how the economic resources and position of the Jews in Glasgow enabled them to help the Jewish population to retain its self-respect and viability.

The Glasgow branch or 'Division VIII' of the Workers' Circle Friendly Society differed in some important aspects from the other benevolent and friendly societies. Its working-class founders regarded the provision of benefit as not enough and in addition the Workers' Circle organised political debate and activities. In retrospect one of its leaders said that the Workers' Circle was "an outlet to their ideals of political education; and would advance progressive (Socialist and Communist) policies in Jewish communal matters affecting the daily life of Jewish workers."¹²² The branch was formed in March 1912 in a Portugal Street tenement. Later they met in different places among which were the Tailors' Rooms in Oxford Street, until the Workers' Circle moved to Gorbals' Main Street, where eventually a Circle House was established in part of an old public library¹²³. It appears that initially the group found little

¹²⁰ SJAC, Financial Statement Glasgow Hebrew Public Burial Society 1912-1913.

¹²¹ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 105 ; JE 24/101/1930. There is no evidence for Hallside's presidency in the annual reports of the Glasgow Trades Council. Later this group was renamed to the Amalgamated Tailors and Garment Workers' Union, with of most of its members said to be Jewish. Other such organisations included a short-lived Jewish Co-operative and Wholesale Society in 1903, revived briefly in 1921.

¹²² SJAC, H. Shapiro, "The Circle in Scotland", in Golden Jubilee Book 1909-1959 (photocopy). For the history of this organisation see also The Workers' Circle Friendly Society. Diamond Jubilee, 1909-1969, London, 1969.

¹²³ JE 10/3/1933, 23/4/1937.

support and did not organise activities on a significant scale until after the First World War.

The major change in Glasgow Jewry during the period between 1880 and 1914 was the creation of a large Jewish work force. This was the result of an influx of immigrant workers. Jewish workers were concentrated in occupations in the clothing industry, and to a lesser extent in furniture manufacturing and cigarette making. In this Glasgow resembled English cities like London, Manchester and Leeds. Jewish workshops in Glasgow seem not to have been as large as those in Leeds.

Most Jewish workers in Glasgow during this period depended on seasonal work and their standard of living was not high. Many Jewish immigrants entered the Glasgow clothing trade during the last two decades of the 19th century and this created a negative reaction among non-Jewish workers fearing unemployment and wage reduction. The fact that this reaction largely disappeared during the 20th century seems to have been the result of the development of the trade unions, Jewish participation in the unions and the fact that percentage of Jewish immigrants in the total workforce in the clothing industry in Glasgow was small. This percentage was even smaller in tobacco and furniture manufacture. During the 20th century Jewish workers mostly disappeared from the tobacco industry.

A relatively large number of Jewish immigrants in Glasgow was occupied in hawking. Jews also formed a large percentage of the total number of hawkers in the city. In this Glasgow differed from English cities like London, Manchester and Leeds, where Jewish hawking was in decline, but resembled the situation in Liverpool. Glasgow seems to have offered more commercial opportunities at this time than most English cities. This was also reflected in a large number of Jewish workers and hawkers attempting to gain an independent status as shopkeepers, small businessmen or workshop owners. The existence of network of Jewish welfare organisations, which shows how the Jewish population in Glasgow as a whole was becoming financially more stable during this period, encouraged immigrants to become economically independent as shopkeepers, small businessmen and workshop owners. Only a few were very successful. From this successful group a new immigrant middle class arose which provided Glasgow Jewry with a new communal leadership. This group of mostly self-made men in Glasgow was relatively larger than in the English cities, the reason for this must be found in the economic structure of the Scottish city rather than the welfare network, as this existed in England too. The reaction of the non-Jewish population to the increase of Jewish shopkeepers, small businessmen and workshop owners was negative. Jewish employers were accused of sweating, shopkeepers of Sunday trading, and in general there was an idea of unfair competition in which a traditional stereotype of the Jew as a usurer returned.

The social structure of Glasgow Jewry during the period between 1880 and 1914 differed from the pyramid formed before the 1880s. There was a new top group with successful immigrant businessmen making their entry. The pre-1880s group of shopkeepers, wholesalers and manufacturers was replaced by a rising middle class of businessmen, retailers and workshop owners. Underneath this rising middle group there was a not so successful group of shopkeepers, hawkers and small workshop owners. At the bottom there was now a large body of immigrant workers.

After 1918 the pattern Jewish occupations in Glasgow began to change again. Young Jews did not follow in the footsteps of the older generation. This change was symbolised by the decline of hawking as a source for Jewish employment, the establishment of new shops in the suburbs and the move into the professions. By the end of the 1930s the place of the Jewish hawkers in the Scottish economy was rapidly taken over by new Asian immigrants¹²⁴. Some Jewish hawkers turned to wholesaling, supplying the new hawkers. Others became travelling buyers and sellers for established companies such as the department store of A. Goldberg & Sons. Representing such firms offered financial stability and a higher social status. Many opened shops and small businesses. There was an increasing number of Jewish shops in the neighbourhoods south of the Gorbals, along for example Allison Street and Victoria Road, and in the suburbs. The new shops¹²⁵ offered a growing assortment of goods, including cars, electrical goods and delicatessen. In addition, Jewish businesses moved to the suburbs, although a survey in 1965¹²⁶ shows that many still remained in the Gorbals.

After the Second World War the Jewish hawkers seem to have disappeared. In 1955, 789 Russian aliens with an occupation were registered in Glasgow. Among these people there were 376 housewives, 186 persons of whom the occupation was not defined, 122

¹²⁴ SRA, E 7/11/1, Register of Pedlars Certificates, pp. 4-6, 200-203; compare B. Maan, The New Scots. The Story of Asians in Scotland, Edinburgh, 1992, pp. 109-110. In July 1939, for example, the Glasgow police granted a total number of 50 certificates necessary for hawking. Of these 50, 7 went to Jews, 13 to Asians, 20 to Scots and 10 to persons who cannot be identified as a member of these groups. By comparison, in January 1948 only 2 Jews were granted a certificate, none in July 1948 and 6 in August 1948 (all 6 lived in the Gorbals). For examples of Jews working as hawkers during the late 1920s and 1930s see E. Cowan, Spring Remembered, chapter 2; JE 29/3/1929.

¹²⁵ See for example the advertisements in JE 29/3/1929.

¹²⁶ SRA, D-AD 2/4, The Corporation of the City of Glasgow. Laurieston/Gorbals Comprehensive Development Area, 1965. Survey Report. In that year 49 Jewish firms were situated in the neighbourhood, mostly in the vicinity of Gorbals Cross. Of these 49, 16 were wholesalers, 13 operated in the clothing trade and 8 were furniture manufacturers. The largest of the firms which had specified their number of employees for the survey was a furniture business with 121 employees, the other furniture firms had on average not more than 6 employees. In the clothing trade, the Jewish firms in the Gorbals had on average not more than 13 employees. The Jewish wholesalers employed on average about 8 employees. Furthermore the Jewish firms in the Gorbals included 3 printers, 2 bakers, 2 electricians (one of whom employed 34 persons), a boot and shoe maker, an instrument maker, a garage, a butcher and one unspecified business. In total there were 345 firms (including at least 49 Jewish ones) in the neighbourhood and 625 shops. The report unfortunately does not supply any details about the shops.

with an occupation, and 105 retired persons, showing a long-settled group of immigrants who had lived here since their arrival half a century earlier¹²⁷. Among the 122 persons with an occupation, 56 were in the clothing industry. Furthermore there were 27 unskilled labourers, 15 salesmen and shop-assistants, 14 indoor and domestic servants, 4 road and railroad workers, 4 fitters and 2 cafe-restaurant owners¹²⁸. These figures show a substantial group in the traditional immigrant occupations, some in new occupations but no hawkers.

At the same time a new body of professional people started to emerge. Between 1918 and 1939 230 Scottish Jews graduated in Medicine. Not all the new professionals stayed in Glasgow. During the 1920s only half of the graduates found employment in Scotland and during the 1930s this dropped to one third¹²⁹. After the Second World War the move into the professions accelerated. Vincent shows that among the Jews in Glasgow in the post-war period there was a relatively high proportion of people in professional occupations¹³⁰. During the 1950s and 1960s, when Vincent did his research, many Jewish parents sent their children to fee-paying schools. They did so more than the general population. This suggests the intention of Jews to change the social status of their family by means of education. Like the decline of hawking and the establishment of new shops, the rise of a professional class began to appear in the period between 1918 and 1939 but the question is whether these changes occurred in all social groups.

Industry in Glasgow during the interwar years¹³¹ went through several developments. In general there was a prolonged period of recession for the older staple industries, like textiles and shipbuilding. New industries advanced. General engineering, the electrical industry and the motor trade did relatively well. The economy went through a small post-war boom, fluctuated during the later 1920s and entered a severe depression after 1929. Towards the end of the period hopes for improvement were raised, embodied in a new industrial site built near Hillington in

¹²⁷ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 71. Of these people, 42 said to have (had) a position as manager in the retail and wholesale business.

¹²⁸ By comparison, in a group of 1,019 Italians, there were 274 cafe-restaurant owners, 219 salesmen and shop-assistants and 184 housewives, which shows how different immigrant groups had different occupations and patterns of settlement.

¹²⁹ Collins, Go and Learn, pp. 89-95; Pollins, Economic History of the Jews in England, pp. 234-235.

¹³⁰ Vincent, "Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", p. 226. Compare B.A. Kosmin, "Localism and Pluralism in British Jewry 1900-80", in Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England, vol. XXVIII, 1981-1982, pp. 111-125, pp. 117-118, 125; Collins, Go and Learn, pp. 90-91. Kosmin shows that in Sheffield the sons of older settlers usually continued their fathers' business, while the sons of self-employed and working class immigrants became professional people. In Glasgow, older sons mostly took over the business or started work when they reached the age of 14, while the younger sons and later also the daughters were offered the opportunity of higher education.

¹³¹ Slaven, The Development of the West of Scotland, pp. 200-204.

1937. Wages were expected to rise shortly after the First World War, but in reality working class wages throughout the whole period only rose modestly in real terms.

These developments were reflected in the position of the Jews in Glasgow. In the clothing and furniture industries there was contraction and concentration. Some firms prospered. In 1933, for example, H. Morris & Co., a twenty year old firm, won a contract worth £50,000 to supply the Cumberland Hotel in London's Marble Arch with bedroom furniture, which would provide immediate employment for 2,500 workers¹³². In the clothing industry a few employers were very successful, especially those who first spotted changes in the market involving a rising demand for children's and ladies' clothes. These changes resulted in the concentration of manufacture in factories and retail in larger shops, retail chains and department stores. Two of the most outstanding Jewish clothing firms in Glasgow were D. & H. Cohen and Morrison.

David Cohen¹³³ had worked in London for sixteen years when he came to Glasgow in 1912 to set up a cap-making business. Initially a small firm like many others, Cohen found premises in Gorbals' Bedford Lane in the 1920s where he produced school caps and girls' berets. By the early 1930s David and his son Harry (born in 1900) had recognised a new opportunity and they changed production to boy's suits and shorts, school blazers and school coats. In 1933, the Cohens introduced girl's pleated garments, skirts (part of the regulation school uniform) and kilts. The firm made enormous progress, moving to Candleriggs to Albion Street, then to King Street, and in 1933 to a factory in Sandyford Place. In 1935 the Cohens bought a factory in Pollokshaws. At the outbreak of the Second World War D. & H. Cohen employed some 300 workers, 200 in Sandyford Street and 100 in Pollokshaws.

D. & H. Cohen's sales reached over £300,000 by 1939 from £9,000 in 1925. In 1945 the firm was formed into a limited liability company with a nominal capital of £50,000 (David Cohen's two sons Harry and Denis were major shareholders). The firm bought the cloth and linings for their garments mostly from non-Jewish manufacturers in Britain. Initially the Cohens had sold their products to wholesalers, only a few of whom were Glasgow Jews, who distributed the goods to retailers. Harry Cohen recognised the growing importance of department stores as outlets and in 1934 he managed to convince the department store chain Marks and Spencer to order their gym garments. This also proved to be a success which further contributed to the expansion of the firm. David Cohen died in 1946 leaving an estate of £10,173.

Morrison¹³⁴ was a ladies fashion retail firm started by Edith Morrison early in the 20th century. The firm first grew to some twenty shops specialising in fashionable

¹³² JE 17/2/1933.

¹³³ Slaven, Checkland, Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, I, pp. 412, 415-417.

¹³⁴ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, pp. 362-363.

ladies outerwear, becoming a public company in 1926. The firm had acquired a hundred outlets by 1939. In later years Edith Morrison's sons took over the administration of the firm. After the war the size of the business doubled, eventually expanding to a chain of some 260 shops in the mid 1950s. In 1957 it was taken over by Great Universal Stores.

Great Universal Stores was owned by Isaac Wolfson, also a son of immigrants who had settled in Glasgow. Wolfson was born in Hospital Street at the end of the 19th century¹³⁵. He was one of eleven children. His family was not very poor. Wolfson received his education in Gorbals Public School and Queen's Park School, the change in school indicating the removal of the family to the better-off Queen's Park neighbourhood. At the age of 14, he joined his father in business, doing various jobs from cabinet-making to selling picture frames. In 1920 Isaac Wolfson moved to London where he set up an import and furniture business. Early in the 1930s he joined Great Universal Stores, a pioneer mail order and instalment credit firm created by two Jewish immigrants in Manchester.

These immigrants had a good eye for the appeal which a comprehensive mail order catalogue and credit facilities had for the general public; perhaps not surprising when their experience in selling goods is taken into account (hawking, for example, usually involved credit). It allowed the less well-off to purchase goods as their living standards slowly improved, while not yet supplying them with enough ready cash¹³⁶. Wolfson climbed from salesman to merchandise controller to become managing director and major shareholder of the GUS which was said to have made a profit of £411,000 in 1931 and was valued at £1.5 million. In 1946 Wolfson was chairman of the GUS. At its post-war peak the company held a very large, if not majority share in the mail order market and controlled hundreds of subsidiary companies and some two thousand shops.

Wolfson remained an observant orthodox Jew, regularly worshipping in the synagogue and he upheld the tradition of the most successful Jewish businessmen taking a leading part in the Glasgow congregations. In 1962 he became the first immigrant-son to hold the Presidency of the United Synagogue of Great Britain, a prestigious and influential post which so far had been exclusively held by descendants of older settlers. Apparently, Wolfson liked to describe himself as a "heimische Yid"¹³⁷ - a Jew who maintained the customs of Eastern Europe.

Had he kept a residence in Glasgow, Wolfson's life would have been the immigrant business success story of Glasgow Jewry. As it turned out, several others competed for

¹³⁵ GH 21/6/1991, JC 28/6/1991; Mail on Sunday 30/6/1991; The Observer 23/6/1992.

¹³⁶ Fraser, The Coming of the Mass Market, pp. 85-93.

¹³⁷ Chaim Bermant, "On the other hand", in JC 28/6/1991.

this honour. In addition to those who have already been mentioned there were two more distillers, Maurice Bloch and Samuel Rosenbloom, who as described in previous chapters were in the forefront of things.

Bloch¹³⁸ was born in 1882, grew up in Dundee and came to Glasgow as a young man. He went into business with his brother Joseph and created Bloch Brothers (Distillers) Ltd. With his success in business he entered Jewish communal life. He was, for example, active as fundraiser for the Queen's Park synagogue and President of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council. In the general political world he joined the Unionists. His public services lead to a knighthood in 1938 (by comparison, Wolfson was knighted after the Second World War). In the 1950s he sold his shares in Bloch Brothers and found a charitable trust for the advancement of religion, education and Medicine.

The other Glaswegian who was able to built up a large interest in whisky distillery was Samuel Rosenbloom, the son of Daniel Rosenbloom. Later he changed his name to Samuel Ross Campbell. Rosenbloom started as a wine merchant, but following Heilbron's and Bloch's successes he changed the emphasis of his business to whisky. In 1930 Sam L. Rosenbloom Ltd.¹³⁹ was incorporated with Rosenbloom as major shareholder and a nominal capital of £100, registered in Hope Street (he lived in Pollokshields on the South Side). A non-Jewish solicitor acted as co-director. By 1949 Rosenbloom owned several firms, which included J. Ferguson & Sons, Campbells (Dist.) Ltd. and the Imperial Hotel in Glasgow. In 1956 he was also named as director of Jardine & Co., Jaeckel Furs, the Glasgow Bonding Co., MacGregor & Stuart Distillers and S. Campbell & Son. In October 1957 Sam. L. Rosenbloom Ltd. was liquidated with assets shortly before amounting to £47,453 (liabilities £1,186).

In 1951 the new name of Samuel Ross Campbell appeared when he took up a new residence in London's Park Lane. It is unclear what made him change the name. Possibly it was because he saw it as being more appropriate for a whisky distiller or simply because he liked it. Perhaps the change was made because he felt more comfortable with a non-Jewish name. In the last case it would be significant that the name first appeared in the company files when he moved to London. In his business activities Rosenbloom/Campbell dealt with Jews and non-Jews, his co-directors were all non-Jews.

It is not always obvious who was Jewish in these business activities. In December

¹³⁸ GH 20/2/1964; JE 21/2/1964. The Jewish Echo did not carry an extensive obituary on the occasion of Bloch's death as one would expect. Instead there was a report on the funeral for which the Chief Rabbi was said to have flown to Glasgow. The report mentioned his activities in charity, communal and national politics, but failed to elaborate on his business activities. This might have had something to do with embarrassment over his alleged involvement in a post-war fraud case. For reports about export of whisky to the USA during the years of prohibition see Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 152.

¹³⁹ WRH, BT-2 16003.

1931, for example, the Jewish Echo¹⁴⁰ carried a strange report. The paper wrote that a man called Dr. R.L Pritchard turned out to be a Jew named Reuben Levi. In the beginning of the 1920s Pritchard alias Levi had come to Glasgow where in 1927 he set up the Pritchard Flax, Fibre and Pulp Co. Ltd., a firm with an estimated value of £1 million. Three years later, however, the firm was said to have been wound up. Another industrialist, though a more real-life figure, was Alfred Yarrow, the shipbuilder. Yarrow, who had a Jewish mother, brought his firm to Scotland in the beginning of the 20th century. He was not connected to a Jewish group or organisation¹⁴¹.

On the workfloor, the position of the Jews did not seem to have improved much during this period despite the changes in the organisation of manufacturing. There remained a large number of small workshops in bespoke tailoring, the fur trade, boot & shoe manufacturing and repair, cap-making and, according to a representative of the Glasgow Trade Board, the "general waste reclamation"¹⁴². In these workshops with small numbers of employees, wages were widely believed to be too low. In the clothing industry there were constant complaints from Jewish union representatives about seasonal unemployment and low wages during the 1930s. It was believed that the workers were made to suffer for the changes in the trade. In November 1930 the secretary of the Jewish branch of the Amalgamated Tailors' and Garment Workers' Union wrote to the Jewish Echo saying:

"The exportation of trade to be made in Leeds and London has now reached gigantic proportions, while the workers in the sub-divisional section master tailor workshops have indeed been the chief sufferers, and one can readily foresee that if this continues their plight will be of a very grave nature."¹⁴³

The employers were accused of letting local trade slip away. In addition, they had also introduced cheap female labour which in general had reduced incomes. During the poor seasons Jewish ^{workers} had to exist on the "meagre allowances of the Labour Exchange"¹⁴⁴. This was said to have forced people to leave Glasgow following the trade to England, but no figures were given.

The difficulties triggered off protest meetings, strikes and negotiations. Results, in wage rises, were mostly short-lived. During a good pre-holiday season disputes could be settled in the favour of the workers. But the union complained that employers were

¹⁴⁰ JE 25/12/1931.

¹⁴¹ Checkland, Slaven, Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, I, pp. 245-247; Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 152.

¹⁴² JE 16/9/1932. He probably meant brokers and those involved in the collection and sale of second hand items or rag merchants.

¹⁴³ JE 14/11/1930.

¹⁴⁴ JE 23/10/1931, 15/7/1932, 5/9/1933. It is possible that in difficult times employers tried to cut costs by employing more women.

not prepared to co-operate in slack times when wages were cut and workers were laid off. Efforts were made to strengthen the union in the workshops and factories. In April 1935 the Jewish Amalgamated Tailors' and Garment Workers' union branch had about a hundred members (it was claimed that in 1922 there were 1,000 members, a figure which was said to have dropped to 750 in 1926). The possibility was considered of amalgamating with the non-Jewish branch which was said to have 1,200 members. Things might have gone a little better after that, but in 1937 the complaint was made that Jewish employers prevented their employees from joining the union which indicates that in fact little had changed¹⁴⁵. In the furniture industry similar problems existed. So much so that the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council tried to intervene in one case because of fears that allegations about Jewish employers would stimulate anti-Jewishness¹⁴⁶. The complaint was that an employer refused to employ union members and that on the whole labour conditions needed improvement.

The situation in the workshops seems to have differed little from the earlier sweatshops. Often allegations were made about Jewish employers failing to keep proper wage books. A number of them had been charged in the Sheriff Court with neglecting the Trade Board Act. An additional complaint was that there was dishonesty among the small Jewish employers, which was reflected in an excessive number of business failures¹⁴⁷. To counter such claims, the Jewish Echo interviewed the Chief Trade Board Inspector who told the newspaper that there were probably a few "black sheep" in the flock, adding that "Jewish employers (were) often themselves hardworking men, manually engaged in their own business."¹⁴⁸ It is difficult to say whether such accusations were correct. They may have been a result of the bad reputation which Jewish workshop owners had since the beginning of the 20th century.

It is clear is that the Jewish working classes suffered during the recurring economic depressions, although compared to shipbuilders, engineers and coalminers the Jewish workers were less dramatically affected by the the depression. By the end of the 1930s the employed section of the Scottish population had more purchasing power than ever before and the Jewish workers in the frugal and low-cost trades which catered for this market profited from that development.

This is not to say that the depression did not claim any victims among the Jews in

¹⁴⁵ JE 8/4/1932, 6/5/1932, 15/7/1932, 15/9/1933, 27/7/1934, 18/1/1935, 26/4/1935, 18/10/1935, 22/1/1937. In April 1932 negotiations created a council to save the local trade, which was to meet in Geneen's, a well-known Jewish restaurant. The arrival of the bad period, notably during the holidays of the traditional Fair, however brought an end to this. The complaint in 1937 was made during a meeting of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council by A. Marcovitch who was supported by the delegation of the Judean Memorial Lodge, a friendly society.

¹⁴⁶ MBGJRC 18/1/1937, 15/3/1937, 27/4/1939.

¹⁴⁷ JE 2/9/1932.

¹⁴⁸ JE 16/9/1932.

Glasgow. Synagogues were told in 1922 to set aside money to pay the seat rent of "those in unfortunate circumstances"¹⁴⁹. The expenditure of Jewish Board of Guardians and the Hebrew Benevolent Loan Society, the two main bodies for Jewish poor relief in Glasgow, rose steadily during the 1920s and 1930s, often causing problems as their income tended to drop during times of economic problems or industrial conflicts (when for example shopkeepers saw their income declining). In general the Jewish welfare organisations helped all who had fallen upon hard times, for example with rent or extra expenses during times of illness, but the words of Arthur Rose, a representative of Jewish ex-servicemen, in 1930¹⁵⁰ that the spirit of many of his men was broken and they were increasingly becoming unemployable objects of charity, may suggest that it was the older generation who suffered most.

The number of recipients of communal poor relief increased substantially after 1930, but the total number is not exactly known. The number of applications for Passover relief, for example, grew from 278 in 1931 to 315 in 1932 and 375 in 1936, in that year in total 1,329 persons actually received Passover relief¹⁵¹. The total expenditure of the Jewish Board of Guardians in 1936 came to almost £5,100 (at a time when prices in general were falling). Maurice Bloch claimed a year later that £1,200 would maintain the Jewish poor in Glasgow for about a quarter of a year¹⁵². Bloch also said that one out of very 13 or 14 Jews in Glasgow received Jewish poor relief, which included Passover relief. If the number of people receiving Passover relief was anything to go by this meant that there were more than 17,000 Jews in Glasgow. There were probably ~~few~~ ^{fewer} Jews in the city and it must therefore be presumed that if Bloch was correct, more people qualified for normal relief than for Passover relief. It is also possible that Bloch was raising alarm in order to increase donations.

During this period the Jewish welfare organisations continued their policy to supply loans. In the year ending in March 1928 the Jewish Board of Guardians supplied 62 loans with a value of £1,784¹⁵³. The other main relief body, the Hebrew Benevolent Loan Society, supplied 157 loans in 1933 with a value of £2,566 (less than the average Board loan) and this rose to 180 loans in 1935 with a value of

¹⁴⁹ SJAC, MBG 17/11/1922. The statement was made by Ben Strump, employer in the furniture trade.

¹⁵⁰ JE 19/12/1930.

¹⁵¹ JE 6/5/1932, 13/3/1936.

¹⁵² JE 10/2/1933, 19/5/1933, 7/9/1934; 5/4/1935; 13/3/1936; 20/3/1936; 12/3/1937. According to Ben Strump the "standard of living had entirely changed and those seeking relief were drawn from all parts of the community." To overcome deficits in the Board's budget, the idea was launched for a scheme to raise money out of weekly contributions from Jewish employees in Jewish businesses, but without success.

¹⁵³ JE 30/3/1928. Compare JE 5/4/1929; Collins, *Second City Jewry*, pp. 218-219. Collins writes that the Board changed its policy in 1923 when it introduced a Special Loan Fund. It was reported in 1928 that during the first four years of this loan fund there had been 220 borrowers with a total expenditure of £7,359. In the next year this figure was put at £9,000.

£2,695 and further to 211 loans with a value of £3,325 in 1936¹⁵⁴. No totals are available for the following years.

Immigrants leaders now distributed Jewish poor relief and in general they adopted the somewhat paternalistic attitude of the older settlers towards the poor¹⁵⁵. During the 1930s some of their wives also began to play an important role in charity. In its annual report in 1929 the Board of Guardians appealed to women to become involved in its social work, saying that the need for a personal touch was women's work. They could guide the poor "in the upbringing of suffering children."¹⁵⁶ The statement reveals the wish to help the poor as much as the desire to help them to adjust - hence the word "guide" - to Scottish society. An institution in which middle class ladies played an important role was the Glasgow Jewish Welfare Centre and Clinic in Thistle Street. The centre, presided over by Mrs. Ben Strump, advised "mothers in poor circumstances regarding the care of the children, and (supplied) them with medical advice and requirements." Prevention and treatment of illness were the main aspects of the work. In a Sun Ray Room 21 children had received infra-red treatment which was regarded as beneficial for slum children (in 1934 on average about twenty mothers attended the clinic's surgery). But Mrs. Strump felt that more could be done. There should be classes and lectures: "Instruction in simple needlework, pre-natal classes, lectures on mothercraft and household topics (...) should prove most acceptable."¹⁵⁷

In addition to these institutions, almost thirty Jewish friendly societies operated in Glasgow at the end of the 1920s and they claimed to represent some two thousand

¹⁵⁴ JE 19/5/1933, 3/5/1935, 17/4/1936. During the last year £2,972 was repaid. Compare JE 23/3/1928, 19/4/1929; Collins, *Second City Jewry*, pp. 67-68. Ellis Isaacs claimed that the Society was founded in a Gorbals' bakery during the 1880s by a group of small businessmen to supply those in need with loans to help them "to retain the spirit of independence." According to Collins, the first leaders of the Society were members of the Garnethill establishment, but immigrants served on the committee. The Society was initially a mutual aid group, its members paid subscriptions while the Society's income was augmented by larger donations. This would make the Society a friendly society rather than a charity institution ran by the older settlers.

¹⁵⁵ See for some examples JE 15/1/1932, 19/8/1932, 21/12/1934. The first case involved the organisation of an orphan wedding, the second a man who became violently angry when he felt treated badly when applying for poor relief. Some charity was carried out in the more traditional anonymous way by institutions such as the immigrant organisation *Lechem Aniyim* (Bread for the Poor Society of Jewish Distribution Society) which for some twenty years collected every week small amounts of money, bread or food in the Gorbals to be distributed among the poor. In 1934 a speaker at a B'nai Brith meeting at the Central Hotel voiced criticism about the paternalistic attitude in charity.

¹⁵⁶ JE 5/4/1929.

¹⁵⁷ JE 25/5/1934. Compare JE 8/5/1936; Collins, *Second City Jewry*, pp. 158-159. In 1936 Christian missionary activity was offered as an explanation for the establishment of the clinic by Mrs. Strump some twenty years earlier: "to build up the health of the poor Jewish women and children in Jewish surroundings, and to shelter them from the blandishments of fanatical zealots." According to Collins, the initiative for a health centre in the Gorbals came in 1911 from Garnethill. Joseph Fox was instrumental in its foundation. He said at a meeting that the people who went to the missionary dispensaries "very often, after receiving medicine for the body (...) get a double dose of poison for the soul."

persons¹⁵⁸. In the mid-1920s there was an attempt to bring them together in a United Council of Friendly Societies¹⁵⁹. The reason for this might have been a decline in membership of some societies, which had already led to amalgamations. The decline had weakened the financial position and security of the involved societies. The United Council launched a Friendly Saving, Loan and Sharing Society which also provided medical assistance and a distress fund. This fund was clearly to compete with the provisions of the Board of Guardians. The initiative did not succeed. Societies which were affiliated to the Grand Order of Israel withheld their support. Their motive might have been to retain independence, although in the Jewish Echo they claimed that they had stayed away because of the lack of unity and because the new Society had allowed non-Jewish members. Meanwhile, the Grand Order of Israel formed its own Loan, Saving and Sharing Society.

The role of the friendly societies was changing during the interwar years. Their provisions were brought in line with general services and insurance funds. The societies which were affiliated to the Grand Order of Israel, for example, co-operated in 1929 with the Glasgow Burgh Insurance Committee to supply medical assistance to their members when needed. The members were able to choose a doctor from a list supplied by the Burgh¹⁶⁰. Some societies began to resemble freemasons' lodges. The Odessa Lodge of the Grand Order of Israel, for example, organised its thirty sixth annual installation supper in January 1935 in Geneen's. Such occasions, traditionally joyful events, were now well organised and carefully reported in the Jewish Echo¹⁶¹ which also enhanced the social status of the officials and members of the lodge. New office bearers were installed. Visitors and dignitaries were invited. Toasts were proposed, made and answered. There was "harmony and brotherly love", "friendship to Jews wherever they were" and pride, as one speaker "pointed at the futility of assimilation. Jews had every reason to be proud of their religion and culture (...) Let them not regard it lightly or as something inferior." On a more solemn occasion, the lodge held its Annual Cemetery Memorial Service to honour deceased members¹⁶². Such activities showed the newly won status and independence of the new immigrant middle classes and part of the working classes.

Some societies remained more working class in character¹⁶³. Of these societies the

¹⁵⁸ JE 11/10/1933.

¹⁵⁹ JE 24/5/1928, 1/6/1928, 8/6/1928, 15/6/1928.

¹⁶⁰ SJAC, medical card Gabriel Garvarten. Garvarten, who lived in Warwick Street in the Gorbals, chose a Jewish doctor.

¹⁶¹ JE 18/1/1935.

¹⁶² Jewish Leader 19/9/1930.

¹⁶³ See for example the agitation of their representatives in the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council in MBGJRC 30/7/1933, 7/9/1933, 8/10/1933; JE 10/3/1933, 11/10/1933, 22/7/1937.

Workers' Circle distinguished itself by its left-wing political engagement and the love for Yiddish culture. The Circle still operated as a benevolent or friendly society with weekly subscriptions from one penny to 1 shilling and 1 penny per week in 1930, while able to pay out sickness benefit of 30 pence per week. In 1929 the Circle had an income of £336 (of which £172 was sent to the national headquarters in London¹⁶⁴). The number of Circle members is unknown, but could have been anything from 300 to 1200. During the year ending in July 1932, 25 new members were registered and in 1934 the Circle acquired extra space in the former public library in the Gorbals¹⁶⁵, both of which developments were clearly signs of growth at this stage.

In addition to its mutual aid work, the Workers' Circle organised programmes for political debate and education. The Circle adopted some new activities during the first half of the 1930s. A women's section was started. The women's section started in September 1934¹⁶⁶. About a hundred women joined. They paid 4 pence per week for which they received illness benefit and medical assistance when needed. It appears that the section tried to compete with the welfare clinic in Thistle Street. Furthermore, there was Yiddish cultural activity. The education section, for example, invited Yiddish orators for its meetings¹⁶⁷ and later the Circle came with the idea for a Yiddish school. Yiddish as such was not new in the Circle. Many of the older members were Yiddish-speaking immigrants. But now an element of nostalgia was creeping in. The language was quickly becoming obsolete, as was discussed in chapter 4.

It was an ageing and declining group who felt drawn towards the Circle¹⁶⁸. More and more the society was becoming a social club. The Circle leaders, by the time of the Second World War mainly Communists, complained about political apathy. During the war Alec Bernstein, the secretary of the education committee, wrote bitterly:

"Playing of cards seems so all important to a number of members. It is a good job I have my (Communist) Party experience to sustain me. I have come to the conclusion that, while there are some good members, taking the membership as a whole, they are stereotyped and still cursed with apathy."¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁴ JE 3/1/1930, 30/1/1930.

¹⁶⁵ JE 15/7/1932, 4/5/1934, 11/5/1934. At the same time the Glasgow Jewish Institute found new premises. The two (in a sense competing institutions) thus provided halls for hundreds of people.

¹⁶⁶ JE 7/9/1934.

¹⁶⁷ JE 28/9/1934.

¹⁶⁸ JE 29/1/1937.

¹⁶⁹ University of Sheffield Archives, Zaidman papers, folder f, Bernstein to Zaidman (not dated) . See further correspondence Gordon (21/12/1948) and Goldberg (28/9/1947, 5/11/1949, 19/2/1961). In 1961 the Circle had 53 members left. A loss of 4 compared to the previous year. One member had died and three had lapsed. Shortly afterwards the group ceased to exist. The political character of the Circle will be discussed in chapter 6.

After the war the membership also dropped quickly. The older immigrants died. In 1947 the membership was down at 165. The post-war National Health legislation caused a general decline in the friendly society movement, from which the Circle also suffered. The Circle House in Gorbals' Main Street closed in 1957. By that time many Jews had departed from the Gorbals. They left behind a group of elderly immigrants, locked in the old occupations and poverty.

Social mobility was not evenly divided over all groups in Glasgow's Jewish population. Jewish occupations in Glasgow changed in the period between 1918 and 1939, but these changes did not occur in all social groups. In general, the involvement in commerce rose. Hawking went into decline, but new shops were opened. Some entrepreneurs prospered, notably in clothing, whisky and retail. More Jews went into the professions, forming a new and rapidly growing middle group. On the eve of the Second World War the social middle groups in Glasgow Jewry were larger than ever before. Glasgow Jewry as a whole was moving towards a more middle class community, although a large working class group made little social progress.

Poor Jews were still looked after by Jewish organisations but during this period also became the responsibility of the modern general welfare services. The Jewish welfare institutions were by now well established and their activity shows how the Jewish population in Glasgow as a whole was financially more stable. During earlier years, the wider commercial opportunities in Glasgow, the attitude of the immigrants and the existence of a Jewish network of charity and self-help organisations had encouraged Jewish immigrants to become economically independent as small businessmen and workshop owners.

Looking over the whole period from 1880 to 1939, Jewish immigrant occupations in Glasgow remained concentrated in the clothing and furniture trades. From a largely commercially occupied group before 1880, Glasgow Jewry as a whole moved more into manufacturing, but after the First World War the pattern shifted somewhat back to commerce. Through a system of Jewish welfare the older settlers assisted immigrant newcomers and later the immigrant middle classes helped Jewish workers to gain an economic independent status. The reaction of the non-Jewish population to the influx of Jewish immigrant labour and commerce was initially negative, but trade union activity and Jewish welfare work possibly eased the entry of immigrant workers. In this welfare work the striving for respectability and civic acceptability can be recognised. The wish to gain an independent economic status and to better oneself stimulated social mobility. This took place in the framework of Glasgow's economy, with a traditionally strong commercial element and opportunities for small businesses. It is not surprising that compared to the Jews in England, Glasgow Jewry was more involved in commerce. On the eve of the Second World War a similar

attitude, growing financial stability among the Jewish workers as well as the traditional importance of learning and the character of the Scottish education system helped many young Jews to choose higher education and enter a professional occupation.

Chapter 6. Public activity : politics, Zionism and art

Politics and art offered Jews opportunities to participate in Glasgow's public life. Jews could take part in the general political life of the city as individual politicians and as a group with specific interests: the rise of Zionism in Britain during the 20th century, for example, provided the Jews in Glasgow with an ideology and organisations to operate in the political world. Similarly, talented individuals could make contributions to the world of art. Politics and art are often related inasmuch as art can be an expression of political ideas or because the involvement in the arts world can be the result of holding a public office. Artistic endeavours are here considered as public activities.

This chapter will discuss Jewish public activity in Glasgow in the period between 1880 and 1939 by examining such activities in politics, Zionism and art. These activities took place in a Scottish society which was changing. Politics in Glasgow, for example, had traditionally been the domain of industrialists and merchants but now they had to make room for professional men and mass political parties. Jews took part in this process. The way and the degree in which Jewish immigrants participated in public life offer opportunities to review their integration into Scottish society.

Jewish political activity in Glasgow can be compared with Jewish political activity in English cities. First of all on a municipal level. The Reform Act of 1832 had given Jews who possessed property or who otherwise qualified, the right to vote. They could also stand as candidates in local elections. Alderman¹ finds the first successful Jewish candidates taking up public offices in Southampton (1838) and Birmingham (1839). In London, Jews were not admitted to the local council until 1846, when disabilities which had earlier prevented admission were abolished; these had apparently disregarded elsewhere in England. In 1847 the first Jew was admitted as an Alderman in London and eight years later the British capital had its first Jewish Lord Mayor. By comparison, in Manchester the first Jew was elected onto the local council in 1851² and Liverpool had its first Jewish Lord Mayor in 1899³.

These Jewish councillors in England were not elected as Jews and they did not represent the Jewish population. Local Jewish organisations usually had contacts with the local authorities which were conducted on an informal level not by representatives on town councils. When involved in municipal politics, most local Jewish organisations in England preferred to work behind closed doors and not to publicly force certain issues. An exception was made during the local elections of 1904 in London. At that

¹ Alderman, London Jewry and London Politics, pp. 2-4, 143.

² Williams, The Making of Manchester Jewry, p. 336.

³ D. Hudaly, Liverpool Old Hebrew Congregation 1780-1974, Liverpool, 1974, p. 17.

time new legislation transferred the funding of English board schools from the state to local government. This had created fears among Jews about the funding of schools with many Jewish pupils, and some Jewish organisations tried to make sure that these institutions were properly funded by influencing the election result. Such occasions, however, remained rare.

The first Jewish Member of Parliament made his entrance in the House of Commons in 1858⁴. The number of Jewish MPs rose to 17 in 1929, a record which would not be surpassed before 1939. The older Jewish settlers in England were traditionally associated with the Liberal Party. Alderman⁵ shows how the Jewish alliance shifted from Liberal to Conservative, then to Labour and later back to Conservative. During the 1920s there were more Conservative Jewish MPs than Labour and Liberal MPs. The first Jewish Labour MP was elected in 1922⁶. In 1945, 93% of all Jewish MPs were Labourites and the majority of them were immigrant sons. By the mid 1930s the majority of the Jews in Britain voted Labour. There was by that time also some Jewish support for the Communist Party. In 1945, however, there were already some constituencies with significant numbers of Jewish voters which returned Conservative candidates, a trend which would eventually reverse the picture of the 1930s.

Representative organisations such as the Board of Deputies and the Federation of Zionists found spokesmen in parliament. Some Jewish MPs spoke on issues which were of particular interest to Jews, others did not. Differences between Jewish MPs reflected the divisions within Anglo-Jewry but Smith⁷ argues that fears about encouraging hostility towards Jews often determined the behaviour of Jewish politicians and stopped them from raising issues of interest to Jews.

There were some issues of particular interest to Jews. One of these was the position of aliens. On a few occasions in the years between 1880 and 1939 this position was debated. This happened during the following periods: between 1891 and 1905 resulting in the Conservative Aliens Bill; in the years 1912-1913 when some financial scandals involved businessmen and politicians whose Jewishness was explicitly referred to; at the time of the internment of enemy aliens in the First World War; and during the 1924 election campaign some Conservatives voiced strong anti-alien

⁴ Despite the Reform Act of 1832 Jews remained barred from parliament for another 26 years because of the disability to swear the Christian oath. Before 1858 several attempts were made to allow Jews to Westminster. See for example *Encyclopedia Britannica*, XIII, p. 684, which mentions a bill which would allow Jews proposed by Robert Grant, MP for Inverness, in 1830.

⁵ G. Alderman, *The Jewish Community in British Politics*, Oxford, 1983, pp. 106, 108-109, 115, 126-127; compare Lipman, *A History of the Jews in Britain*, pp. 76-77.

⁶ This was Emanuel Shinwell from Glasgow (see below). Another Jewish Labour politician from Scotland was Michael Marcus MP (1929-1931) from Dundee. Marcus was the first Jewish Socialist to act publicly as a defender of Jewish interests in parliament.

⁷ E. Smith, "Jews and Politics in the East End of London, 1918-1939", in Cesarani, *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, pp. 141-162.

resentments⁸, again raising the question of alien immigration. In addition there were a number of issues of interest to Jews, including the reaction to pogroms in Russia, support for Jewish schools, shechita, and the question of the Jewish refugees from Germany after 1933. During the 1930s two issues dominated. This concerned the British administration in Palestine and Fascism in Britain. On the eve of the Second World war these two issues may have influenced Jewish electoral behaviour in England.

The consideration of Jewish political activity in Glasgow will discuss the careers of Jewish politicians in or from Glasgow and the issues they were interested in, the behaviour of the Jewish electorate, and the ways in which Jewish groups in Glasgow tried to influence politicians. Local government agencies in Glasgow during the period between 1880 and 1939 were the Town Council, the parish councils and the School Board, later Education Authority. Concentration will necessarily be on the Town Council because little is known about Jewish involvement in the parish councils; the School Board and Education Authority have already been discussed in chapter 4 in connection with unsuccessful attempts to establish a Jewish day school.

Nothing is known about the behaviour of the Jewish electors among the older settlers in Glasgow, but two members of this group were elected onto the Town Council, namely Michael Simons and Frank Cohen, and from their activity some information about the local political involvement of the older settlers can be derived. Simons stood as a candidate in the 1883 Glasgow municipal elections. In that year the Glasgow Town Council consisted of 50 members, 48 of whom represented the 16 city wards. During annual elections in November at least one of the three ward representatives was chosen. These elections, since 1872 decided by the ballot box, could be dull affairs with returns often being unopposed, but there was a possibility for excitement about certain issues and personalities⁹. During the 19th century most ward representatives were large industrialists and merchants with only a few professional men on the Town Council. Pressure groups existed, but organised parties did not enter municipal politics until after the First World War when professional politicians started to dominate the Town Council. Other changes came with the extension of the city boundaries, as in 1912. More wards had to be represented and with it the number of representatives rose to 111 councillors in 1920. By that time electoral reforms had already increased the electorate.

⁸ D. Cesarani, "The Anti-Jewish Career of Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Cabinet-Minister", in Journal of Contemporary History, volume 24 (1989), pp. 461-482, p. 471.

⁹ GH 7/11/1883.

During the 1883 municipal elections 8 of the 16 candidates were unopposed¹⁰. The registered number of people eligible to vote was still relatively small: 79,774 persons, including 12,986 women. Michael Simons was a candidate in the third ward where councillor James Reid retired. The third ward consisted of the eastern part of the old city centre, Dennistoun and part of Springburn. In that ward 5,425 persons held the franchise. Councillor Reid was said¹¹ to have been forced to retire because of business pressure arising from his Hyde Park Locomotive Works company and Simons was asked by the ward committee of electors to take his place¹². On the face of it, one representative of Glasgow's prosperous middle class replaced another and there seemed little reason for controversy.

This changed with the intervention of the Rev. Robert Thomson, since 1877 minister of the Colston-Wellpark (or Ladywell and Wellpark) Church of Scotland parish situated in this ward. Thomson was one of the founders of the Scottish Protestant Alliance, an outspoken group which proclaimed to maintain traditional Protestant values which were felt to be under threat from Roman Catholicism and "infidelity"¹³. The Alliance can be seen as a conservative reaction to modernity, as was discussed in chapter 3. Thomson started his 1883 campaign at the densely crowded and noisy annual meeting of the electors of the third ward in the Sydney Place U.P. Church on Thursday 18th October 1883, declaring "war"¹⁴ on the Catholics of the city.

Although there is little doubt about his enmity towards Catholicism, the minister's motives to stand against Simons remain unknown. He did not say publicly that he opposed Simons because the fruit merchant was a Jew. Collins writes¹⁵ that Thomson campaigned on a "No Jews and no Jesuits ticket". Collins' source is the Jewish Chronicle which reported on the subject two days after the elections noting that Simons' victory was remarkable as he was opposed by a "Protestant clergyman who went to the poll with the cry of 'No Jews and no Jesuits'"¹⁶. There is no further evidence for Thomson's anti-Jewishness; the Glasgow Herald, for example, does not mention the issue at all. It is possible that without saying so publicly Thomson

¹⁰ GH 2/11/1883. Compare Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, pp. 424-429 for the background of municipal politics in Glasgow. Other late 19th century elections in general showed a similar picture with occasionally even more candidates standing unopposed.

¹¹ GH 10/10/1883.

¹² See the praise for Simons and his father in The Bailie 29/12/1880, described in chapter 1.

¹³ H. Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ. The Succession of Ministers in the Church of Scotland from the Reformation Time, Volume III, Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, Edinburgh, 1920, p. 406. See also Post Office Glasgow Directory 1882-1883, 1886-1887. Thomson had earlier unsuccessfully contested a seat in the Kilmarnock Burgh elections. After coming to Glasgow he had become a member of the School Board.

¹⁴ GH 19/10/1883, for reports on further public meetings in the ward see GH 23/10/1883, 25/10/1883, 2/11/1883 and 3/11/1883.

¹⁵ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 50.

¹⁶ JC 9/11/1883.

regarded Jews as much as Catholics and other “infidels” a threat to his form of Christianity and felt therefore that a Jewish candidate should be opposed. Perhaps he feared that a success for a Jew would enhance the chances of a Catholic being elected on a future occasion. Alternatively, he might have tried to exploit sectarian feelings for his own benefit, or perhaps the minister really feared that Catholics were taking over the city’s administration. In any case, it is remarkable that Thomson voiced anti-Catholic feelings but no anti-Jewishness.

It was Simons and not Thomson who publicly raised the issue of his Jewishness. This happened on only one occasion and Simons referred indirectly to it. In order to discredit him, appeals had been made to “base prejudices (...) quite unworthy of this enlightened age,” Simons told an audience in Springburn¹⁷. Indicating that he also might have been accused of unfair business practices - Jews were traditionally associated with usury and unfair trading - he declared that he had prospered by honourable means, making the following statement.

“He claimed to be able to take, and he was justified in taking as deep an interest in the welfare and progress of this city as any member of the community.”¹⁸

This would suggest that in Glasgow the right of a Jew to stand in the local elections was still disputed.

Canvassers called Thomson “the well-known friend of the people”¹⁹, the minister tried to portray himself as the Protestant Christian champion of working and middle class men. He promised his support for improvement of sanitation facilities, lower taxes and the building of working class housing (Simons had been attacked as a house-owner, but he quickly pointed out that apart from his own residence his property did not consist of dwelling houses). In addition Thomson advocated early closure of public houses. He “would open the eyes of some of those who were apparently blind”. His anti-Catholicism remained his most important issue. When a man at the end of one of his tumultuous public meetings at Wellpark church in Ladywell Street yelled “Three cheers for Archbishop Eyre”, Thomson declared “We will not tolerate a Papist here (...)”²⁰

Sunday trading and a proposal for a new fruit exchange at the Saltmarket were also raised as election issues. On both accounts Simons’ position was weak but he defended himself skilfully, leaving room for manoeuvre. Sunday trading was an issue in which

¹⁷ GH 25/10/1883. The meeting took place in the Hyde Park Hall. Simons also spoke at meetings in churches. During the following Friday evening, for example, he addressed an audience in a church.

¹⁸ GH 25/10/1883.

¹⁹ GH 7/11/1883.

²⁰ GH 23/10/1883.

Jews were involved because Jewish retailers were known to trade on Sundays. During some public speeches Simons said about Sunday trading that he would do what was in his power, thereby not committing himself. As a fruit merchant Simons had a personal interest in the Saltmarket question. First he voiced clear-cut opposition to the proposal, but when the election date drew closer he switched to a different position, stating that he would accept the pending outcome of a committee enquiry. It is unknown whether he was already informed of that outcome, but in any case, by making this statement he showed the image of a moderate man who was prepared to listen to the electorate.

Simons stressed his experience in commerce. He said he was a businessman interested in promoting general welfare. Ministers should look after their flock, the sick and the poor. Businessmen who provided employment for thousands of Glasgow's citizens were better equipped to govern the city. So far, Simons said, they had often neglected the administration of the city, but this was because the administration was in such a bad state. The first thing was to bring Glasgow's finances in better shape. Simons also touched upon the housing issue. The merchant attacked what he called overspending and bungling politics claiming that the Improvement Trust, which was involved in slum clearing and sanitation improvement, had "ruined"²¹ people by forcing them to hand over their property. Such matters were better left to private enterprise.

It is difficult to say how important these issues were eventually for the voters in the ballot box. Despite the tension displayed at public meetings, many people did not seem interested in the elections. Just over two thousand electors out of the total of almost five and a half thousand persons eligible to vote did not vote. The Glasgow Herald²² reported that the elections in the third ward were hardly as lively as expected. But Simons' supporters could be satisfied. He received 1,809 votes, Thomson 1,424. The fruit merchant thus became the first Jewish Town councillor in Glasgow. The Bailie magazine was delighted. Not mentioning the fruit merchant's Jewishness, the magazine wrote that Simons was the only newcomer who had shown a "distinctive mark of individuality and faculty for managing affairs", a "distinct acquisition to the Council" having given a "foretaste of the treatment to which firebrands (like Thomson) are subjected when they stray within the walls of the Council Chamber."²³

Simons did not fail to honour this prediction. Almost a year later, The Bailie noted that the new councillor had taken a leading role in the city's affairs. He had kept his word about putting Glasgow's finances into better shape and he was especially credited

²¹ GH 2/11/1883.

²² GH 7/11/1883. Elsewhere in Glasgow the elections showed a similar picture. Overall, a larger than normal number of new councillors made their entry.

²³ The Bailie 7/11/1883.

with a report by the "Committee on the Financial Management of the Chamberlain's Office". The magazine summed up some other interests and finally mentioned his Jewishness: "While Mr. Simons is a native of this city, he is of Jewish origin, and is, indeed, the first Jew who has been elected to a post of public trust in Scotland. Like all the men of his race, he takes a keen interest in art. His tastes are large and liberal. Every movement that assists to make life brighter and pleasanter has his eager support."²⁴

Simons left his mark for the vigour with which he approached his work in the council and his individuality and independence distinguished him from most of his contemporaries. His public services were rewarded. In 1887 he entered the magistracy by becoming a Bailie²⁵. A year later he was among the 250 prominent inhabitants of the city to be included in Sir John Lavery's painting "The State Visit of Her Majesty Queen Victoria to the Glasgow Exhibition, 1888"²⁶. During the organisation of the 1888 Exhibition Simons chaired the commission for refreshments, a task which he carried out to new acclaim: "to no section of the exhibition is more honour due than to that presided over with so much ability, tact, and geniality by Bailie Michael Simons."²⁷ His public career was cut short when two years after his election as a magistrate Simons was forced to retire from that post because of increasing business pressure which resulted from the failing health of his father. Michael Simons first took over his father's tasks and then accepted the sole responsibility for the company when Benjamin Simons died in 1891. During that year he resigned as councillor. Later in life, he might have been in a position to stage a political comeback, but he made no such attempt. After his retirement from local politics, Simons remained active in public life and as a patron of the arts in Glasgow (see below). In 1906 he was honoured with the appointment as a Deputy Lieutenant for the city²⁸.

Simons' devotion to public service also helped to provide the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation with a respectable image. The councillor secured the help of other civic leaders in campaigns against the persecution of the Jews in Russia during the early

²⁴ The Bailie 8/10/1884. Simons was not a native of Glasgow, he was born in London.

²⁵ SJAC, MBGHC 13/11/1887, an occasion on which he was congratulated by the congregation.

²⁶ Painting in Glasgow Art Galleries and Museums. Lavery finished the painting in 1890. Simons appears as sitter number 107.

²⁷ Chamberlain Nicol, "Vital, Social and Economic Statistics of Glasgow 1885-1891", quoted in The Bailie 8/5/1901. In 1901 Simons again took part in the organisation of the Glasgow exhibition, being responsible for music, entertainment, sport and refreshments.

²⁸ Slaven, Checkland, Scottish Business Biography, vol 2, pp. 386-387. Compare Levy, Origins of Glasgow Jewry, p.56. According to Levy this appointment came in 1905. Levy also says that Simons had declined the office of Lord Provost. This statement must however be regarded with some reservation. No source is indicated by Levy for this information. The Bailie (8/5/1901) wrote that he could have been Lord Provost or MP for the Blackfriars Division. Levy might have referred to this. Levy mistakenly dates the first exhibition in which Simons took an active part in 1898.

1890s. In 1897 the President of the congregation, Julius Frankenburg, was invited onto the executive of the Lord Provost's committee to raise funds for the Queen's Diamond Jubilee. This was "the first time in the history of the congregation that we had been officially recognised by the municipality of Glasgow," the council at Garnethill recorded proudly²⁹.

The other older Jewish settler on the Glasgow Town Council was Frank Cohen. In 1902 he was elected in the Springburn ward. Like Simons, Cohen could not be associated with a political party although he leaned towards a vague sort of populism. This young man, he was 26 at the age of his first election, came from a middle class background. He was a member of the establishment of the Jewish population³⁰. His father Morris Cohen and grandfather Joseph Cohen had been office bearers in the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation. Frank Cohen was born in Hillhead (at the time of his election the family still lived in that neighbourhood, at 2 Alfred Terrace). After being educated at the Glasgow High School he entered the family firm³¹. Cohen took an early interest in politics. He became a member of debating societies, but he is said to have declined to contest the Gorbals ward³². Cohen did try his luck in Springburn in November 1902. He lost the election but in December the seat was declared vacant, forcing a new ballot, and Cohen had a more successful attempt. In 1904 Cohen lost the seat but during the next year he was re-elected. He held the seat from 1905 to 1912.

After less than a year on the Town Council, The Bailie paid tribute to the young councillor. He was noted for his endeavour to satisfy the wishes of his constituents. The magazine saw him as a "fitting successor"³³ of Simons. Cohen was further portrayed as a hard working, young man with the aim "to better his fellow-workers without going in for strong revolutionary measures"³⁴. His Jewishness was not mentioned, but the association with Simon and the name Cohen were clear enough. The councillor was easily recognisable as a Jew. Later, Cohen's middle-name Israel was frequently mentioned, also by himself. Cohen does not appear to have taken an interest in specifically Jewish issues. He did not, for example, speak publicly about the Aliens

²⁹ SJAC, MBG 1/4/1897, 20/6/1897.

³⁰ SJAC, MBG 4/1/1903 and Communal Register Garnethill (1911); Levy, Origins of Glasgow Jewry, p. 35; Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 102. In 1907 Cohen served for a short period as the chairman of the Employment Bureau of the Glasgow Hebrew Boot, Clothing and Employment Assistance Guild for Young People.

³¹ The Bailie 5/8/1903 ; compare Post Office Glasgow Directory 1902.

³² The Bailie 5/8/1903.

³³ The Bailie 5/8/1903; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 102; JC 14/11/1902. Collins writes that no mention of Cohen's Jewishness was made in 1902. As a result of his name, Cohen's Jewishness was of course very obvious and this was often referred to openly.

³⁴ For Cohen's policies see I. E. Sweeney, The Municipal Administration of Glasgow, 1833-1912. Public Service and the Scottish Civic Identity, Glasgow, 1990 (PhD thesis Strathclyde University); The Bailie 5/8/1903; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 102, 156, 189.

Bill, the subject of much contemporary debate.

Cohen initially showed a tendency towards populism, appearing as a middle class “workman’s friend”, occasionally referred to as “Frankie”. Cohen supported *a policy of* higher incomes, the building of working class housing, safety in neighbourhoods through better lighting, and further improvements like bath and wash houses, bowling greens and tea kiosks. He was in favour of the establishment of a municipal zoo near the New City Road. Cohen also adhered to the temperance movement. One of his first reported public acts was to chair a sub-committee formed to lessen the number of deaths by drowning in the Forth-Clyde Canal, known at the time as a “death trap”³⁵. The satirical press was well aware of his image-making. The Bailie described as follows how Cohen would spend a fictitious Spring holiday in Springburn:

“(…) patting small Springburn juveniles on the head, flattering the mothers, and grasping the fathers by the honest, thorny hand. For Frank loves the Springburnite with a great love, and enjoys basking in the sunshine of their approval.”³⁶

After a closely fought election contest in Springburn in 1908³⁷, from which he emerged as the winner, Cohen seems to have distanced himself somewhat from this populism. This may have been a result of an insult by Andrew Scott Gibson, the populist leader in the Town Council. At that time, populism often associated itself with anti-alienism³⁸ and this could have formed the background to Gibson’s insult. The incident took place in March 1909. Gibson afterwards apologised, but the matter was pounced upon by the popular press. In a piece called “The Municipal Marionettes”, The Eagle gave Gibson jokingly the role of “Harlequin who has a slap at everything”. He was quoted as saying: “We all know (Cohen) is of the Jewish persuasion - but that does not justify him in sticking his nose in everything.” Upon which Cohen, who “plays the part of Clown to the life”, answered: “I’ll tell my mother (...) I appeal to the chairness of the fair - I mean, the fairness of the chair. I have been showing a good example to you all here, and I’m sure I’m a credit to the Nation. Mother says so, and

³⁵ JC 8/12/1905. The Jewish Chronicle also reported that Cohen for the third time in his life had saved somebody from drowning.

³⁶ The Bailie 14/4/1909.

³⁷ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 427.

³⁸ C. Holmes, “Introduction”, in C. Holmes (ed.), Immigrants and Minorities in British Society, London, 1978, pp. 13-22, p. 14; B. Gainer, The Alien Invasion. The Origins of the Aliens Act of 1905, London, 1972, pp. 7, 35, 58.

she ought to know.”³⁹

Following this episode, The Eagle, which at times displayed strong anti-Jewish sentiments, on more than one occasion mentioned Cohen’s Jewishness and used this to discredit him. Applying what must have been regarded as a more humorous tone on April Fool’s Day 1909 the magazine reacted to news that a Jew had deserted from a Welsh regiment with the words “and he did not get the life of a dog. We hope Councillor Cohen will take the matter up.”⁴⁰ In 1909 it was rumoured that Cohen had been asked to stand as a candidate in the parliamentary elections. The Eagle showed Cohen in a cartoon causing the laughter of his envisaged fellow MP’s with the words: “My constituents have set me here as a Tariff reformer, and whatever that may be, that’s what I am, and no swack about it.” The Bailie wrote more sympathetically: “leave us our Frankie”, Glasgow’s “brightest ornament”⁴¹.

The Eagle portrayed Cohen as an opportunist. Other contemporaries had similar reservations about the councillor. There was praise from David Willox in his poetical sketches, but Willox also felt that Cohen was too much of a young man in a hurry. In one of his sketches the poet wrote the following about the Jewish councillor:

“You’re young yet and strong yet,
Sae bide your time a wee;
There’s time yet to climb yet,
Ca’ cannie when you flee.”⁴²

By comparison, The Bailie called Cohen “the self-elected Lord Provost”⁴³. It is unknown how Cohen felt about the criticism of his personal and political talents ventilated in the popular press, but he must have had some ambitions and Levy writes that he “frequently expressed his disappointment at being passed over when the annual nominations to the Magistrates Bench were being made”⁴⁴. Perhaps the disappointment about failing to become a Bailie led to his decision in 1912 to leave Glasgow and resign from the Town Council.

³⁹ The Eagle 25/3/1909. Compare GH 11/6/1909; The Bailie 24/3/1909. The row took place during a heated and at the time widely publicised dispute in the Town Council concerning hospital administration. With respect to Gibson’s insult The Bailie commented that Cohen was a “great lad for his joke” but had now acted wrong. A “Joke Missed”: he “intimated that he could stand that colleague (Gibson) no longer, but sat still instead of leaving. How much better it would have been had he exclaimed ‘A Jew!’ and departed!”

⁴⁰ The Eagle 1/4/1909; compare The Eagle 29/4/1909.

⁴¹ The Eagle 17/6/1909; The Bailie 16/6/1909. Compare Glasgow Annual 1911 in which he is shown rather curiously as a bon vivant with a vacuum cleaner attached to his head.

⁴² D. Willox, Members of Glasgow Corporation, 1907-10. A Poetical Sketch, Glasgow, n.d. (circa 1911).

⁴³ The Bailie 5/5/1909.

⁴⁴ Levy, Origins of Glasgow Jewry, p. 35.

The circumstances surrounding Cohen's departure are not clear. In 1911 he had been re-elected and he was appointed Master of Works of the Corporation⁴⁵. Early in 1912 he left Glasgow for New York. In July the Town Clerk received a letter from New York in which the councillor addressed his colleagues requesting an extension of his leave of absence (he had already been given six months from 1st February). When it became clear that no more leave than the statutory period of six months could be granted, Cohen resigned. He notified the council by telegram and confirmed his decision in a letter in the beginning of August. "Important business detains me here," Cohen wrote and went on to describe the years as Town Councillor as "the happiest of my life". He felt "proud of being a Scotsman and representing the Scottish people for so long."⁴⁶ But he offered no further explanation for staying away. Apparently he did not return to Scotland. Six years later Frank Cohen died in New York.

As in England, Jewish Town Councillors in Glasgow who came from the group of older settlers were not elected because they were Jews. Both Simons and Cohen represented a ward in which few Jews lived. In Simons' case his Jewishness might have played a role during the elections. Simons spoke publicly about some issues of interest to Jews, like Sunday trading and he used his position to mobilise non-Jewish protests against the pogroms in Russia (discussed in chapter 1), on which occasions he represented the Jewish population of the city. Cohen's Jewishness began to play a role after his election to the Town Council, although he did not display an interest in Jewish issues. It is possible that this was a result of the populist anti-alien agitation at this time. Cohen's Jewishness could have had a negative influence on his political career.

Although Emanuel Shinwell, the local secretary of the British Seafarers Union and member of the Glasgow Trades Council, briefly occupied a seat in the Town Council during the First World War⁴⁷, local politicians of Jewish immigrant origin did not make their entry in the Glasgow Town Council until 1928. In that year ^{two} Jewish candidates stood in the coming Town Council elections. One of these candidates was Dr. Simon Bennett who represented Labour in the Woodside ward. Bennett won the seat which he had already contested unsuccessfully during the previous year⁴⁸. He retired from the Town Council in 1934. The other candidate was Jack Morrison, director of M. Morrison & Co. and secretary of the Talmud Torah, who represented the Good

⁴⁵ SJAC, MBG 12/11/1911.

⁴⁶ GH 23/8/1912, see also GH 23/7/1912, 21/8/1912.

⁴⁷ Collins, *Second City Jewry*, p. 189. Shinwell represented one of the Govan wards. His activity will be discussed below. In 1919 Harry Ognall became a Councillor of the Burgh of Rutherglen; this was at the time an independent burgh south of Glasgow.

⁴⁸ SRA, C 8/3, Domesday Book of Glasgow Members of Council; compare JE 12/10/1928. The paper neglected the Labour councillor after his election, apart from a brief appearance in a report on a Zionist meeting in June 1930. Also in 1928, businessman Morris Caplan was a candidate for the Moderates in the parish council elections in Woodside.

Government League and contested the Gorbals ward. Morrison failed to win a seat on the Town Council⁴⁹. Little is known about Bennett. He did not embark on a long political career and during the following years he disappeared from the political scene. In November 1932 two other Jews participated successfully in the Town Council elections and they would establish themselves as important local political leaders. They were Ernest Greenhill and Myer Galpern. From their careers some information can be gleaned about the issues which occupied Jewish politicians in Glasgow during the 1930s.

Greenhill belonged to the moderate wing of the Labour party. He was an accountant, who had been born in 1887 in Liverpool and grew up in Leeds⁵⁰. As a young man Greenhill moved to Glasgow where he settled in the finance business and joined the Garnethill congregation. He was active in the field of adult education and this activity introduced him to municipal politics. When Greenhill was elected in 1932 in Townhead he was chairman of the Workers' Educational Association. On the Town Council, Greenhill initially did a lot of committee work. During his first year he joined four departmental committees, namely Housing, Streets, Libraries and Markets. There he learned the skills of a municipal administrator. In 1936 Greenhill became a magistrate, while holding the post of sub-convenor in the Finance committee, and a year later he succeeded P.J. Dollan as City Treasurer. After that he held other public offices and became a director of the Citizens' Theatre. Greenhill's career showed a modern local politician at work in the daily administration of the city as well as in policy making⁵¹.

Myer Galpern won his seat in the Shettleston ward in the East End of Glasgow. During previous years he had unsuccessfully contested Partick East in the West End and Cathcart on the South Side⁵². Galpern came from a middle class background. He lived in Kelvinside. After his education at Hutchesons' Boys Grammar School and Glasgow University he entered the family's house furnishing business. He joined the more leftward Independent Labour Party (ILP), chaired its Woodside branch and in 1931, at the age of 28, he was elected Chairman of the Glasgow Federation of the ILP after

⁴⁹ JE 2/11/1928. There was at the time some controversy about Morrison's candidacy, possibly because he was a communal leader, although this was not specified. A correspondent of the Jewish Echo noted that Jewish voters made up 4.45% of the electorate in the Gorbals. This figure must be regarded with some reservation. It is, for example not clear which electorate was meant. The Gorbals ward for the Town Council elections had in total about 20,000 voters, if the Jewish electorate made up 4.45% of the total, this would mean that 890 Jews in this ward were eligible to vote. The Gorbals ward for the parliamentary elections had in total about 50,000 voters, 4.45% of this is 2,225. The size of the Jewish electorate in the Gorbals will be more fully discussed below.

⁵⁰ Glasgow Evening News 19/6/1933; JE 12/11/1937. According to the Jewish Echo Greenhill's father had been a founder of an orthodox religious congregation.

⁵¹ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 428.

⁵² Glasgow Evening News 22/7/1933, JE 31/10/1930.

serving on its executive and being involved in propaganda work for a number of years⁵³.

The ILP formed a radical element within the Labour party up until 1932. Galpern, so commented the Glasgow Evening News, did “not hide his light under a bushel.”⁵⁴ He quickly gained a reputation for his outspokenness but appears to have combined this radicalism with a pragmatic outlook. Shortly before winning in Shettleston, the Jewish Echo reported that Galpern had (unsuccessfully) opposed a decision of the ILP to disaffiliate from Labour⁵⁵. On the Council he joined the General Finance Committee as well as Markets and Streets. In 1943 Galpern was appointed Depute River Bailie, to become a Bailie of the Burgh in November 1944. Shortly after the Second World War he was appointed senior Bailie⁵⁶.

Greenhill and Galpern followed distinguished public careers, which were continued after the war⁵⁷. In 1950 Ernest Greenhill was made a Baron for his public services⁵⁸. Myer Galpern left the ILP in 1947 and resigned his Shettleston seat, but in May 1949 he was re-elected in the same ward for the Labour party. He eventually became leader of the Labour group in the Town Council and was elected Lord Provost in 1958. During the following year Galpern also won the Shettleston parliamentary seat, becoming the first Jewish MP in Glasgow. In 1960, during the year in which he was knighted, Galpern resigned from the Town Council, thus serving only two rather than the normal three years as Lord Provost⁵⁹.

Greenhill and Galpern were representatives of a new generation of municipal politicians who were taking over the administration of the city and there lay their major contribution. Before the Second World War they showed a great interest in administration and educational matters but not in Jewish issues. Greenhill played little or no part in Jewish life in Glasgow⁶⁰. He told the Jewish Echo on the occasion of his appointment as City Treasurer that the “conception of the Jewish community as a

⁵³ JE 24/4/1931. Galpern was born in 1904.

⁵⁴ Glasgow Evening News 22/7/1933.

⁵⁵ JE 5/8/1932.

⁵⁶ SRA, C 8/3, Domesday Book of Glasgow Members of Council.

⁵⁷ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 753f. Another Jewish Town Councillor after the war was Dr. Maurice Miller.

⁵⁸ JE 1/12/1950. According to the Jewish Echo he was the first Scottish Jew to receive this honour.

⁵⁹ His immediate predecessor served 4 years.

⁶⁰ Benno Schotz. Portrait Sculpture (Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum exhibition catalogue), Glasgow, 1978, p. 21. Greenhill had studied Talmud until the age of 19. After the Second World War Greenhill was portrayed by Benno Schotz. He told the sculptor that the “sad and brooding” head of Greenhill which Schotz created (in 1963) expressed “much of the Jewish tragedy”. It is possible that later in life Greenhill identified himself more with the Jewish people.

separate entity within the Gentile ranks, (was) particularly irksome”⁶¹ to him. The Jewish Echo portrayed Myer Galpern as a “good type of Jew” and the fact that he spoke Yiddish was stressed⁶², but before the Second World War he did not raise Jewish issues. That changed when he helped to establish the Kosher School Meals Service during the 1950s. The kitchen for the Meals Service was set up at Garnethill synagogue and the whole enterprise received financial support from the Glasgow Corporation. At the same time Galpern was instrumental in the erection of the first clubhouse (Bayit) for the Glasgow Habonim, an organisation of Zionist youth, again with financial help from the city.

It is possible that before 1939 these politicians saw no reason to stress their Jewishness. They represented wards which had no or very small numbers of Jewish inhabitants and they were members of the Labour movement which laid emphasis on the equality of men. There might have been other reasons. The extreme political right traditionally associated the spread of left-wing extremism with Jews⁶³. Such allegations were also made during the 1930s. The editor of the Jewish Echo did not fail to remind Jewish Socialists of the danger of them fuelling anti-Jewish feelings. In 1939, for example, he wrote the following comment to condemn the Socialist Poale Zion group which had decided to march behind their own banner in a May Day parade:

(...) in these critical days of distrust and suspicion, when intolerance rules and persecution of the weak is the order of the day, it would perhaps be better that Jewish Socialists be not excessively eager to display their progressiveness.”⁶⁴

Perhaps the Labour councillors did not want to display their Jewishness because they were afraid that this could damage their party’s interests or fuel anti-Jewish feelings.

There could have been a further reason not to stress their Jewishness. Frank Cohen’s Jewish origins might have harmed his public career. The appointment of the first Jewish Lord Provost in Glasgow came relatively late when compared to other British cities. In Liverpool, for example, Louis Cohen served as Lord Mayor from 1899 to 1900⁶⁵. Glasgow could have had a Jewish Lord Provost long before Galpern’s election if Michael Simons had been appointed as such, but somehow he was not asked or declined the post as suggested earlier. Perhaps men like Greenhill and Galpern

⁶¹ JE 12/11/1937; compare JE 1/12/1950. No irksome feelings were expressed when Greenhill was entertained by the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council in the Grand Hotel on 26th October 1950 on the occasion of being made a baron.

⁶² JE 31/10/1931, 24/4/1931; compare JE /5/1958.

⁶³ GH 7/5/1920; see also chapter 4.

⁶⁴ JE 5/5/1939; compare idem 3/6/1938 about accusations about Jews being plotting, anti-religious Communists.

⁶⁵ D. Hudaly, Liverpool Old Hebrew Congregation 1780-1974, Liverpool, 1974, p. 17; compare Alderman, London Jewry and London Politics, pp. 27-81.

sensed a sensitivity about Jews in important public offices during the 1930s which caused them not to emphasise their Jewishness.

Did the Jewishness of a local candidate in parliamentary elections or a Jewish politician from Glasgow play such a role? Little is known about older settlers in national parties⁶⁶, but the activities of the immigrant sons Emanuel Shinwell and Maurice Bloch are well documented⁶⁷ and their careers may provide an answer to this question.

Shinwell was born in 1884 in London. He started work at the age of 11 in Glasgow's East End, became a union organiser and joined the ILP in 1906. Shinwell first represented the local Amalgamated Jewish Branch of the Tailors' Union on the Glasgow Trades Council, but soon after that he switched to the general Clothiers' Operatives. He served as Vice-President of the Glasgow Trades Council in 1910. In 1911, Shinwell associated himself with the newly formed Seafarer's Union and got involved in a national strike. In 1918 he stood as an unsuccessful Labour candidate in West Lothian.

It is significant that at an early age Shinwell changed from a Jewish union to the general organisation and was subsequently associated with the seamen's union. Seafaring was an unusual occupation for Jewish immigrants, but Shinwell's previous election onto the Trades Council may have been an acknowledgement of his political talent and organisational skills which led to a request to support the seamen. Alternatively it is possible that Shinwell volunteered to work for the seamen's union. Among the seamen Shinwell was an organiser of the unorganised. Union work on the docks was not easy. During the seamen's strike a gun was fired, killing one of his associates. Several times he was involved in fist fights, but the union leader had learned as a boy to harden himself. Later in life, in 1955, he remembered how his boxing talents came in useful: "Union work on Clydeside forty years ago (during the 1910s) was no job for a weakling."⁶⁸ In his love for boxing, Shinwell was not different from other Jewish boys, but union work on the docks was certainly not typical of Jews.

⁶⁶ Compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 195. Collins writes that Ellis Isaacs was active in the Liberal Party but does not specify these activities.

⁶⁷ The following biographical information on Shinwell is taken from Annual Reports of the Glasgow Trades Council 1905-1906-1907, 1910-1911, 1914; W. Knox (ed.), Scottish Labour Leaders 1918-1939. A Biographical Dictionary, Edinburgh, 1984, pp. 48, 84, 263; I. McLean, The Legend of Red Clydeside, Edinburgh, 1983, pp. 122-134, 241, 245; E. Shinwell, Conflict Without Malice, London, 1955, pp. 13-76; idem, The Labour Story, London, 1963, pp. 66, 92-113; J. Doxat, Shinwell Talking. A Conversational Biography to celebrate his hundredth birthday, London, 1984, pp. 13, 21, 30, 37, 44, 51, 60-61, 67, 76, 82, 85-86, 89-90, 93, 99, 103. There is not a separate entry on Shinwell in the Scottish Labour Leaders 1918-1939. A Biographical Dictionary (nor on Bennett, Galpern and Greenside, which suggests that they are not regarded as labour leaders or were not important enough to be included) but Shinwell does appear in entries on others. According to McLean (p. 245) Shinwell moved to Glasgow shortly before the First World War. In 1907, however, Shinwell already stayed in Glasgow (see Annual Report of the Glasgow Trades Council 1905-1906, 1907). Perhaps McLean refers to Shinwell's brief stay in London shortly before or after his marriage. For Bloch see below.

⁶⁸ Shinwell, Conflict Without Malice, p. 51.

Shortly after the 1918 elections Shinwell was involved in what became known as “Red Friday” or “Bloody Friday”. Following the end of the First World War, industrial unrest swept through in Britain. On Clydeside, a Shop Stewards committee called for a strike on 27th January 1919 to support demands for 40-hour working week. When the official unions refused to support the strike, the committee appealed to the Glasgow Trades Council, which was by now chaired by Shinwell. On the following Friday, 31st January, a delegation of the strikers led by Shinwell went to see the Lord Provost in the City Chambers at George Square. Outside the building thousands of strikers demonstrated.

Similar events took place elsewhere in Britain in an atmosphere which was filled with fear of revolution. In Glasgow, troops were held in reserve in case such fears became reality. Nothing like that happened but somehow the demonstration at George Square got out of hand and some bloody skirmishes with the police occurred. Shinwell, who in an earlier radical mood had called for the demonstration but during the event followed a moderate line and tried to calm the demonstrators, and other workers' representatives were arrested charged with incitement to riot. Three months after the incident Shinwell was convicted and sentenced to five months imprisonment. After his release from prison Shinwell returned to his union work but in November 1922 he won his West Lothian seat in parliament. Together with 13 Labour candidates who were returned in Glasgow and who became known as the Red Clydesiders, Shinwell received a massive send-off from St. Enoch's Square. Although Shinwell might have had a reputation as an extremist as a result of these events, Red Clydeside was for Shinwell a springboard for a distinguished career at Westminster. In London he distanced himself from radical Socialism⁶⁹.

It is difficult to say how Shinwell's Jewishness played a role in the following political career. He was known to be a Jew and he was aware of being known as such. In 1929 for example he was asked to address a meeting of B'nai B'rith⁷⁰. His opponents also reminded him of his Jewishness. In 1923 Sir G. Hamilton, a Conservative MP allegedly shouted “Jew” in his direction. Shinwell replied as follows.

“The honorable gentleman opposite me made a reference to the race to which I belong and of which I am proud to be a member. The Prime Minister of this House, when he accepted office, pledged himself to adopt a policy laid down by a Jew, namely Disraeli. Why then should honorable members of the other side insult me

⁶⁹ In 1923 Shinwell joined Labour's minority government in which he headed the Mines Department. In 1928 he became Financial Secretary at the War Office, but soon returned to the Mines Department as Parliamentary Secretary. Following Labour's victory in 1945 Shinwell became Minister of Fuel and Power. Subsequently he held other government posts and kept his seat in the Commons until 1970 when he was created Baron Shinwell of Easington and elevated to the House of Lords.

⁷⁰ JE 28/6/1929. The meeting took place in London. Shinwell spoke about tolerance, equality and Jewish civic rights.

for being a Jew? If that were a matter that entirely concerned myself, I would not regard the expression as offensive - I am rather proud of it. And since there are other honorable members of the House who come under the same category, I share with them whatever offence may have been contained in that statement."⁷¹

And during a parliamentary debate on Spain in 1938 the MP for Cleveland, Commander Bower, shouted: "Go back to Poland." In a reaction, Shinwell crossed the floor and struck Bower on the face⁷². However, such attacks were exceptional.

Before the Second World War Shinwell did not speak much on Jewish issues and remained silent on, for example, Palestine. Later in life he is said to have been a supporter of Zionism, but that his work had been limited to conversations and assistance behind the scenes: "I must confess that through the long years of Zionist activity (...) I had done little or nothing in public to help the movement."⁷³ This is not quite correct. In 1956 Shinwell was the only Jewish Labour MP who publicly supported Israel during the Suez-crisis⁷⁴. But on the whole, Shinwell differed in this respect from other Jewish politicians like Herbert Samuel, the Liberal politician and leader of his party during the early 1930s, who had embraced Zionism⁷⁵, and the outspoken Labour MP for Dundee Michael Marcus⁷⁶. It is possible that in Shinwell's case, the Holocaust, the foundation of the State of Israel and the subsequent Arab-Israeli wars changed his attitude towards Zionism and that this was expressed in later life.

There is a possibility that early in life he wanted to get away from his background. In his early memoirs, Shinwell did not mention his Jewish origins. In his first biographical work, Conflict Without Malice (1955), he starts with the words: "I am a Londoner (...)"⁷⁷, he describes his family and background, but the fact that his family is Jewish is not recorded. Similarly, when he describes the population groups in Glasgow he names Irish immigrants, Italians and miners from Poland and Lithuania,

⁷¹ Quoted in the Edinburgh Star, number 3, September 1989; compare JE 6/11/1931. The article in the Edinburgh Star contains some biographical details which are different from those provided above. According to the Star, Shinwell's 1919 conviction, for example, was for conspiracy rather than incitement to riot.

⁷² Shinwell, Conflict Without Malice, pp. 137-138; Doxat, Shinwell Talking, p. 12. Both men later apologised to the Speaker and were reconciled. Shinwell said in retrospect that on that occasion he had to prove that he was not a coward.

⁷³ Doxat, Shinwell Talking, p. 226. Zionism will be more fully discussed below.

⁷⁴ Alderman, The Jewish Community in British Politics, pp. 131-132.

⁷⁵ B. Wasserstein, Herbert Samuel. A Political Life, Oxford, 1992, p. 200.

⁷⁶ Alderman, The Jewish Community in British Politics, p. 115. See for example JE 29/8/1930.

⁷⁷ Shinwell, Conflict Without Malice, p. 13.

but not the Jews⁷⁸. Later on in the book, when the 1938 incident in the House of Commons is discussed and he relates a visit to Israel in 1953, his origins become more clear, but the word "Jew" is not mentioned.

Late in life, during an interview on the occasion of his 100th birthday, Shinwell did more openly discuss his Jewishness. He had "no feelings of being Jewish," he said, but in a debate on Israel in the House of Commons he had "gloried in the fact that the Jews were defending themselves. You see, that was my own attitude. I won't allow anyone to injure me - no matter who the person."⁷⁹ The interviewer added that during his early years in Glasgow Shinwell had not joined the Jewish clothing workers' union but another organisation because he objected to a purely ethnic organisation⁸⁰.

There could have been several reasons for Shinwell not to stress his Jewishness. In general he felt closer to those who thought that Socialism and not Zionism would solve the problems of the Jewish workers. During the 1930s - when problems of poverty and the fear for persecution plagued the Jewish workers - such politicians, including for example Shinwell's colleague William Gallacher, argued that Zionism was an "illusion"⁸¹. It was felt that Zionism could damage the anti-Fascist cause, because Jewish nationalism created disunity as it was a separatist movement. Jewish workers should forget the Zionist idea and join the Labour movement. Shinwell therefore rejected Jewish separatism and stressed the importance of the Labour movement. Following the rise to power of the Nazis in Germany, Shinwell told a 1933 Labour conference: "The very existence and purpose of a Labour Movement ensure the utmost antagonism and hostility to any effort to create dissension among the people of any race, land or creed."⁸² This statement which was a protest against the persecution of the Jews in Germany, was in effect also a condemnation of Zionism.

Socialist beliefs as such were not always a reason for a Jewish political activist to remain quiet about his Jewishness. In general Socialists believed that left-wing Jewish politicians should remain loyal to their own people and show solidarity. Lewis Rifkind, a Jewish Socialist from Glasgow, stated for example that Jewish politicians

⁷⁸ Shinwell, Conflict Without Malice, pp. 18, 30-31. The Labour Story (1963), which was meant as a more political addition to these memoirs, does not differ in this respect, and his work The Britain I Want (London, 1943) does not mention the "Jewish Question" which was elsewhere hotly debated and could hardly have escaped Shinwell's attention (see, for example, E. Frankenstein, Justice for my People. The Jewish Case, London, 1943; L. Golding, The Jewish Problem, Harmondsworth, 1938; J. Parkes, An Enemy of the People: Antisemitism, Harmondsworth, 1945; I. Rennap, Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Question, London, 1942 - Golding's and Parkes' books were Penguin specials, Rennap's book contained an introduction by Shinwell's fellow MP William Gallagher).

⁷⁹ Doxat, Shinwell Talking, p. 11.

⁸⁰ Doxat, Shinwell Talking, p. 12.

⁸¹ W. Gallagher, "Introduction", in I. Rennap, Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Question, pp. 7-11.

⁸² Quoted in the Edinburgh Star, number 3, September 1989.

should openly express their Jewishness⁸³. Perhaps it was a matter of personal temperament. Shinwell was not religious and perhaps he felt more affinity for the working classes and humanity in general than for the Jewish population in particular⁸⁴.

Unlike Emanuel Shinwell, the Unionist candidate Maurice Bloch who from 1929 to 1935 stood three times against ILP MP George Buchanan in the Gorbals could hardly avoid the matter of his Jewishness and made no attempt to do so. Bloch, born in 1882 in Dundee and educated there, had come to Glasgow as a young man and found his fortune in the distillery business. He remained unmarried and became an outstanding philanthropist and communal leader - the "uncrowned king" of Glasgow Jewry⁸⁵. In 1929 he was honoured for his involvement with the Jewish Board of Guardians, said to have started in 1911. An oil painting was commissioned and a dinner in his honour was to be held⁸⁶. When he was appointed as candidate by the Unionist party, he eventually became vice-president of the Glasgow Unionist Association, a committee was formed to support him during the election campaign and Zevi Golombok, editor of the Jewish Echo, who said to have taken a neutral position in previous elections, declared his support. Bloch was said to add to the "prestige of our people"⁸⁷.

As a Jewish communal leader, Bloch may have hoped for many Jewish votes in the Gorbals. The question is how large the Jewish electorate in the Gorbals was. There are some estimates regarding the size of the Jewish electorate. First, there is a figure mentioned in 1928⁸⁸ of 4.45% of the total electorate in the Gorbals being Jewish, but it was not said whether this was in the municipal or the parliamentary ward. If the figure was correct, either 890 or 2,225 Jews in the neighbourhood were eligible to vote depending on whether the municipal or parliamentary ward was meant. Secondly,

⁸³ Lewis Rifkind (Commemorative volume of essays issued by the Lewis Rifkind Memorial Book Committee and Glasgow Poale Zion), Glasgow, n.d. (probably 1938), p. 27.

⁸⁴ Compare JE 13/12/1929, 30/10/1931, 6/11/1931; Doxat, Shinwell Talking, p. 13. Shinwell was the oldest of 13 children. His younger brother Maurice maintained his association with Scottish Jewry despite a political career in the Labour movement. Maurice Shinwell, a journalist working occasionally for the Jewish Echo and member of the executive of the Glasgow branch of the National Union of Journalists, lived in Hamilton where he won a seat in the 1931 municipal elections against a candidate who branded him an "atheist".

⁸⁵ GH 20/2/1964; compare JE 21/2/1964; The Times House of Commons 1929, London, 1929, p. 124, idem 1935, pp. 139-140. The Jewish Echo did not carry an obituary on the occasion of Bloch's death as was usual with communal leaders, which might have been due to business problems and rumors of involvement with a fraud case. The paper did report extensively on the funeral ceremony for which the British Chief Rabbi was said to have flown to Glasgow.

⁸⁶ JE 3/5/1929; compare JE 12/3/1937. In the last issue it was reported that he had served the Board since 1919 as Honorary Treasurer and President.

⁸⁷ JE 24/5/1929, see also JE 12/4/1929. In the May issue of the paper a letter from another communal leader, Joseph Sachs, was included calling for support for the Liberal party. Labour was not mentioned at this stage.

⁸⁸ JE 2/11/1928. See footnote 49.

Alderman⁸⁹ estimates that in 1930 there were about 3,500 Jewish electors in the parliamentary Gorbals ward, constituting about 7% of the total electorate. There are no ways of checking these estimates. The exact size of the Jewish population in the Gorbals is unknown, it was a changing population as many Jews were leaving the neighbourhood at the time, and it should be noted that many Jews in the Gorbals who originally came from Russia had been unable or unwilling to acquire the British nationality and thereby did not obtain the right to vote in parliamentary elections⁹⁰. Furthermore, it has been shown in chapter 5 that many Jews in the neighbourhood had not appeared on the Valuation Rolls in earlier years and this would mean that quite a lot were therefore not on the voters' roll. Traditionally in Scottish society poor men found it difficult to get the vote for which a certain amount of stability, like renting of a home for a year, was required. The Jewish population in the Gorbals consisted of many poor people who frequently moved house. It is therefore possible that the Jewish electorate in the Gorbals was smaller than the overall Jewish presence in the neighbourhood suggested.

What was the Jewish influence in the elections if we presume that the largest estimate was correct? The Gorbals' seat was at this time firmly held by George Buchanan, a trade unionist in the clothing industry and member of the Glasgow Trades Council and Town Council. During the years 1922-1931 Buchanan represented Labour and in 1935 he stood for the ILP. The elections results in the Gorbals between 1918 and 1948 presented in table 6 (see appendix) show that this was not a marginal seat⁹¹. In 1924 Buchanan had a majority of more than 9,000. If we presume that the Jewish electorate consisted of 3,500 voters, this means that the Jewish voters in the Gorbals had a considerable but not decisive influence.

The question can also be whether the Jewish vote was influenced by Bloch's candidacy. In 1929 Bloch lost with Buchanan's majority increasing from 9,388 (31.8%) at the previous elections to 16,677 votes (49.6%) now, while elsewhere in Britain the Unionists and Conservatives gained votes. In 1931 Bloch tried again, this time as the Unionist candidate for the National Government. He did better than previously and was able to increase his share of the votes from 8,457 (25.2%) in 1929 to 11,264 (34.0%) in 1931, while Buchanan's majority dropped to 8,014 votes (24.1%). The Jewish Echo commented that: "The Jews (...) voted mostly for the

⁸⁹ Alderman, The Jewish Community in British Politics, p. 198.

⁹⁰ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 816. In total 3,181 Russian aliens were registered in Glasgow in 1931 as against 1,929 Italians, the second largest group. In 1954 the Italians constituted the largest group, with the Russians on the third place after Polish aliens. In 1954 in total 797 Russian aliens were registered in Glasgow.

⁹¹ Compare Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 438.

National Candidate, realising their duties to the country.”⁹² And Maurice Olsberg, the chairman of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, in an unusual gesture “offered the congratulations of the Council to Mr. M. Bloch on his splendid fight.”⁹³ It may be argued that the Jewish Echo comment was not correct. Compared to Conservatives and Unionists elsewhere, Bloch did not do particularly well. During the 1931 elections the Labour vote in Britain in general collapsed and in Glasgow most Unionists made large gains. In addition, the Gorbals result was influenced by the Communists who had fielded Harry McShane as a candidate and won 2,626 votes (7.9%). The 1935 result puts Bloch’s gains in perspective. In that year his share of the votes shrunk to 5,824 votes (19.1%)⁹⁴.

This is not to say that Bloch did not win any Jewish votes for the Unionists or that his gains in 1931 did not represent a growing support for Bloch among the Jews in the Gorbals. During the early 1930s a number of issues could have influenced the behaviour of Jewish voters. First of all there were the traditional concerns about the position of aliens, shechita⁹⁵ and education. The alien issue, for example, had led in 1905 to the Council of the United Synagogue of Glasgow sending letters to local MP’s “drawing their attention to the grave defects of the bill, and the injustice which would be caused by the same, if it passed into law.”⁹⁶ During and after the First World War the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council intervened on behalf of Jewish aliens in Glasgow; during the early 1920s it provided certificates for aliens and later the naturalisation of certain groups of aliens, such as the Russian Jewish ex-servicemen, was an almost constant concern. As discussed in chapter 1, the alien issue was still important to Glasgow Jewry during the 1930s.

In addition there were growing worries about expressions of anti-Jewishness. Remarks from local politicians were regularly reported in the Jewish Echo. In January 1929, for example, it reported that David Kirkwood MP (ILP) had used the remark “that German Jew” when he spoke about Lord Melchett during a meeting in Glasgow. This remark was felt to be derogatory⁹⁷. And in 1931 a correspondent of the paper complained about tactlessness and intolerance of Labour speakers at election meetings. About one candidate it was reported that she said “I don’t know why the

⁹² JE 30/10/1931, see also JE 23/10/1931. During these elections the Tailors’ and Garment Workers’ Union organised a public meeting with Bloch, Buchanan and the Communist Harry McShane, but the paper did not report on that occasion.

⁹³ JE 1/11/1935, MBGJRC 12/11/1931.

⁹⁴ Compare Alderman, The Jewish Community in British Politics, p. 198.

⁹⁵ For an example see JE 9/11/1930. During the 1930 municipal elections John Murdoch who stood in Langside promised to look after Jewish interests mentioning shechita as one of these interests.

⁹⁶ SJAC, MBUSG 17/5/1905, compare entry for 21/6/1905. The initiative for the letter came from the Board of Deputies in London. Four Glasgow MP’s apparently did not reply.

⁹⁷ JE 11/1/1929.

Gorbals,” while manipulating her hands above her head (like Jews were believed to do), and then, turning to the Chairman, she smilingly remarked, “The Gorbals have been very generous to us, isn’t that so (...)”⁹⁸

It is not that the Jewish Echo was one-sided in condemning of Labour politicians, some were praised. Bailie James Watson, an independent Labour candidate in the Gorbals⁹⁹ was called an “old-established friend of Jews”, while there were similar words for Bailie John Henderson¹⁰⁰. In 1931 Henderson spoke at the opening of new premises of the Jewish branch of the British Legion promising that the Glasgow Corporation would do its best for all population groups. On this occasion he acknowledged the assistance he had received from Jews during the municipal elections, notably his first. Henderson’s constituency was the Langside ward, where he had won his seat in 1925¹⁰¹. Henderson “felt he was amongst friends” and said he was “almost a Jew”¹⁰². The Langside area had a significant middle-class Jewish population.

In addition, Palestine became an important issue for Jewish voters. This followed the publication of the Labour government’s White Paper on Palestine in 1930. This document, also known as the Passfield Paper after the colonial secretary Lord Passfield, formerly Sidney Webb, was compiled after the outbreak of violence in Palestine at the end of the 1920s. In the eyes of most Jews in Britain, the Paper seemed to blame the unrest in Palestine on the Jewish settlers there. Passfield wanted to restrict the number of Jewish immigrants and the amount of land Jews could purchase in Palestine. This was felt to be a contradiction of the promise in the Balfour declaration of 1917 and therefore an offence to Jews. A storm of protests against the Labour government broke out when the document was published. In June 1930 the GZO organised a meeting to protest against the White Paper at which Labour Town Councillor Dr. Simon Bennett proclaimed his faith in the “Jewish National Ideal” and denounced the government. Other Labour politicians did not stay far behind, James

⁹⁸ JE 30/10/1931, 6/11/1931. One of the politicians attacked in the letter was George Buchanan which led to a further letter from one his supporters pointing out that Buchanan had defended Emanuel Shinwell when he was said to have been attacked in the Commons in 1923 by Sir G. Hamilton.

⁹⁹ GH 9/11/1930. Watson had been a Labour member of the Town Council for the Gorbals from 1921. As a result of a dispute in the Labour party he stood as an independent candidate in 1930, but lost the seat to the official Labour candidate Daniel Boyle. Boyle received 3,159 votes, Watson 2,423. The Moderates got 2,604 votes and the Communists (McShane) 543. The total municipal electorate in the Gorbals ward in November 1930 was 19,287. It is unclear whether the Palestine issue, as discussed below, played a role in the Labour dispute. Watson supported Jewish protests against the Labour government.

¹⁰⁰ JE 31/10/1930. See also JE 14/11/1930.

¹⁰¹ SRA, C 8/3, Domesday Book of Glasgow Members of Council. He resigned his seat in 1946 when he became MP for Cathcart, another constituency in which Jewish voters could have influenced the outcome of the elections. Henderson was Bailie from 1930 to 1933.

¹⁰² JE 29/5/1931.

Watson called the government's paper a "serious blunder"¹⁰³. At the height of the protests in Britain in November 1930 the government opened negotiations with Jewish groups, leading to a reconciliatory letter from Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald in February 1931 which, at least temporarily, defused the issue. But perhaps the damage had already been done. The Jewish Echo had started an anti-Labour campaign, despite friendly words for some Labour politicians, and declared its support for Bloch.

During the 1935 parliamentary elections the Jewish Echo did not openly support a candidate. By that time the Jews were more openly divided amongst themselves on the Palestine issue. The Poale Zion, a Socialist Zionist group, while not always happy with the official Labour policy on restriction of Jewish immigration in Palestine, issued a statement in favour of Labour candidates. Bloch reacted with a vague letter in the Jewish Echo stating that he was "in favour of the maximum number of Jewish immigrants being allowed in Palestine"¹⁰⁴. All these issues mentioned above could have led Jews to vote for Bloch, but in particular the events surrounding the White Paper, in addition to the reports about anti-Jewish remarks from some Labour politicians and the public Jewish support for Bloch could have contributed to the Unionist gains in the Gorbals in 1931.

If many in the Gorbals voted for Bloch, they went against the trend in British Jewry as mentioned above. Bloch was a typical wealthy Conservative but not a typical Jewish politician of the 1930s. It is unknown why he persisted in contesting the Gorbals ward. If he really wanted to pursue a political career, it would have been better to stand elsewhere. Did he really believe that he could beat George Buchanan in the Gorbals? It seems unlikely. Bloch could have had a variety of reasons to be stubborn. It is possible that he wanted to spoil Buchanan's predictable victories. Maybe he was simply a Unionist who had the means to stand as a candidate and his candidacy had nothing to do with him being a Jew, in which case his political career does not throw any light on the political dimensions of Glasgow Jewry apart from showing that Jews belonged to different parties and that such parties were prepared to accept Jewish members. But perhaps it was thought that a Jewish Unionist was likely to be less liable to be totally rejected in the Gorbals than a non-Jewish Unionist candidate. It is also possible that Bloch wanted to offer the Jews in the Gorbals a Jewish alternative. Or maybe he wished to show to non-Jews that not all Jews were political radicals.

Perhaps vanity and the pursuit of personal recognition were his motives. Bloch, already a Justice of the Peace (JP), was rewarded for his persistence and services to the Unionist party when he received a knighthood in 1937. To celebrate the honour

¹⁰³ Jewish Leader 6/6/1930, 7/11/1930; compare JE 29/8/1930, 31/10/1930, 7/11/1930; MBGJRC 13/11/1930. The Jewish Echo also had an interview with Michael Marcus MP who disagreed with "the ban on the immigration of working men to Palestine".

¹⁰⁴ JE 8/11/1935.

which was conferred upon its leader that year the executive of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council decided to organise a dinner. One representative objected to the idea of a dinner. This was Alex Marcovitch, the delegate of the Workers' Circle which naturally opposed the Unionist party. He said that the Council was "going beyond its scope in a public recognition of Mr. Bloch."¹⁰⁵

Marcovitch represented the other end of the political spectrum, namely the radical left and he was probably a Communist. This party won some Jewish support in England¹⁰⁶. Did something similar happen in Glasgow? As table 6 shows, the Communists on several occasions took part in the parliamentary elections in the Gorbals. In 1922 John Maclean got 4,027 votes (13.3%), in 1931 Harry McShane received 2,626 (7.9%) and in 1948 Peter Kerrigan won 4,233 (16.9%), the last year represented the high-water mark of the party's popularity¹⁰⁷. The question is how many Jews voted for the Communist candidates.

There are no figures on the strength of Jewish support for the Communists in Glasgow, but there is some evidence to suggest that a number of Jews in Glasgow joined the Communist party and its predecessors. Little is known about actual support for the Russian Bolsheviks among the Jewish immigrants in Glasgow, but there were some Jews among the Glaswegians who cheered the Russian Revolution in 1917. There were of course many people in the Left who welcomed the overthrow of the Czar but Jews had a special reason to celebrate the downfall of the Czar as he was often associated with anti-Jewish measures and pogroms. Some Jews openly sympathised with the Bolshevik revolution which followed the overthrow of the Czar. William Gallagher as follows remembered Emanuel Shinwell on the occasion of a 1917 demonstration in Glasgow:

"The demonstration went off with gusto (...) the best, and strongest, speech came from my pal Manny Shinwell. He too was pleased at the overthrow of the Czar, but he wanted to see the same thing happen here. He tore into the robber parasites in this country and left them stark naked before the eyes of a thoroughly receptive audience. 'They're squirming now' he exclaimed, 'but before we're finished we'll make their teeth rattle.'¹⁰⁸

Gallagher made this observation in 1966, almost fifty years after the event, which might have influenced his recollection, but there is little doubt that the news of the events in Russia had a great impact on the immigrants and that the radicals among them

¹⁰⁵ MBGJRC 18/5/1937, 6/10/1937; JE 14/5/1937, 25/6/1937. At the next meeting of the Council, Marcovitch was replaced by another representative of the Workers' Circle. In the late 1930s he went to Spain to join the International Brigade.

¹⁰⁶ JE 3/1/1936, 12/6/1936. In that year he defended the Communist point of view during a meeting of a Zionist youth organisation.

¹⁰⁷ Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account, p. 443.

¹⁰⁸ W. Gallagher, The Last Memoirs of William Gallagher, London, 1966, pp. 100-101.

sympathised with the revolutionaries. Some immigrants, such as the members of the leftist Bund in Eastern Europe who in Glasgow might have joined the Workers' Circle, returned to Russia to join the revolution. Exact numbers are unknown, but this must only have concerned a minority of the immigrants. Despite the sympathy felt for the revolution, the majority of the immigrants, when given the opportunity to return to Russia decided to remain in Glasgow and await further events¹⁰⁹.

The events in Russia encouraged some persons to join the radicals. Among them was Rose Klasko (she later married Peter Kerrigan), the young daughter of an immigrant tailor who had come to Glasgow after living in Dublin. Shortly after the First World War Rose Klasko became a member of the Socialist Labour Party and she was among the founder members of the Communist Party in 1920¹¹⁰. During the 1930s the Communists gained some support among young Jewish workers and intellectuals and Rose Kerrigan was joined by a few young men, like Alec Bernstein and Monty Berkley. They held party offices but did not become part of the regional or national leadership¹¹¹. The editor of the Jewish Echo regarded them as "hot heads"¹¹². It is possible that the development in the Soviet Union appealed to these men, but it was mostly the outspokenness of the Communists in Scottish matters which gave the CP credibility in their eyes.

It is possible that the Communist opposition to the activity of Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists influenced Jews. In 1936, for example, the Communists took an active part in public meetings organised by the Workers' Circle, reportedly to counteract Mosley's streetcorner assemblies¹¹³. It can be questioned whether the anti-Fascist public meetings were organised purely to defend Jewish interests. Earlier, in 1934, similar attempts had been made to block Fascist meetings, but at that time there was no specifically Jewish involvement¹¹⁴ and there is little evidence of anti-

¹⁰⁹ So far research on this subject has mainly concentrated on England and London. See Alderman, The Jewish Community in British Politics, ; W.J. Fishman, East End Jewish Radicals 1875-1914, London, 1975; S. Kadish, Bolsheviks and British Jews. The Anglo-Jewish Community, Britain and the Russian Revolution, pp. 209-210, 228. It is also difficult to say how many Jews returned voluntarily to Russia (see chapter 1). The Glasgow branch of the Workers' Circle reported that as a result of repatriations their total number of members dwindled to 28, which suggests that probably about one dozen but not more than two dozen of the Glasgow members returned either forcefully or voluntarily to Russia. Kadish writes about Shinwell (p. 236) that his father moved the family to the Gorbals, not the East End, and she calls 31st January 1919 "Black Friday" instead of "Red" or "Bloody Friday".

¹¹⁰ "Rose Kerrigan, 'We Just Want to get Something for the Working Class...'", in Generations of Memories. Voices of Jewish Women, London, 1989, pp.48-76.

¹¹¹ SJAC, Oral History Project, interviews A. Bernstein and M. Berkley.

¹¹² JE 3/7/1936, 10/7/1936, 17/7/1936. See also JE 25/9/1936, 3/6/1938, 5/5/1939.

¹¹³ JE 29/5/1936. The meetings were reportedly held in working class districts. Other organisations reported to have taken part included trade unions, the ILP and the Friends of the Soviet Union.

¹¹⁴ GH 28/6/1934, 25/10/1934.

Jewishness being expressed by Mosley's followers at this time¹¹⁵. Furthermore, it can be argued that Mosley's organisation remained peripheral in Glasgow¹¹⁶. Nevertheless, the Jewish communal leadership in general was careful not to be associated with the 1936 anti-Fascist demonstrations, but several youth groups enthusiastically joined the organizers.

More serious were some anti-Jewish incidents in Glasgow and the Jewish support for Communists may have been a reaction to the communal leadership's alleged lack of initiative when these incidents occurred. In 1934, for example, anti-Jewish posters appeared in Glasgow in connection with the Jewish ownership of cinemas in the city. At a vacant piece of land next to a cinema in Shawlands a poster was put up with the message "Good news for the Jews. Site for the New Semitic Picture. Proprietor A. Hitler."¹¹⁷ The communal leadership regarded the posters as being more stupid than malicious and advised that they should therefore be neglected, the suggestion being that the signs were put up by jealous competitors of Jewish cinema owners. As more signs appeared on bill boards in the city centre, the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council tried to use quiet diplomacy to influence politicians like Bailie Henderson, hoping that they would use, for example, their power to issue licences to stop the poster campaign. To some it appeared as if the Council was not doing anything while groups like the Gorbals' Branch of the Young Communist League and the Workers' Circle held public protests to demand from police and Town Council that action should be taken¹¹⁸.

↙ This may have attracted some young Jews to the Communists¹¹⁹ and some joined the CP during the 1930s, but on the whole the Communist view on Judaism and Zionism antagonised Jewish groups which otherwise might have become even further involved in joint anti-Fascist activity. Several discussions took place between different groups to form a united front, including the Communists, but eventually their points of view remained too far apart¹²⁰. The Workers' Circle, however, was drawn into the Communist camp. This did not happen without conflicts. In 1945 the secretary of the Circle resigned being "sick and disgusted with the vested interests of individuals who

¹¹⁵ H. Maitles, "Fascism in the 1930s: The West Of Scotland in the British Context", in Scottish Labour History Journal, number 27 (1992), pp. 7-22. The results of Maitles' thesis "Anti-Semitism in Scotland 1914-1945" (M.Phil, University of Strathclyde, 1992), unfortunately came too late to be discussed here. Compare JE 25/9/1931. In 1931 Mosley was interviewed by the Jewish Echo saying that his party was not anti-Semitic.

¹¹⁶ See J. Brown's review of C. Holmes, Anti-Semitism in Britain, 1876-1939 (London, 1979) in Scottish Historical Review, volume LX (1981), p. 86.

¹¹⁷ JE 24/8/1934.

¹¹⁸ JE 1/11/1935, 8/11/1935, 6/3/1936, 13/3/1936, 23/10/1936. Compare MBGJRC for the same period.

¹¹⁹ See for example the discussion in the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council on the United Jewish Youth Movement in MBGJRC 18/4/1939, 27/4/1939, 4/2/1940, 18/4/1940.

¹²⁰ JE 3/7/1936, 10/7/1936, 17/7/1936, 25/9/1936. The athlete Max Rayne, for example, appears to have had initial Communist sympathies, but later turned against them stressing the importance of Palestine as a solution to Jewish problems rather than Communism.

have no conception of working class unity (...) I am an idealist (...) my efforts are simply a waste of time. I might take a more active part in my trade union and also in the Labour party.”¹²¹ For a while the Glasgow branch of the Workers' Circle was much more pro-Communist than the national leadership in London¹²².

✓ The Second World War and the contribution of the Soviet Union to the defeat of Germany further raised sympathy for the Communists. When George Buchanan resigned his seat in parliament in 1948 to become Chairman of the National Assistance Board, the sympathy for the Communists formed the background of the unprecedented 16.9% of the votes which the Communist won in the Gorbals by-election. There were of course other factors, such as the relative unfamiliarity of the new Labour candidate. It is possible that Jewish voters contributed to the Communist share of the votes in 1948 and that their sympathy for the Communists was larger than among non-Jews. Perhaps they had made a similar contribution in 1922. During the October revolution, the 1930s and the Second World War the Communists appeared to be fighting the same enemies as the Jews in general and this could have influenced the Jewish electorate in the Gorbals.

If so, there was among the Jewish immigrants in Glasgow a remarkable difference between the issues in which Jewish politicians were interested and the issues which influenced the Jewish voters, with a possible exception in 1931. Politicians like Greenberg, Galpern and Shinwell appear to have been occupied by general, not Jewish issues. It is possible that they sought not to emphasise their Jewishness and that this was a result of a negative non-Jewish attitude towards Jewish politicians. In this there may be a parallel with the striving for respectability and civic acceptability among the Glasgow Jews in general. Bloch was not a typical Jewish politician of the 1930s, but more resembled the Jewish Conservatives of the 1920s. None of the Jewish politicians in or from Glasgow represented the Jewish population in the city, although Simons and Bloch would do so, but not in their function as politician. Prior to the 1930s, Jewish groups in Glasgow only on a few occasions tried to influence politicians. This most concerned the position of aliens and Jewish education (discussed in chapters 1 and 4). During the 1930s the communal leadership of Glasgow Jewry sought to influence politicians, but preferably not by means of public activity. During the decade before the Second World War some Jewish groups attempted to influence politicians on the

¹²¹ University of Sheffield Archives, Zaidman papers, folder f, letter M. Goodman to L. Zaidman 22/12/1945.

¹²² University of Sheffield Archives, Zaidman papers, folder f, letters Bernstein to Zaidman n.d., Goodman to Zaidman 22/12/1945, Zaidman to Goodman 18/12/1945, Goldberg to Zaidman 10/7/1949, 13/2/1950. The Glasgow branch got involved in a conflict with the London headquarters. After that this enthusiasm disappeared. Compare Smith, “Jews and Politics in the East End of London”, in Cesarani, The making of Modern Anglo-Jewry, p. 161. In London the local Workers Circle had a similar radical character. Smith writes that the East End branch was known as the “Communist branch”.

issues of anti-Jewishness, Fascism and Palestine. This issues might also have influenced the behaviour of Jewish voters.

The growing importance of the Palestine issue coincided with the rise of Zionism. The term Zionism is used here in two ways. It means the idea of the return of the Jews to Eretz Israel, the historical Land of Israel with its ancient capital Jerusalem (Zion). Zionism is also a movement which consists of various organisations which subscribe to this idea. This movement provided the Jews in Glasgow with an ideology and organisations to operate in the political world.

The Zionist organisations were shaped by local circumstances, but the development of Zionism in Glasgow can be reviewed in the larger framework of British Zionism. In England Zionism grew from small beginnings at the end of the 19th century to a movement which infiltrated most Jewish communal institutions and which began to dominate Jewish life during the Second World War¹²³. Stuart Cohen and Cesarani¹²⁴ show how Anglo-Jewry on the eve of the First World War was largely divided in two groups, one for and one against Zionism, with a large uncommitted third group in the middle. Anglo-Jewish leaders, wealthy older settlers and their descendants, were often to be found in the anti-Zionist group. Upcoming middle class immigrants usually belonged to the pro-Zionist group. The struggle between the two groups was also a fight for the Anglo-Jewish communal leadership. Zionism provided an ideology on which the immigrant group could base its claim to power.

Zionism was more, because it also proved to be an answer to modern problems. Lipman¹²⁵ describes how during the 1930s Anglo-Jewry faced three challenges. First there was the question whether it should get involved in government policy over the British administration in Palestine. Secondly, it had to react to the rise of Nazism and Fascism. And thirdly, Anglo-Jewry had to find solutions for the problems created by the arrival in Britain of a growing number of Jewish refugees from Germany. Traditionally, Anglo-Jewish leaders would meet such challenges with a moderate policy of a low public profile and work behind the scenes. During the 1930s the Anglo-Jewish leaders came under a lot of pressure from the radical Left for aggressive public activity. The upcoming immigrant leaders might previously have been inclined to take a radical line, but now they were becoming the office-bearers and therefore they opted for a policy which combined traditional moderation with Zionism. Furthermore, Zionism filled a gap in Jewish life which traditional religion was no longer able to fill.

¹²³ Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, pp. 119-137.

¹²⁴ A. Stuart Cohen, English Zionists and British Jews: The Communal Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1895-1920, Princeton (New Jersey), 1982, p. 285; D. Cesarani, "The Transformation of Communal Authority in Anglo-Jewry, 1914-1940," in Cesarani, The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry, pp. 115-140.

¹²⁵ Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, pp. 173-174, 197-198.

Kokosalakis and Krausz¹²⁶ find that in Liverpool and Leeds during the interwar years religion and the role of the congregations in the centre of local Jewish life were replaced by Zionism and Zionist organisations.

The development of Zionism in Glasgow showed differences as well as similarities with the development of Zionism in England and the Zionist organisations in Glasgow possessed several Scottish characteristics. There is a myth about the Jews in Glasgow being among the most loyal supporters of Zionism in Britain. Take, for example, the following contemporary statement of Denis Cohen, director of the firm D. & H. Cohen and former chairman of the Glasgow branch of the Joint Israel Appeal (JIA), which together with the Jewish National Fund (JNF) form at present the main Zionist fundraising bodies in Britain.

“For those who have been financially successful in life, giving some money away is no big deal, but to sacrifice when you have little is magnificent. People came to our office at Queen Square (during the Six-Day War in 1967). Old-age pensioners, people with very little, who donated part of their pension. Others brought jewellery - trinkets and pieces of silver. I will never forget those days. I will give you a figure. In 1966 our income had been £41,000 and this rose to £357,000 in 1967. That is what Glasgow Jewry did for Israel. (Every year) the Glasgow target was well surpassed. It always reached its target. Glasgow is an outstanding community. People are warm and generous and understanding - they came from Eastern Europe and because of their history and traditions they were able to convey the importance of Palestine to their children.”¹²⁷

Cohen's statement is important because it reflects a collective idea. He says that successful businessmen like himself but also ordinary people were involved in fundraising, traditionally the main Zionist activity in Scotland. He also says that fundraising was so successful because the character of the movement in Glasgow was very Eastern European.

The statement also reflects the idea that the older settlers and their descendants, showed much less enthusiasm for the Zionist cause than the immigrants. In reality the development of Glasgow Zionism went through several stages. During the first stage, the older settlers played a significant role in the movement, at this stage more important than immigrant workers and businessmen. The attitude of the older settlers towards the Zionist idea differed slightly from that of the immigrants. This led to conflicts which were connected to the wider confrontation between older settlers and immigrants, the various aspects of which have been described in previous chapters.

The first stage, dominated by the older settlers, can be situated between 1891 and 1914. After that, the role of the older settlers in general diminished. The Balfour

¹²⁶ Kokosalakis, *Ethnic Identity and Religion*, pp. 144-145; Krausz, *Leeds Jewry*, pp. 19-20.

¹²⁷ JE 28/9/1990.

declaration in 1917 heralded a new and very optimistic stage in the development of Glasgow Zionism which lasted until the middle of the 1920s. By that time, the movement was almost completely in the hands of immigrants. The third stage started late in the 1920s. At the beginning of that stage a new leadership appeared. After 1933 the optimism which characterised the second stage however gave way to growing anxiety and alarm. This third stage ended with the establishment of the Jewish state in 1948.

During the first stage, religion played an important role. Originally Zionism is part of Jewish religious thought. It is embedded in various prayers which express the hope to return to Israel. This return is connected to the arrival of the Messiah, who will summon all the Jews to Israel. To make aliyah, that is to emigrate to Israel, might quicken the arrival of the Messiah. During the 19th century a new and increasingly more political and secular rather than religious movement grew up, first in Eastern Europe and later in Middle and Western Europe where it culminated in Theodor Herzl's Zionist Congress in 1897 which formed the breakthrough of the movement in Western Europe¹²⁸.

Organised Zionist activity in Glasgow started at the end of the 19th century when on the initiative of some members of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation the preacher Chaim Maccoby lectured about Zionism in Garnethill synagogue and the Gorbals' Main Street synagogue in April 1891¹²⁹. On this occasion the first Zionist group in Glasgow was formed. This was a local branch of the Chovevei Zion, the Lovers of Zion. The group further named itself a "Society for Colonising Palestine by Jewish Emigrants". The Chovevei Zion held mainly philanthropic activities in favour of settling poor Jews from Eastern Europe in Palestine.

Most older settlers in Glasgow could not envisage themselves as emigrating to Palestine, but the object of the settlement of the Eastern European poor in Palestine rather than Britain might have seemed a good solution to the rapidly growing immigration problems in the United Kingdom. These problems also existed in Glasgow. At this time the presence of many poor immigrants in Glasgow was a heavy burden on the congregational facilities. It is therefore not surprising that following Maccoby's visit, some Garnethill members took a leading role in the Glasgow Chovevei Zion group.

Not all Garnethill members supported the group because of self-interested reasons. One of the Garnethill clergymen, the Rev. Isaac Levine, offered his wholehearted support to Chovevei Zion declaring that the organisation was "the means to an end, namely the final restoration of Palestine"¹³⁰. He thereby emphasised the religious

¹²⁸ For this perspective see S. Avineri, The making of Modern Zionism. The Intellectual Origins of the Jewish State, London, 1981; W. Laqueur, A History of Zionism, London/New York, 1976.

¹²⁹ Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 74, see also pp. 9-10, 73-75, 117-119, 119-128, 201-204, 215-219.

¹³⁰ Quoted in Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 74.

aspect of the return of the Jewish people to their native land, which would have appealed to some members of Garnethill. Perhaps Levine had the encouragement of wide-spread settlement in Palestine in mind. Not all men at Garnethill thought alike. Some were genuine supporters of Zionism, others followed hesitatingly.

Significantly, Levine made his statement in the Gorbals. The situation among the immigrants was different from that at Garnethill. On the whole, the immigrants were able to envisage a return of the Jewish people to Palestine, although most of them did not expect themselves to be part of that return. During this period only a few immigrants and their families went to the Holy Land.

The opposition to Zionism arose at Garnethill. When the movement grew a few older settlers started to oppose Zionism on the grounds that the movement would estrange them from Britain. As a result, the Garnethill leadership was ambivalent about Zionism. This ambivalence was personified by Adolph Schoenfeld who belonged to different groups at the same time. He was active in the Anglo-Jewish Association, an organisation found in the 19th century with the object to elevate Jewish life with a very strong emphasis on patriotism¹³¹. As a member of this Association Schoenfeld should have been an opponent of Zionism, but contrary to that, he became branch commander of the Chovevei Zion. Another leading Garnethill member who actively supported Zionism was Jacob Kramrisch who was active in the Naturalisation Society, which aimed to settle Jews as British citizens rather than as inhabitants of Palestine.

Following the first Zionist Congress in 1897 where the foundation for the international organisation was laid, Zionist enthusiasm in Glasgow grew. Large public meetings were held, on one occasion attracting two thousand people. New fundraising and cultural groups were found, including a fashionable Zionist Cycling and Athletic Club. The first local umbrella organisation to be formed was the Glasgow Zionist Association with Schoenfeld as President. In 1906 the annual conference of the Federated Societies of the Zionist Movement in Great Britain and Ireland was held in Glasgow, the first time the conference came to Scotland.

By that time the Zionists were deeply divided on the territorial question. The British government had offered the Zionists territory in Uganda for a Jewish homeland where refugees from Russia could be settled. This caused a dilemma. Traditionally, Zionism had centred on settlement in Palestine and the return of the Jewish people there was the ultimate goal of the movement. Should the British offer be accepted in order to relieve the problem of the refugees? Was this a first step towards settlement in Palestine? Should the movement wait until the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine or should other parts of the world, like Uganda, be colonised first in order to create a haven for refugees? Would the offer jeopardise settlement in Palestine and

¹³¹ See for example JC 20/1/1871.

should it therefore be rejected? These questions, which dominated the Glasgow conference¹³², were also debated within the Glasgow organisations. Eventually the issue split the Zionist Congress and the Glasgow organisations.

In Glasgow the conflict took a particular shape. Zionist leaders who came from the ranks of the older settlers confronted Zionist leaders of immigrant origin. On one side stood the Bnei Zion group, which had been established at the end of the 19th century. More than the Chovevei Zion, Bnei Zion laid emphasis on political means to realise the Zionist ideal. During the first years of the 20th century immigrants gained the upper hand in the Bnei Zion and elected Percy Baker as their leader. Baker had earlier co-operated with Schoenfeld in the establishment of the Glasgow Zionist Association¹³³. On the other side stood the Glasgow Dorshei Zion, a group founded in 1903 by Kramrisch and Pinto when the Bnei Zion failed to appoint representatives of the older settlers, including themselves, as delegates to the International Zionist Congress. Dorshei Zion was in favour of a territorial solution like the Uganda scheme. It was a conflict with many aspects, including cultural differences. The immigrants in Bnei Zion followed the Russian Zionists who rejected the Uganda scheme and favoured settlement building in Palestine. The older settlers were obviously looking for practical solutions for the immigrant problem in Britain. Not only was the presence of a large group of poor immigrants a heavy burden on congregational facilities, it was probably also felt that this presence could harm the social status of the Jews in Britain. During this period the debate on the Aliens Bill took place and the leaders of the older settlers might have feared that the anti-alien propaganda could also be directed at them. In addition there was the wider conflict between older settlers and immigrants within the United Synagogue of Glasgow (described in chapter 2).

In various ways the two groups tried to sabotage each other's activities. The Garnethill executive ruled, for example, in 1904 that no representatives would be sent to a demonstration of the Bnei Zion¹³⁴. And in May 1906 Pinto and his territorialist followers of Dorshei Zion, now renamed Am Israel (People of Israel), managed to get a Bnei Zion meeting adjourned by talking out the debate. During the same month the breakup of the United Synagogue took place.

Although the territorialists remained active in Glasgow, it was the Bnei Zion group who eventually gained the upper hand. Kramrisch left Glasgow early in the 20th century and Pinto died in 1911. Zionist leadership in general shifted towards the

¹³² GH 15/1/1906. The question had become pressing after pogroms in Russia caused a new wave of refugees. The Zionist leader Chaim Weizman who was reported to have spoken in Yiddish at the Glasgow conference proposed a vote of confidence in the leadership of the international Zionist Organisation which was to solve the problem. Eventually settlement outside Palestine was rejected.

¹³³ JE 20/4/1928. He later moved to London, where he died.

¹³⁴ SJAC, MBG 11/12/1904.

immigrants. Other men entered the leadership. Among them were later communal leaders like Samuel Grasse, Alec Easterman, Joseph Sachs, Abraham Haase, Abraham Links, Zevi Golombok, Harry Furst and Herzl Shulman¹³⁵. Most of these men were small businessmen and workshop owners, a few were students or university graduates. Among them were idealists as well as men who sought recognition of their social status. Although new groups were founded, like the Poale Zion (1907) and the Young Men's Zionist Cultural Association (1908), the enthusiasm generated by the early Zionist Congresses was lost. During the First World War the activity of the Bnei Zion were somewhat eclipsed (attempts in 1919 to revive the organisation by Grasse remained unsuccessful).

Zionist activity during these years was mostly of theoretical and cultural nature. Few Jews from Glasgow emigrated to Palestine at this time. Those who went, like Rabbi Abraham Shyne, usually went for religious reasons. Or they combined religious motives with the wish to retire in the Holy Land, like Isaac and Rose Lazarus who came from Minsk and had worked a few years in Glasgow as tobacconists before they left in 1896 for Palestine. Among the local Zionist groups there was only one organisation with the practical aim of emigration to Palestine. This was the Glasgow Agudas Olei Zion¹³⁶ which supported a scheme for the settlement of Glasgow families in a co-operative in Palestine.

The group was established in 1908 or early in 1909 by a handful of immigrants. Each paid annually £6 into a central fund (the amount was believed to be the equivalent of a monthly salary) to save for his family to be re-settled in Palestine. Although the group members were warned about the difficult circumstances in Palestine, they pledged: "This is far better for us than to live in the Diaspora (...) We wish to live as free men on our national land, to work for our children and our people."¹³⁷ In 1912 four families left Glasgow and embarked for Palestine. Among these pioneers were Abraham Brazinski, aged 37, a cigarette-maker and treasurer of the group; Abraham Sunderland, an older man and tailor by profession; Lewis Koorsh, a shoemaker who was accompanied by his wife and six children; and 37-year-old Yehuda Leib Goodman who went with wife and five children (one of whom a 3-months old baby). Of Goodman some more details are known. He was said to be a Socialist Zionist who had arrived in Britain in 1904.

The men were all manual workers. They claimed to have some knowledge in

¹³⁵ Compare JC 13/2/1914; JE 5/11/1937, 20/12/1938, 27/1/1939. Furst left in 1914 for Palestine, but later returned to Glasgow.

¹³⁶ The information on the Glasgow Agudas Olei Zion is taken from A. Gutman, A Story of a Dream. The Aliyah of the "Oleh Zion" from Glasgow to Merchavia, Ramat Efal, 1990 (in Hebrew, I would like to thank Mrs. B. Naftalin for her translation of the Hebrew text); compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 128.

¹³⁷ Letter 1911 quoted in Gutman, Story of a Dream, p. 28.

agricultural work and skills which were deemed necessary in Palestine: "There are among us blacksmiths, carpenters able to make carts and those who know how to harness horses."¹³⁸ Life in Palestine was harder than expected and shortly after their arrival Brazinski and Sunderland¹³⁹ were forced to return to Glasgow. The Glasgow group also got into conflict with the Jewish National Fund about the amount of land which it was allowed to purchase in order to set up their co-operative (for an envisaged twenty families). The question remained theoretical as the Agudas Olei Zion seems to have ceased to exist later in 1912 when five families left the group and demanded their money back. The end of the small group also symbolised the end of the first stage in the development of Zionism in Glasgow.

Glasgow Zionism during this first stage was therefore inspired by religion and developments in the secular international Zionist movement but characterised by local factors such as the differences between older settlers and immigrants. Garnethill members were motivated by religion, their drive for respectability and fear of anti-Jewishness. Immigrants brought their Eastern European aspirations and beliefs with them but here also the striving for respectability can be seen at work. Although the two groups worked together for a while, their backgrounds and ideologies clashed. On the eve of the First World War Glasgow Zionism was looking for new inspiration.

The war period saw a general upsurge in nationalism, in Britain and elsewhere. One significant result of the First World War was the defeat of the Ottoman Empire and the occupation of Palestine by British troops. Palestine became a British mandate. This affected Jews in various ways. It stimulated Zionism in Britain. The increased Zionist activity and pressure on the government in London led to the Balfour Declaration in 1917. The announcement of the Declaration caused a new wave of enthusiasm and popular support for Zionism and heralded the second stage in the development of Zionism in Glasgow.

The events surrounding the Declaration also had repercussions for Glasgow Zionism. On the eve of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 the members of the Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation adopted a resolution saying that "the national hope of Jews is the establishment of a permanent home in Palestine." A new stage in the development of Glasgow Zionism had started and lasted until about the middle of the 1920s. This was reflected in the establishment of new organisations. In 1915 a Jewish National Movement Committee was founded in Glasgow and during the following year the Jewish

¹³⁸ Quoted in Gutman, Story of a Dream, p. 27.

¹³⁹ Compare JE 12/4/1929. In this obituary in the Jewish Echo, Abraham Brazinski was portrayed as an exemplary orthodox Jew, credited as a founder of the Oxford Street Synagogue. Later his son or nephew Ben Brazil (Brazinski, also related to Maurice Bloch) was among the founders of the Pollokshields Hebrew Congregation. Sunderland remained a Zionist leader in Glasgow. His son Joseph followed in his footsteps and also was a communal leader.

National Institute in Elgin Street was opened.

The Declaration also helped to overcome the opposition of some Garnethill members against Zionism. While the Queen's Park members endorsed the Balfour Declaration, some of the Garnethill members still had reservations. In November 1917 the Garnethill membership resolved to congratulate the British government for the "Declaration in favour of the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people" but only after an amendment added to the resolution "for those members of the Jewish people who desire it."¹⁴⁰ Bertie Heilbron, his brother Granville, Michael Simons and his half-brother P. B. Simons continued to oppose Garnethill participation in Zionist activity. But within the Garnethill leadership they were becoming a minority. By the time of the visit of Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann to the city in 1922 this group had to give up its opposition. It was resolved that the "Executive and Council (of the congregation) would welcome Dr. Weizman at the (Grand Hotel) and proceed to the Synagogue, and those who wished could attend any other functions during his stay."¹⁴¹ After that only token resistance against Zionism remained at Garnethill¹⁴².

In 1919, the Garnethill opponents of Zionism were unable to prevent representatives of their congregation from being sent to a newly formed Scottish Zionist Council presided over by Rabbi Salis Daiches of Edinburgh¹⁴³. Isaac Speculand and S.S. Samuel attended the meeting for the Garnethill congregation and were elected Chairman and Treasurer of the Council (Alex Easterman who had previously been active in the Jewish students' society and the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council became Secretary and his presence together with Speculand and Samuel shows a new alliance of religious and secular elements). The Council organised fundraising. A public meeting was held in the Gorbals. Later that year the Glasgow Zionist Association was founded¹⁴⁴ in an attempt to unite the different groups on a local level. Julius Samuel, the Honorary Secretary of the Garnethill Congregation, declared in his annual report in 1920: "Zionism (is) now beyond party politics but part of the future development of Judaism."¹⁴⁵

The movement also began to win popular support. Many new members flocked to the

¹⁴⁰ SJAC, MBG 25/11/1917.

¹⁴¹ SJAC, MBG 22/1/1922.

¹⁴² SJAC, MBG 1/11/1925, 19/11/1930, 7/12/1930. This came for example from P.B. Simons. Michael Simons, his half-brother, although personally equivocal about the idea of Zionism was prepared to take part in Zionist activities. Compare Collins, *Second City Jewry*, pp. 201-4, 215-216; SJAC, MPB 5/5/1938, 6/2/1936. Immigrant synagogues which had modelled themselves upon Garnethill did not resist Zionism. At the time of the Balfour declaration the Queen's' Park and South Portland Street congregations supported Zionism as did Pollokshields during the 1930s.

¹⁴³ SJAC, MBG 18/5/1919. The opposition motion was defeated with 6 against 14 votes.

¹⁴⁴ Collins, *Second City Jewry*, pp. 214-216.

¹⁴⁵ SJAC, Printed Financial Statement and Annual Report 1919-1920 in MBG.

Jewish National Institute. In 1923 the Jewish National Institute was joined by the Glasgow Jewish Young Men's Institute of the local branch of the Association of Jewish Ex-Service Men, formerly a non-Zionist organisation which now joined the ranks of the movement. The growing popular support was also reflected in the money collected for the Keren Hayesod or Palestine Foundation Fund, an international fundraising body set up by the JNF to carry out the Zionist aims in Palestine which were supposed to lead to large scale Jewish immigration there. From July to December 1921, 446 persons in Glasgow pledged to give £12,827 in regular donations (£1,581 had been paid by December), while the regular JNF income between July and October 1921 was £578¹⁴⁶. This figure means an average pledge of almost £30 which is another sign of the enthusiasm for Zionism at the time. Zevi Golombok's Jewish Voice, Glasgow Organ for Zionism and Local Jewish Affairs which appeared monthly in Yiddish, regularly published lists of contributors to the Fund. These included wealthy people in the city centre, the West End and the southern suburbs who could afford large sums of £100 to £200, but also numerous contributors in the Gorbals and the East End who managed to pledge substantial sums, sometimes up to £50 and occasionally even more. On the less affluent side of Apsley Place in the Gorbals, for example, one man pledged 5 guineas (by December he had given 1 guinea) and his wife promised another 5 guineas. Three members of one family in the Bridgegate pledged £20, a man in Govan Street £50 (£10 paid by December) and his wife £10 (£1 paid by December), and so on. At special occasions like marriages and bar mitzvah ceremonies extra donations were made.

The campaign was given the character of a people's movement. "The Jewish community of East and South of Glasgow have done very well," wrote Golombok, but "what about the community in the West?"¹⁴⁷ People had boxes in their homes in which small weekly contributions were put. They were saving up, as it were. About one fifth of the money came in this way. Golombok used the following example to show his readers what should be done.

"One of the collectors to the Keren Hayesod (...) called upon a fellow for his first subscription. The first reply was — 'Do you know that times are bad and it is hard for one to take out such a large sum.' (This man resides in a side turning in the South Side.) 'But, as you are here, please take a seat for a moment and I will see what I can do for you.' The man went to another room and returned with a little casket, saying 'Here you are'; and in reply to a further question by the collector said "I am a poor man and cannot afford a large sum to pay at one time, hence I drop in this casket every week as much as I can afford; please count the contents and give me a receipt for same.' The casket proved to contain 3s. 6d. more than his quarterly subscription. And in reply to the collectors 'Good-day,' he said, 'my pledge to my

¹⁴⁶ The Jewish Voice, number 6, December 1921.

¹⁴⁷ The Jewish Voice, number 1, July 1921.

nation is a pledge to God.' Well brethren, please copy."¹⁴⁸

As the examples suggests, religion was believed to be a major motive for donations. Golombok continued as follows:

"Now brethren, let no one be out of it (...) the Almighty God (...) will certainly not forgive those that forget or reject the rebuilding of the Holy Land and the return of the persecuted Jews to their settlement, Erez Israel. The coolness of some sons who reside in the western countries towards the 'Keren Hayesod' because they have settled there and are quite comfortable, is by no means an excuse why they should not subscribe and give their share. As a matter of fact it is not their share, it is His. Here is the reading of our sages: 'Give unto Him of what is His, seeing that thou and what thou hast is His.' And the return of the Jews to their Promised Land is the will of Him."¹⁴⁹

This fundraising suggests a growing optimism in the early 1920s about the realisation of the Zionist hope. During this period most people probably still regarded Palestine first of all as a haven for refugees from Eastern Europe where Jews were victims of persecution and disasters¹⁵⁰. But the large number of subscribers to the Keren Hayesod, the average amounts which were pledged, and the method of payment, might also indicate that many saw their contribution as an investment, expecting that a Jewish homeland would now be established in Palestine and that in the future they might themselves emigrate to that land. If this observation is correct it means that hundreds of immigrants in Glasgow did not regard their position in the city as permanent.

At this stage other aspects were added to Zionism in Glasgow. In 1924 the Glasgow Zionist Literary Society and the local Zionist Circle, previously called the Junior Zionist Organisation, amalgamated to form the Glasgow Zionist Literary Circle. The formation of yet another group was not so unusual, previously (about 1919-1920) a Zionist Study Circle had already existed, but now an effort was made to set up youth groups in order to give young people a role in "the renaissance of our people". Youth was a symbol of energy, life and hope. The Circle magazine, published by the group wrote. "(...) our Jewish Youth both in Glasgow and elsewhere, despite criticism to the

¹⁴⁸ The Jewish Voice, number 1, July 1921.

¹⁴⁹ The Jewish Voice, number 1, July 1921. Notwithstanding Golombok's reference to men only, the lists in his paper included many females registered as subscribers. The importance of religion in Zionism at this stage was also shown by the presence of many ministers, like Rabbi Salis Daiches in Scottish Zionist organisations, and the appointment of religious leader Isaac Speculand as the chairman of the Zionist Council, Speculand had just been involved in the foundation of the outspoken religious-Zionist Mizrachi group in Glasgow (see SJAC, MBG 26/1/1919). For a discussion of different Zionist groups see below.

¹⁵⁰ See for example SJAC, MBG 29/11/1925 when an appeal of the Federation of Ukrainean Jewry with a reference to the "terrible afflictions of our brethren in the Ukraine" was discussed during a general meeting.

contrary, continue to respond to the National Call.”¹⁵¹ Like other non-Zionist youth groups, the Circle had as one of its purposes the preservation of young people for Judaism, but here they were also given the task to revive or rebuild Judaism. The idea of a Jewish renaissance and the task of the Jewish youth as builders of Judaism would frequently return in future. The youth was becoming more important. The appearance of The Circle also marked a significant change in the aims of the movement in Glasgow. The Zionist groups had traditionally organised cultural activities, raised money and sent a small number of their members to Palestine; now it also became an instrument with which Judaism could be preserved at home.

The euphoria which followed the Balfour declaration did not last. Zionist plans got bogged down in Palestine settlement problems and politics. Economic problems in Scotland from 1922 onwards with the growing depression of the staple industries¹⁵² badly affected people's incomes. Just over a year after its first publication, the Jewish Voice folded. It had already stopped publishing lists of subscribers to the Keren Hayesod. According to the last list, published in April 1922, almost a year after the start of the campaign, more than one hundred persons had been unable or unwilling to pay their contributions, despite their pledge¹⁵³. In 1925 the Jewish National Institute split into a Jewish branch of the Royal British Legion and the Glasgow Jewish Institute (which during the thirties would make a successful move to South Portland Street). Both institutions lacked a Zionist image. Perhaps the lessening of the enthusiasm for the movement also meant that during the mid-1920s the immigrants and their families were preparing themselves to settle in Glasgow for a long period. Thereafter, Zionism remained part of Jewish life, but it would have a different character and another role in Glasgow Jewry.

A few new developments occurred during the late 1920s and they signify the start of the third stage in the development of Glasgow Zionism. A new leadership came into being, partly consisting of previous Zionists activists, partly recruited from a new generation of successful businessmen. Secondly, a certain amount of polarisation appeared within the movement resembling the party politics in general society. And thirdly, events outside Glasgow, like the rise of Nazism and the continuing problems in Palestine, influenced the local movement.

The new leadership emerged at the end of the 1920s when attempts were made to revive a central Glasgow Zionist institution. As the Jewish Echo observed, the

¹⁵¹ The Circle, number 2, October 1925. The first issue of the magazine appeared in September 1925. It was printed by Golombok.

¹⁵² Slaven, The Development of the West of Scotland, p. 182 et seq., see also previous chapter.

¹⁵³ The Jewish Voice, number 10, April 1922. The list had last been updated on 24th March. In total 13 issues of Jewish Voice appeared. It probably ceased to exist because of lack of advertising revenue.

movement had been in decline and needed new blood¹⁵⁴. To unite all the local groups, the Glasgow Zionist Organisation (GZO) was founded (the exact date of the establishment of the GZO is unknown, but this must have been around 1928). It took some years for the GZO to establish itself properly¹⁵⁵. The organisation was supposed to co-ordinate activities and to organise its own events, like public meetings. The GZO also created different sections, such as for women and young people. By 1935 the organisation could claim that during the previous year it had sold 1,381 shekelim (the Zionist shekel was sold at a price of one shilling and was regarded as annual subscription to the movement). This was said¹⁵⁶ to represent an increase of fifty per cent during the last two years. The growth of the organisation must have involved a substantial number of people. Six years earlier, in 1929, the complaint had been that “the work was left to merely a handful of Zionists.”¹⁵⁷

The new leadership of the Glasgow Zionists consisted of a small group of men¹⁵⁸. They were mostly businessmen. Their communal work was praised in reports on Zionist activity in the Jewish Echo and they were publicly honoured on several occasions. In 1936, for example, a function was organised in honour of Fred Nettler, president of the GZO (who had just been made a Justice of the Peace and also had the honour of presiding at the 36th annual conference of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland in London). During the same year the name of the treasurer of the JNF, N. Links, was inscribed in the Golden Book on the occasion of his silver wedding¹⁵⁹. What these two men had in common was that they combined their activity with an active business life. Nettler owned a large furrier business in the city and the wholesaler Links was just having a new six-story warehouse built in Wilson Street. They efficiently but perhaps less idealistically than their predecessors led the Zionist organisations in a similar way as they conducted their business. At this stage it appears as if businessmen like Nettler and Links dominated Glasgow Zionism. In a sense their position as Zionist leaders acknowledged the social position of these businessmen.

Underneath this leadership there was room for others to preside over sections and

¹⁵⁴ JE 20/1/1928. Compare Jewish Leader 21/3/1930.

¹⁵⁵ Compare Krausz, Leeds Jewry, pp. 19-20. The Leeds Zionist Council was formed about the same time.

¹⁵⁶ JE 1/11/1935. Compare JE 20/9/1933, 10/11/1933, 26/1/1934, 2/2/1934, 9/2/1934. In 1933, when a new co-ordination committee was formed, it was reported that during the past two years in total 2,800 shekels had been sold. Shortly after there was a drop in the sale, which probably rose and fell in accordance with international developments and growing and diminishing attention for events in Palestine.

¹⁵⁷ JE 5/4/1929. Nevertheless, during the year which ended in April 1929 £650 had been collected: a “substantial sum”.

¹⁵⁸ JE 3/1/1930. A correspondent of the Jewish Echo complained that rank and file of the movement were not consulted on important matters and called the GZO too elitist. Compare JE 12/10/1934. For differences between the GZO leaders and the editor of the Jewish Echo see below.

¹⁵⁹ JE 29/5/1936.

other organisations. A women's section was formed in 1928¹⁶⁰. This group, the Glasgow Ladies Zionist organisation later affiliated to WIZO, was headed by the relatively unknown Mrs. Selma Teitleman. Later she and her husband, a general practitioner, changed the name to Mann. Most committee members were wives of well-known communal leaders. The group had a difficult start at a meeting in Sloan's Cafe in Buchanan Street because of a "poor attendance"¹⁶¹, but quickly got down to work. Some 44 members were enrolled in one month. One of the first activities was the creation of a sewing class on Monday evenings in Mrs. Nettler's home and the sale of work in Geneen's Restaurant¹⁶². They decided during a drawing room meeting at the home of one of the ladies that "no toasts - as suggested by the men - would be necessary,"¹⁶³, thus showing a measure of independence and dislike of alcohol.

The ladies' section further organised social functions, often in the homes of their more affluent members, like a Garden Fete in 1933 in Abraham Goldberg's residence in Pollokshields which was opened by Abraham Links¹⁶⁴. Monthly meetings were held for members and money was raised for Zionist causes. During their third year, the ladies collected in total £482 (of which £148 went to the Women's Zionist Federation and £277 to the JNF). Apart from the income of social functions, the sale of work and occasional donations, 138 women paid an annual subscription of 10s. 6d. None of the subscribers lived in the Gorbals¹⁶⁵ which confirms the middle class status of this group.

The GZO was an umbrella organisation. It united different political groups. During the 1930s the divisions between these groups increased. The most powerful group consisted of the General Zionists. They had no particular political or religious colour, remained on the whole rather moderate, and were loosely organised. The leaders of the Glasgow General Zionists were middle class immigrants. This group could claim to represent the majority of the Glasgow shekel-holders because it won most votes during local Zionist elections. Other groups were the Mizrachi, Poale Zion and a small Jewish State Party which consisted of adherents of Vladimir Jabotinsky's more extreme revisionism movement. Revisionism, simply said, was in general more militant than

¹⁶⁰ JE 10/2/1928. See also SJAC, Minute Book Glasgow Ladies Zionist Organisation (cited hereafter as SJAC, MBGLZO).

¹⁶¹ SJAC, MBGLZO 3/9/1928. Compare JE 10/5/1968 which offered a more rosy picture.

¹⁶² SJAC, MBGLZO 26/11/1928, 13/12/1928.

¹⁶³ SJAC, MBGLZO 26/9/1928.

¹⁶⁴ JE 19/5/1933. The women copied the men in at least one respect. On an earlier occasion, when another Garden Fete took place at her home, Mrs. A. Goldberg was presented with a silver salver on the occasion of her silver wedding which could have been a sign of appreciation but was certainly also an acknowledgement of her social position.

¹⁶⁵ SJAC, Third Financial Statement (11/2/1930-6/3/1931) in MBGLZO; compare Balance Sheet 1942-1943 in MBGLZO. In ten years activities and income remained virtually unchanged, although ball evenings were a new item on the agenda.

mainstream Zionism and sought to create a Jewish homeland which would extend across the river Jordan.

The Jewish Echo reported in 1935¹⁶⁶ that during the election of 4 Glasgow representatives to the Zionist Congress in Lucerne, the General Zionists received 67.5% of the votes, Poale Zion 19.5% and the Mizrachi 13%. The British delegation consisted of 7 General Zionists, 3 Mizrachi members and 2 representatives from Poale Zion. At the Congress 450 delegates took part in the proceedings. During leadership elections at the Congress, the Poale Zion scored a victory with 57% of the votes. This suggests that the dominant element in Glasgow, as in Britain as a whole, consisted of the moderates, with the more extreme religious and Socialist elements in the minority; unlike the balance as shown at the Zionist Congress. The State Party did not participate in the Glasgow elections.

Although Jabotinsky remained a popular figure in Glasgow¹⁶⁷, the influence of the State Party and revisionism in general appear to have been marginal prior to 1939. One of the Glasgow revisionists was Harry Furst, a former member of Poale Zion, who had served with Jabotinsky during the First World War in a Jewish army unit. He was joined by a small group of young people, including Harry Crivan, a scientist who after the Second World War became President of the Glasgow Jewish Representative Council¹⁶⁸.

The Mizrachi emphasised the religious background of Zionism. The group echoed many of the contemporary complaints about the “drift of the youth” and the “general decadence in Jewish life” which is not surprising when its membership is taken in consideration. Throughout its existence it attracted many clergymen and leaders of the religious congregations. Jewish Echo editor Zevi Golombok felt close to the group and was often prepared to open his columns to Mizrachi spokesmen. The group was however not well organised. Numerous “reorganisations” and attempts to “revitalise”¹⁶⁹ the group suggest that the ministers and congregational leaders were unable to keep Zionist activities going for a long period.

The Mizrachi were involved in a struggle with the other more secular groups. Similar conflicts existed about education (see chapter 4). In 1930 this struggle formed the background for the foundation of the short-lived Jewish Leader. This weekly paper, edited and printed by Nathan Louvish, acted as a competitor to

¹⁶⁶ JE 26/7/1935.

¹⁶⁷ JE 3/2/1939, 10/3/1939. In 1939 he spoke at a mass meeting in the Jewish Institute.

¹⁶⁸ JE 5/9/1930, 17/3/1939; interview H. Crivan.

¹⁶⁹ JE 20/1/1933, 4/10/1935, 8/1/1937. Such an attempt came, for example, after 18 months of inactivity when in 1937 Mizrachi leader Herzl Shulman resigned to open the way for reorganisation. It was reported that his activities in Mizrachi, which he was said to have founded, spanned some 20 years. Shulman, an official at Queen's Park, was also involved in Hebrew education and the friendly society movement.

Golombok's Jewish Echo. Both papers supported Zionism, but the Leader paid more attention to the more secular Zionist groups. In addition the Leader favoured the Talmud Torah whereas the Echo supported the more orthodox system of Hebrew classes. The Leader also offered the Rev. M.S. Simmons of Garnethill an opportunity to express his modernist views¹⁷⁰. Louvish was a small printer, who lacked the financial means to publish a weekly paper. He received support from the leaders of the more secular groups, notably from the General Zionists. It is possible that Fred Nettler was directly behind the publication of the Jewish Leader¹⁷¹. Financial limitations must have ended his support after less than a year. Subsequently a reconciliation between the General Zionists and Golombok took place.

The General Zionists and the Mizrahi found each other on the same side in the opposition to Poale Zion. The conflict between these two sides was closely related to British politics and the British policy in Palestine. Poale Zion was a widespread organisation of Socialist Zionists. The organisation in Britain identified with the Labour party and the Glasgow branch of Poale Zion followed the British organisation in this. Unionist candidate Maurice Bloch was therefore not likely to get much support during the General Elections from the members of the Poale Zion.

The relation between Poale Zion and Labour in general was not always easy and the Zionist group did not follow Labour blindly, but serious problems arose for Poale Zion after the publication of the Labour government's White Paper in 1930 which followed the troubles in Palestine and proposed to limit Jewish immigration into Palestine¹⁷². Although the Poale Zion and many Labour politicians quickly distanced themselves from the document, the White Paper was used as a stick to hit Poale Zion. The Jewish Echo started an anti-Labour campaign on the issue. While the Glasgow branch of the Jewish Agency, like the JNF a fundraising body in Glasgow with General Zionist leaders, was congratulated for their public support for an Unionist candidate in the East Renfrewshire by-election¹⁷³ in 1930, Poale Zion was accused when it supported a

¹⁷⁰ Jewish Leader 14/3/1930. The subtitle of the paper was "A Newspaper and a magazine". The last issue appeared on 21/11/1930. Louvish's printing business in Gorbals' Main Street was called N. Lewis.

¹⁷¹ SJAC, Oral History Project, interview M. Louvish. Misha Louvish, son of the editor, says that his father started the paper after the Jewish Echo had portrayed Nettler and other General Zionist leaders in a bad way. This might concern the report on 3/1/1930 (see above).

¹⁷² JE 6/9/1929. Compare Robbins, The Eclipse of a Great Power, p. 114. The Palestine troubles to a certain extent contributed to the revival of interest in Zionism in Glasgow. In September 1929 a reported number of 3,000 persons attended a demonstration in the Coliseum to protest against the massacre of Jews in Palestine. At the same time there was a growing uneasiness about the British interests in Palestine. Robbins remarks that at this time an ambivalence towards the Empire permeated many levels of British society, the political left especially was becoming more critical of imperialism.

¹⁷³ JE 28/11/1930; compare Jewish Leader 14/3/1930. The support consisted of the canvassing of motor cars. Jewish Unionists also had their problems with their loyalties. At a meeting of the branch of the Agency in March 1930 Maurice Bloch said: "It was a great opportunity for British Jewry, for, through the means of the Agency, a British Jew could be more Jewish as a Jew and more British as a Britisher."

Labour candidate in the Whitechapel by-election during the same year. Poale Zion was blamed for supporting a Labour candidate rather than a Jewish Liberal who was known as a Zionist and therefore known as an opponent of the White Paper. Golombok, who followed the national Jewish Chronicle in his support for this Liberal Zionist, however omitted that the Labour candidate had stated that he would vote against the government if the White Paper was not amended, and it was not until after the Poale Zion had received this assurance that they gave him their support¹⁷⁴. The affair led to some angry exchanges in the Jewish Echo.

The issue brought Golombok into conflict with one of the most colourful local Poale Zion leaders. This was Dr. Lewis Rifkind, a general practitioner who moved to Glasgow in 1932. Rifkind was born in 1892. He had been associated with the Poale Zion since his days at university in Edinburgh where he had met Dr. M.T. Mann (husband of WIZO-founder Selma Mann). In 1918 Rifkind wrote a rather utopian pamphlet called "Zionism and Socialism"¹⁷⁵ for the organisation in which he based his hope for Jewish national autonomy on the help of the "future International" and the Jewish "masses" rather than on the Jewish establishment. After his studies he opened a medical practice in a mining village. By 1930 he wrote for the Jewish Leader using the pen-name "Label" and later switched to the Jewish Echo for which he wrote a column until he fell out with editor Golombok over the Poale Zion issue. Rifkind died on 24th December 1937, aged 45¹⁷⁶.

In many ways Rifkind was an original thinker. He believed that the Jewish population of the western world was in crisis and that the persecution of the Jews in Germany has shown their weaknesses. Poverty plagued the masses of Jewish workers. The rich were losing their Jewish identity. There was the constant danger of the eruption of anti-Jewish feelings. He claimed that too often Jews were offered a false choice: to adapt to the surrounding culture and become loyal citizens or to remain Jews and to leave¹⁷⁷. In order to solve this crisis, Rifkind offered an original solution which looked backwards and forward for inspiration.

Rifkind believed that important lessons could be learnt from the history of Eastern European Jewry. Judaism in the west had run dry, religion or membership of synagogues was all that bound Jews together. But in Eastern Europe Judaism had not deteriorated, it had remained a living idea. In the east no class distinctions between

¹⁷⁴ Alderman, Jewish Community in British Politics, pp. 112-113; Lipman, History of the Jews in Britain, pp. 177-178, N. Rose, Chaim Weizmann. A Biography, New York, 1986, p. 283. The Labour candidate was trade union leader James Hall, the Liberal was Barnet Janner.

¹⁷⁵ Reprinted in Lewis Rifkind, pp. 26-42.

¹⁷⁶ JE 31/12/1937, see also JE 8/7/1932.

¹⁷⁷ Compare JE 24/2/1939. This was a common feeling. In the build-up to the Second World War when National Service was declared the Echo editor tried to explain that Jews could be loyal to their country, Zionists and faithful Jews at the same time.

Jews were created. There, unity was based on race and nationality, not religion. The Eastern European Jews had upheld Hebrew, created Yiddish literature and founded their own Socialist movement. They had done all this in the worst possible material circumstances. Rifkind wrote that in the west Jews could follow this example: "There is nothing in all this that would militate against the idea of being loyal citizens to the country of our adoption. We are and can go on being loyal citizens, paying our taxes, contributing our share to the welfare and culture of its people, sharing its joys, and participating in its sorrows, defending it when attacked, and helping it in time of economic crisis and national distress. We can be all this to the country of our adoption and still be Jews, real living Jews, not merely of the Jewish persuasion. We can still have our mess of pottage, without selling our soul."¹⁷⁸

For the future structure of Jewry Rifkind looked to Socialism. In 1934 he found the Jewish Socialist League to solve "the catastrophe that has taken place in the economic, social and political life of the whole of Jewry". The League was to participate in all activities of Jewish life in the spirit of International Socialism: "The League must lay stress on inculcating the sense of individual responsibility in each of its members and also in each member of the Jewish race in general; it must elevate the moral standard of Jewish life, and awaken the spirit of sacrifice for the realisation of Jewish needs and ideals."¹⁷⁹

In a lecture on the economic collapse of European Jewry¹⁸⁰, Rifkind outlined a six-point programme. First an occupational transformation had to be established. More people had to learn trades. There were too many middlemen or, as he put it in a 1935 lecture in the Jewish Institute, Western European Jewry was "top-heavy"¹⁸¹. His second point was closely connected to the first. A back-to-the-land movement or a move into agricultural occupations was needed. Thirdly, emigration had to be resumed. In early decades people had migrated from Eastern Europe to the west, but now the population movement had come to a halt. Once again Jews had to move on. To Palestine, to Biro-Bidjan (the Stalinist invention of an autonomous Jewish region in the Soviet Union; like many other Socialists Rifkind apparently put trust in the Communist propaganda about this region) and other territories. Enormous funds had to be collected to realise the first three points and his fourth point reflected his ideas about money raising. Rifkind rejected charity and wanted to create a plan for fund-raising in which the majority of his people could take part. His fifth point was a call for concerted

¹⁷⁸ Lewis Rifkind, p. 89. He made this comparison while reviewing the problems of the Jews in Germany in a 1935 lecture.

¹⁷⁹ JE 2/11/1934; Lewis Rifkind, pp. 20-21. The Jewish Echo reported I. Maizel, Harry Furst and Misha Louvish as the other founders of the League.

¹⁸⁰ Lewis Rifkind, pp. 90-110, see especially pp. 107-110.

¹⁸¹ JE 1/2/1935.

action. A world-wide democratic organisation had to be established in which every Jew could participate. Rifkind's sixth point was that Jews should engage in anti-Fascist activities. He concluded his lecture by drawing attention to the education of the youth who had to be taught respect for "things Jewish".

The propagation of such ideas was without precedent in Glasgow. This does not mean that Rifkind was original in all aspects of his thinking. He borrowed from other Socialists¹⁸². Like them he believed that the unpopularity of the Jews was caused by their occupations. In this view the immigrants had been forced to find employment in the lowest-paid and worst organised trades, where they often undercut the native workers. Those who had been able to rise socially had become sub-contractors, sweaters, small industrialists, and traders - all "small bourgeois" and therefore also not liked. In this he echoed the often heard complaint among non-Jews, discussed in the previous chapter, that Jews were moneylenders, sweaters and small businessmen who profited from the labour of others. Hence the emphasis on occupational transformation and agriculture. In Britain and elsewhere in Europe Socialist and Zionist groups advocated occupational change and agricultural work.

Little of this programme was realised and it appears that the Socialist League did not get off the ground. Nevertheless, Rifkind was able to exercise a lot of influence in the Poale Zion and especially among young Zionists. Notably, his criticism of local communal leaders appealed to young Zionists. During a lecture in the Jewish Institute in 1935 on the "Problems of young Anglo-Jewry" Rifkind spoke of it as a tragedy. The British Jewish youth was not the cream of all Jewries but the reverse. They had no dignity, no pride in their Jewishness. Young Jews showed no interest in local Jewish affairs, Rifkind said, because there was no democracy and they were not able to have a say: "At present the community is run by the rich."¹⁸³

Rifkind's ideas provoked a confrontation between the General Zionists and the Poale Zion in the GZO. Although the GZO was in theory a representative organisation, its leadership had traditionally been in the hands of the General Zionists. The problem for those who were not General Zionists was that the GZO had affiliated to the Zionist Federation and through that body to the World Union of General Zionists. The Poale Zion action to end this situation took the shape of a revolt against the communal leadership because the leadership of the GZO was in the hands of businessmen like Nettler and Links, who had much in common with communal leaders like Bloch.

At an extraordinary general meeting of the GZO in October 1935 the Poale Zion demanded that the GZO would become a non-party body. Misha Louvish, son of Jewish

¹⁸² Compare Rennap, Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Question, pp. 100-102.

¹⁸³ JE 1/2/1935. Communal leader Joseph Sachs replied that it was "not right that men who had laboured for their fellow men out of consciousness of their problems, should be dubbed 'busybodies' without even being accredited with honest motives."

Leader editor Nathan Louvish, moved an amendment to that effect, but this was rejected when an equal number of votes was declared for and against the amendment and chairman Nettler “unhesitatingly”¹⁸⁴ cast his vote against it. Rifkind threatened that his organisation would leave the GZO but even that did not help. After the meeting, the Poale Zion, followed by the Mizrachi, severed their ties with the organisation. This led to the formation of a new representative body, namely the Glasgow Zionist Council¹⁸⁵.

Louvish’ ideas seem to have been close to those of Rifkind. At a Poale Zion meeting he declared that “communal affairs had been too long in the hands of the ‘moneyed’” and that it was time to ask the masses for their opinion¹⁸⁶. Rifkind’s ideas were also picked up by other young Zionists. In 1931 a Glasgow Junior Zionist Organisation had been created out of the remnants of the youth group of the Zionist Circle¹⁸⁷. As the name suggests, it operated as a junior section of the GZO next to other youth groups like the local youth section of WIZO which was called Ziona, and the Zionist section of the Glasgow University Jewish Society. In addition there was a local Habonim group¹⁸⁸, a small organisation of dedicated young Zionists without common political commitments. By the mid-1930s the members of the junior group started to sound warnings. In a 1935 letter to the Jewish Echo, Philip Jacobson, one of the leading young Zionists in Glasgow¹⁸⁹, wrote that the Glasgow Junior Zionist organisation was in “anything but a healthy and flourishing state” because it did “not provide such social facilities as are demanded by young people”. The president of the group noted in his annual report, reported in the same paper, the “complete ignorance of Zionist matters amongst the Jewish working classes.”¹⁹⁰ Under the influence of Rifkind’s ideas and against the background of developments in Germany these warnings would lead to direct criticism of the communal leadership.

This criticism first came into the open on the occasion of the formation of the United Jewish Youth Council (see chapter 1). The establishment of this organisation followed

¹⁸⁴ JE 18/10/1935.

¹⁸⁵ JE 1/11/1935, 6/12/1935.

¹⁸⁶ JE 3/4/1936. Compare JE 10/4/1936, 14/5/1937, 4/6/1937. A week after his statement Louvish’ mother wrote to the Jewish Echo addressing the women Zionists on the same issue. In its appeal to the “masses” the Poale Zion organised a series of open air meetings in the Gorbals during the following year.

¹⁸⁷ JE 13/1/1928, 9/11/1934. By 1928 the junior section of the Circle was no longer operating successfully. In that year its parent body again tried to interest young people in cultural lectures on Friday evening.

¹⁸⁸ JE 3/7/1936. The movement was founded in 1928, but did not organise many young people until after the Second World War. The idea behind the movement was that the youth represented the builders of society.

¹⁸⁹ Compare JE 29/5/1936 when together with Nat Jackson he represented the Glasgow group at the annual conference of the British Federation of Zionist Youth in London.

¹⁹⁰ JE 29/3/1935.

the pogroms of the Kristalnacht in Germany in November 1938¹⁹¹. The movement used some of Rifkind's ideas. Its president Nat Jackson, a Poale Zion member who later moved to London, said, for example, during a Council meeting that the power in the local institutions was in the hands of a few, the masses were not consulted nor involved. Philip Jacobson added that to end the apathy among the majority of the Jews a "unification, reorganisation, and reconstruction of Jewish National and Communal life" was needed¹⁹². The envisaged reconstruction of communal life, which became one of the movement's priorities, would in effect have included a replacement of the communal leadership. The conflict can be regarded as a power struggle between generations.

Other aspects of the activity of the Youth Council had a less radical character. On Zionism it remained somewhat ambivalent. The movement was said to recognise "the importance of Palestine in Jewish life"¹⁹³ and it expressed its unity with the youth of Palestine and its admiration for their discipline and the courage with which they had defended their positions, but the movement did not see Palestine as the Jewish homeland.

Palestine was still regarded as a place where Jewish refugees could be settled. After Hitler's rise to power, Jews began to flee Germany, but it was felt by the Glasgow Representative Council that it would be unwise to settle large numbers of these refugees in Scotland. In 1934, the communal leadership reluctantly agreed that a small group of Jewish children from Germany could be housed in the local Jewish orphanage, but it was feared that the arrival of many refugees would fuel anti-Jewish feelings. When the number of refugees leaving Germany increased dramatically after the Kristalnacht, more people were welcomed and hostels were opened for young refugees, for example at Garnethill¹⁹⁴, but still it was felt that Palestine should be the main destination for refugees. Zionists turned to fundraising in order to finance the settlement of German refugees in Palestine. At the end of the 1930s this became the major Zionist activity in Glasgow. In 1939 the JNF organised a Carnival Ball at Purim. In the programme the following attempt was made to liven up the gloomy atmosphere:

¹⁹¹ JE 11/11/1938; see also chapter 1. Compare JE 17/4/1936. In 1936 another united body was formed, namely the Jewish Youth Council which followed the example of the Scottish Youth Peace Council, but the Jewish council apparently did not organise any activities.

¹⁹² Youth News, volume 1 number 2 (30/3/1939). The movement, while demanding democracy, failed to condemn the dictatorship in the USSR. Perhaps to balance this Jacobson demanded the "categorical rejection of any theory purporting to solve the Jewish problem by the assimilation of the Jewish People" which appears to be a condemnation of Communism.

¹⁹³ SJAC, MBUIYM 28/11/1938.

¹⁹⁴ MBGJRC 27/8/1934, March 1939.

"Our brethren in Palestine, in spite of hardship and danger, have reinstated Purim as the gayest Festival of the year. Infected by their lively enthusiasm, Purim is taking on for us also a livelier tone and gayer note. For Purim expresses the challenge of a living people to all its enemies that Hamas may come and go, but the Jewish people with its age-long loyalties lives for ever."¹⁹⁵

The Youth Council also collected money for refugees. It appealed to the local youth for a campaign of self-denial, during which they should donate their pocket money to refugee relief in stead of spending it on luxuries.

In their vision of Palestine as a haven for refugees, the Zionists of the 1930s do not seem to differ much from the majority of the older settlers thirty years earlier. More than the older settlers they regarded Palestine as a future Jewish homeland, but they were not yet prepared to settle there themselves. If rich enough they might undertake a journey to Palestine, have a holiday in the country or even own a business¹⁹⁶, but few actually went to live there. Those who did settle in Palestine during periods when immigration was relatively unhampered, did so for various reasons. During 1933, for example, the following people emigrated. In January the honorary president of the Langside congregation retired to Palestine. A month later he was followed by a businessman who decided to become a planter. In March a family went, which was exceptional because people usually travelled as individuals or couples. There was a gap until October, when Abraham Sunderland announced that he would return to Palestine, this time taking his son Ellis. He declared the following at a meeting of the Judas Maccabeus Beacon:

"We Jews are a homeless people. It has been the one endeavour of my life to wipe this shame from the name of the Jewish race. In doing so I have merely fulfilled my duty. For that I need no praise. I now have my reward. Twenty years ago my attempt to settle in Eretz Yisroel failed. I am now going to realise my life's ambition."¹⁹⁷

Only a few Jews in Glasgow had similar ambitions. In this they differed little from other Jews in Britain. In 1935, the year before large scale Arab rioting in Palestine and the subsequent restrictions on Jewish immigration, just over 60,000 Jewish immigrants entered the country, this was more than double the normal annual figure. Two thirds of the total number of immigrants came from Germany and Poland. The

¹⁹⁵ SJAC, Programme JNF Annual Purim Carnival Ball 7/3/1939. Hamas is the king in the Purim-story who wants to have all Jews killed. At this time the figure of Hamas was often associated with Hitler.

¹⁹⁶ See for example JE 14/1/1938 for a report on the orange groves and citrus essence factory of Abraham Goldberg in Palestine.

¹⁹⁷ JE 27/10/1933. For the other three cases see JE 20/1/1933, 10/2/1933, 31/3/1933. The Jewish Echo during that year reported no further cases of emigration. Compare MBP 6/11/1933 where it was registered that Ben Levi, teacher of the Pollokshields congregation, was about to leave for Palestine.

number of Jews coming from the United Kingdom was negligible¹⁹⁸. With the outbreak of the Second World War emigration to Palestine became impossible.

The atmosphere in Glasgow changed. The 1930s had been a decade of growing anxiety about poverty at home, political polarisation, the rise of Nazism, the plight of the German refugees, persecution of Jews elsewhere in Eastern Europe, fears about the position of the Jews in Britain, the Palestine troubles and in general the uncertainty of the future. Anxiety was replaced by alarm. In 1942 news about the Holocaust started to reach British public opinion. Ratcliffe of the Protestant League in Glasgow started a vitriolic anti-Jewish campaign during the early years of the war, some of which reappeared in a watered down form in the Glasgow Herald¹⁹⁹.

Zionists reacted to this development with a complete review of their position. In 1944 Joe Levy wrote a radical pamphlet published by the GZO. The pamphlet was called "Assimilationist Kindergarten". Levy's main point was that non-Jews would never accept the Jews even if the Jews tried to adopt the culture of the society in which they lived. He tried to show that illusions about a "Scottish melting pot" had led the old guard to be embarrassed about their Jewishness and to flee "into a world of illusion and make believe. It breeds loss of dignity, of self respect, and ultimately, of morale. It produces an artificial individual, hiding and suppressing his real self, wearing a mask and forever living diplomatically under the paralysing censorship of 'Will this cause anti-Semitism? Will this allay anti-Semitism? Does this conceal me? Won't it reveal me?'" Levy regarded adaption to the host culture as impossible. Rather than doing that, Jews should stand up, be self-conscious and claim their birthright. Then they would "cease to feel a longing to be included in any social group which desires to exclude them. They will have a healthy attachment to, and respect for, their own group and no less worthy and be loyal citizens of whatever country they live in."²⁰⁰ But despite this radicalism, which would have been unacceptable to the General Zionists during the 1930s, Levy did not call for mass emigration to Palestine once the war was finished and circumstances would eventually allow this.

Later, during the euphoria surrounding the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948 and when the Jewish state went through difficult spells, Glasgow Jewry rallied to its cause, showed its dedication, surpassed the fundraising targets, sent more of its members to Israel. On the occasion of the establishment of the state, Sunday 16th May

¹⁹⁸ Jewish Yearbook 1938, pp. 377-378.

¹⁹⁹ C. Holmes, "Alexander Ratcliffe. Militant Protestant and Antisemite", in T. Kushner, K. Lunn (ed.), Traditions of Intolerance. Historical Perspectives on Fascism and Race Discourse in Britain, Manchester, 1989, pp. 196-217; T. Gallagher, "Protestant Extremism in Urban Scotland 1930-1939: Its Growth and Contradiction", in Scottish Historical Review, volume LXIV (1985), pp. 147-156; JE 26/3/1943, 16/4/1943, 6/10/1943. Holmes refers mistakenly to the Glasgow Jewish Representative Trades Council (pp. 211-212). For Ratcliffe see also chapter 1.

²⁰⁰ J. Levy, Assimilationist Kindergarten, Glasgow, 1944, pp 5-8.

- 57 years after the start of organised Zionism in the city, hundreds of Glasgow Jews gathered in Langside and Queen's Park halls. The Jewish Echo carried the headline: this was "Glasgow Jewry's memorable day"²⁰¹. The Jewish state and its accomplishments filled people with pride and offered them a sense of security. For many Jews in Scotland, Zionism became the centre of Jewish identity. In binding people together, Zionism took over some of the function of religion.

By that time, the Zionist movement in Glasgow had changed from a bundling of institutions of charity and cultural organisations, in which the older settlers initially were able to dominate the immigrants, to an instrument to preserve Judaism and a political force. Zionists found inspiration in religion, the Eastern European past, and in the political movements of the wider society. Although they were constantly influenced by developments in Palestine and the British and international Zionist movement of which they formed a part, the Glasgow Zionist groups remained basically local organisations. During the 1920s and 1930s the Zionist groups became new centres of organised Jewish activity in Glasgow. They offered activities for those who would otherwise have been frustrated by general social, political and cultural life. The groups had a social function for their members. Zionism also offered women a change to distinguish themselves and provided the youth with a platform to ventilate their ideas. The success of the movement helped its middle class leaders in their striving for respectability and civic acceptability. Similar developments took place in England, but in Glasgow Zionism dominated Jewish communal life during the 1930s whereas in England it would not do so until the Second World War. Zionism also helped to shape the response to anti-Jewishness and other political attitudes. Under its influence, Jews in Glasgow began to operate as groups on political issues such as the British administration in Palestine.

Just as developments in the outside world influenced Glasgow Zionism, they had their effect on Jewish artists in the city. During the Second World War the sculptor Benno Schotz created his work "Unto the Hills" (1944) which his fellow-artist Josef Herman later described as

"(...) his most compelling composition (...) This is a work of deep pathos. The Second World War was not over yet, but the civilised world knew already of the specific kind of suffering, humiliation and death the Jews were singled out for. And it is this that Schotz attempted to summarise in one single figure. The body is a bare column which preserves thus the circular substance of the tree from which it came. The stiff and hard arms which cling to the body also lead the eye upwards to the head which has a haunting stare of fear, anguish and pain. But the very pose, slightly

²⁰¹ JE 21/5/1948. For examples of fundraising see SJAC, Blue & White Bazaar brochure 1949, 1953, 1957; JE 16/1/1948, 13/2/1948, 26/3/1948, 31/12/1948; SJAC, United Palestine Appeal Financial Statements & Reports 1945-1946; compare JE 28/9/1990.

titled backwards has solidity, defiance and pride.”²⁰²

Schotz’ work on the Holocaust is of course an extreme example, but it serves to show that Jewish artists in Glasgow did not live in a vacuum. A review of the work of these artists shows the interaction between Jewish public activity in the arts and the surrounding society. The contribution of Jews to the world of art in Glasgow can be compared to their contribution in England. Jews in England produced English literature, a development which started with writers like the outstanding Israel Zangwill in the second half of the 19th century. By the 1930s, for example, Louis Golding was already a well-known author in Manchester. In the visual arts, an older settler like Londoner Solomon J. Solomon (1860-1921), member of the Royal Academy and co-founder of the New English Art Club, was succeeded by innovative immigrant painters like Alfred A. Wolmark, born in 1876 in Warsaw, and Jacob Kramer, born in 1892 in the Ukraine²⁰³. The newcomers introduced a new form of creative experience to the English art world.

The first Jews to enter Glasgow’s art world were patrons of art rather than artists²⁰⁴. The most outstanding was Michael Simons. He was involved in the organisation of the 1888 Glasgow exhibition which touched upon the arts²⁰⁵ and for which Simons contracted bands and orchestras. After his resignation from the Town Council in 1891 he remained Sub-Convener of the “Recreation Committee of the Association for improving the condition of the People” and according to The Bailie supplied the East-End Exhibition Centre with “bright surroundings”, “high class music” and “attractions of a pure and elevating character” for the working classes²⁰⁶.

Simons was also associated with Howard and Wyndham Ltd., the company of theatre owners and impresarios²⁰⁷. When the company was floated in 1895 Simons and David Heilbron acted as promoters. The former Bailie remained with the company as

²⁰² Benno Schotz Retrospective Exhibition (catalogue), Edinburgh, 1970, pp. 4-5. This exhibition took place in 1971.

²⁰³ Lipman, A History of the Jews in Britain, pp. 78-80; Schotz, Bronze in my Blood, p. 64; compare E. Rodoti, in Jewish Art, pp. 298-299. Rodoti believes that among the older settlers in England there were no innovating painters. This seems not quite correct in the light of Solomon’s contribution.

²⁰⁴ Compare The Bailie 28/4/1880, 7/12/1892; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 176-177, 206; Post Office Glasgow Directory 1851. Collins notes that during the early years of the 20th century Jews and non-Jews still mainly had separated cultural activities, but that some Jews entered the general cultural life. He gives the example of Louis Freeman who about 1908 got involved in the public performance of music. By 1930 Freeman was a well-known musician in Glasgow (Daily Record and Mail 4/2/1930). Freeman’s predecessor was the violinist Julius Seligmann, the son of a Hamburg share-broker who came to Scotland during the 1850s. Other well-known Jewish musicians included Amy Phillips, the daughter of the Rev. Phillips who married Garnethill choir master Joe Samuels, and 1930s bandleader Harry Margolis.

²⁰⁵ Kinchin, Glasgow’s Great Exhibitions, pp. 17-53.

²⁰⁶ The Bailie 28/12/1892.

²⁰⁷ Slaven, Checkland, Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography, II, p. 386.

chairman until 1925. Howard and Wyndham, regarded as one of the “most important theatrical concerns”²⁰⁸, owned four theatres of which two were situated in Glasgow, namely the Royal and the Royalty. Simons managed the business side. Simons and Heilbron also got involved with Robert Arthur Theatres Ltd. of which Simons became chairman in 1914.

According to The Bailie²⁰⁹, by 1904 Simons was also chairman of the council of the Royal Glasgow Institute of the Fine Arts, which had just been lifted out of a “languishing condition” and re-housed in Corporation Galleries. The institute was said to have the “exceeding good fortune” to be chaired by Simons for a number of years and it was noted on the occasion of the Spring exhibition that his “great business acumen, and genial, kindly nature make him the ideal chairman.”²¹⁰ In 1909 Simons was also on the committee of “hangers” who decided the contents of exhibitions. Once again The Bailie noted his business qualities and mentioned his devotion, but also noted that if “he has a fault it is that he is sometimes a little autocratic in his methods.”²¹¹ It is not clear whether this comment reflected his business methods or his artistic choice. In later years, immigrants succeeded Simons and Heilbron as patrons of art. Among them were Fred Nettler who modelled twice for Benno Schotz and the Links family who collected modern art for an exhibition in the Lynx House. Links operated as an art sponsor for Scottish Art Promotion and was advised by Tom Macdonald. Furthermore, Harry Winocour and the Frutin family owned theatres and cinemas²¹².

It is somewhat surprising that apart from drama, Jews in Glasgow did not make any contribution to literature before the Second World War. The most productive of Jewish writers who can be connected with Glasgow was Chaim Bermant. He arrived in Glasgow as a small boy during the 1930s and his work was naturally not published until after the war. By that time he had already left Scotland. In his first book, Jericho Sleep Alone (1964), he used his youth in Glasgow as inspiration. In his later work²¹³ he would return to Scottish subjects. Other authors from Glasgow who had their work published are Jack Caplan, Evelyn Cowan and Ralph Glasser. All their books appeared

²⁰⁸ The Bailie 8/5/1901.

²⁰⁹ The Bailie 17/2/1904; compare Collins, Second City Jewry, p. 177. Collins has Simons as “Chairman of the Glasgow Royal Fine Arts Society”. Simons had probably been appointed in 1903 and served until 1911.

²¹⁰ The Bailie 20/2/1907.

²¹¹ The Bailie 10/2/1909.

²¹² SJAC, OHP interview: A. Frutin; JE 24/8/1934, 5/10/1934, 1/11/1935, 8/11/1935, 23/10/1936; Benno Schotz Portrait Sculpture, p. 18; B. Schotz, Bronze in my Blood. The Memoirs of Benno Schotz, Edinburgh, 1981, p. 161. Winocour in 1934 owned the Theatre Royal in Coatbridge and 3 cinemas: the Elephant (Shawlands) which he bought for £40,000, the Calder (Govanhill) and the Astoria (Paisley). The exhibition in Lynx House took place in 1964.

²¹³ For his work with autobiographical aspects see for example (in alphabetical order) C. Bermant, Ben Preserve Us, London, 1965; Coming Home, London, 1976; Jericho Sleep Alone, London, 1964; The Patriarch, London, 1982 (paperback edition).

after the war. Of these three only Cowan stayed in Glasgow. She produced two works of fiction with Glasgow Jewish subjects²¹⁴. Caplan wrote two books of memoirs of the Gorbals and his army service during the Second World War²¹⁵. Glasser's autobiographical trilogy²¹⁶ was in scope and size the most monumental addition to this collection of memories.

While these authors differ on details and aspects of their life in Glasgow their work bears a resemblance to contemporary non-Jewish literature. Ralph Glasser's description of the ongoing discussion among the poor young men about politics and life in general against the dispiriting background of the Gorbals, for example, echoes Edward Gaitens' Dance of the Apprentices²¹⁷. What these Jewish authors describe is therefore their account of an experience which was Jewish and Glaswegian.

As observed above, drama was an exception in as far as Jews in Glasgow made a contribution to literature before the Second World War. In 1937 Avrom Greenbaum's play "The Bread of Affliction" was included in an annual volume of The Best One-Act Plays²¹⁸. Greenbaum²¹⁹ started work at the age of 14 as a tailor in his father's firm B. Green & Sons in St. George's Road near Charing Cross. He had a lively interest in music and like other Glasgow Jews he must have visited the theatre when travelling Yiddish actors or a local amateur group staged a play like "Zuszeit un Zuspreit" written by the famous Yiddish playwright Sholem Aleichem²²⁰. In 1924 and 1925 Greenbaum was convener of the drama section of the Glasgow Zionist Literary Circle²²¹. Later he was the central person of the Glasgow Jewish Institute Dramatic Club also called the Jewish Institute Players. His first recorded play with the Players was "Children of Dreams" which was staged in 1936 during a competition of the south-west division of the Scottish Community Drama Association²²². Although he never turned professional, Greenbaum became a very active playwright, director and actor.

²¹⁴ E. Cowan, Portrait of Alice, Edinburgh, 1976; and Spring Remembered. A Scottish Jewish Childhood, Edinburgh, 1974.

²¹⁵ J. Caplan, From Gorbals to Jungle, Glasgow 1960; and Memories of the Gorbals, Edinburgh, 1991.

²¹⁶ R. Glasser, Growing Up in the Gorbals, London, 1987 (paperback edition); Gorbals Boy at Oxford, London, 1990 (paperback edition); Gorbals Voices, Siren Songs, London, 1991 (paperback edition).

²¹⁷ E. Gaitens, Dance of the Apprentices, Glasgow, 1948; compare J.A. Mack, "The Changing City", in Cunnison, Gilfillan, Third Statistical Account of Scotland, pp. 758-771. The parents of the hero in Gaitens' book are Irish. Such youth experiences have of course also an universal character.

²¹⁸ A. Greenbaum, "The Bread of Affliction", in The Best One-Act Plays of 1937, London, 1938, pp. 187-212.

²¹⁹ JE 9/10/1963; compare interview I. Schuster and R. Greenbaum. According to Morris Linden, the author of the obituary in the Jewish Echo, Greenbaum, who died in 1963 aged sixty, had been born in Lublin and was brought to Scotland when he was 15 months old.

²²⁰ SJAC, copy of handbill. The play was performed about 1919 by local players in Elgin Street.

²²¹ The Circle, volume 1 number 2, pp. 16-17; SJAC, Membership card and syllabus Glasgow Zionist Literary Circle 1924-1925. In December 1925 a play called "Galuth" (the Diaspora) was programmed.

²²² Programme in University of Glasgow, Scottish Theatre Archive, section Jewish Institute Players.

Greenbaum was an outstanding figure in the Scottish theatre. During the 1930s there were hundreds of amateur theatre groups, drama sections and societies in Scotland²²³. In this, Greenbaum and his Jewish Institute Players formed part of a large movement, but unlike many of these theatre groups, the Jewish Institute Players did not restrict their performances to the population from which they originated. The question is whether this Jewish inspired dramatic activity reflected Jewish political thinking in Glasgow and influenced contemporary political outlooks or just reflected these. A direct link between these matters is hard to find but the choice of plays staged by the Jewish Institute Players provides some clues.

Greenbaum staged translations, but he did not write Yiddish plays. All his own work was in English. Perhaps his knowledge of Yiddish was not sufficient for writing drama, but probably Greenbaum regarded the Yiddish audience as too narrow and he wanted to create work which would appeal to a wider audience. The subject matter of his plays is also noteworthy. After "Children of Dreams" about which little is known, came "The Bread of Affliction" which was staged from 1936 to 1939. The subject of this play was the persecution of the Jews in Eastern Europe and the survival of traditional values, while there were sidelines on Socialism and Zionism (some of the aspects of the play must have been difficult for non-Jews). It is a rather romantic play in which good prevails at the end. Shortly after that came "Ecce Homo" reviewed in the Jewish Echo as an ironic indictment against Christianity²²⁴. Greenbaum made a radical change with the war-time "Watch on the Clyde". In this play Greenbaum departed from Jewish subject-matter. This comedy shows two men, Bob and Hughie getting mixed up with Karl Schachtenhausen, a retired lieutenant of the German navy.

Greenbaum's choice of plays written by others was also significant. At the opening of the Little Theatre in the new Jewish Institute on 5th September 1938 the Glasgow Jewish Institute Dramatic Club directed by Greenbaum played Henrik Ibsen's "Ghosts"²²⁵. During the 1940s and 1950s Greenbaum and his players performed regularly in this theatre, but also played on stages elsewhere in the city and toured outside Glasgow. They staged plays like Greenbaum's "The Bread of Affliction", Sean O'Casey's "Juno and the Peacock", S. Ansky's "The Dybbuk" and Eugene O'Neill's "The

²²³ See J.W. Marriot's foreword in The Best One-Act Plays of 1937, p. 5. For the wider background see D. Hutchison, The Modern Scottish Theatre, Glasgow, 1977.

²²⁴ JE 18/2/1938. It should be noted that Jewish artists like Chagall also used the life of Jesus Christ as subject matter.

²²⁵ Programme in SJAC. The Little Theatre was also named Sir Maurice and Joseph Bloch Little Theatre or Joseph Bloch Theatre. In 1938 the Glasgow Jewish Institute Dramatic Club or Jewish Institute Players had already been in existence for a few years. After his death, they were re-named Avrom Greenbaum Players.

Glass Menagerie”²²⁶. To raise money for European Jewry shortly after the war Greenbaum staged “Morning Star” by Sylvia Regan, an American play about the life of Jews in New York’s Lower East Side which was at the time very popular with Jewish and Scottish working class audiences. With this play the Jewish Institute Players won the 1946 championship of the Scottish Community Drama Association²²⁷. This choice of plays represents a rich and popular mixture of Jewish, (translated) Yiddish and social commentary plays, which combined contemporary Jewish outlooks and general political thought.

Greenbaum was an important figure in the Glasgow Unity Theatre. Unity was formed during the war, possibly as early as 1941, following a London example, involving players and directors whose companies had been closed because many of their members had to leave the city to serve in the armed forces. The group found a place in Scott Street where also a refugee club was situated which was frequented by political activists. Some of the refugees joined Unity. In addition the group attracted a number of artists. Meetings, rehearsals and performances took place after normal working hours. The group tried to create what it saw as working-class theatre and when a lack of appropriate Scottish plays occurred, Unity turned to the social commentary plays. In 1941 Greenbaum directed Clifford Odets’ “Awake and Sing” under the Unity banner with a cast of members from the Jewish Institute Players. With the choice of plays with an emphasis on social awareness Greenbaum was able to influence contemporary political thought.

Greenbaum influenced his fellow artists. Among the people in Unity was Tom Macdonald who designed the sets. Being some ten years younger than Greenbaum, he came under his influence. In retrospect Macdonald said about the playwright and director: “(...) an artist to his fingertips (...) whatever he did he did with an artist’s eye and his whole drive was to increase his effectiveness as an artist.”²²⁸ It was felt that Greenbaum added a European touch to Unity. He also proved to be a master at improvisation, which was badly needed as the funds for Unity were very limited. The playwright thus functioned as a kind of mentor and kindred spirit for the young Macdonald who was forming himself as a painter.

Greenbaum’s choice of plays and his activities in Unity and the Jewish Institute

²²⁶ Programmes in University of Glasgow, Scottish Theatre Archive, section Jewish Institute Players, and SJAC.

²²⁷ JE 9/10/1963. After the war some Jewish Institute Players like Ida Schuster and Sam Hankin started professional careers.

²²⁸ Quoted in G. Oliver, “Tom Macdonald”, in Tom Macdonald 1914-1985. Paintings, drawings, and theatre designs (exhibition booklet), Glasgow, 1986, pp. 5-14, pp. 5-6. On Unity see also L. Mackenny, “Introduction”, in R. McLeish, The Gorbals Story, Edinburgh, 1985, pp. 7-16. Macdonald was born in 1914. Before Macdonald, Joseph Ancill (see below) had also designed sets for the Institute Players. Olivier also detects the influence of Josef Herman and perhaps Yankel Adler (see below) in Macdonald’s work.

indicate that he could work for non-Jewish as well as Jewish audiences. Later in life he composed several humorous poems in which combined elements from the two cultures. In the following extract from “Shir Ha-Ne’everday” Greenbaum ridicules the Jews who were tempted to celebrate Christmas.

“Auld Scotia’s Yidden, there’s nae doot,
Maintain some orra social laws.
The Chanukah candles scarce burnt oot,
We turn tae welcome Santa Claus.”²²⁹

And on the occasion of Burns Night Greenbaum wrote the following lines in the poem “Yom Ha-Rabbie Burns”.

“In these days o’insanity
A thocht’s aye birkin’ in my heid, -
Wi’a’ his rich humanity
Rabbie should ha’ been a Yid.”²³⁰

Like these poems, Greenbaum’s career seems an attempt to bring the two worlds together.

Another Jewish playwright from Glasgow would enjoy a similar success in later years. This was C.P. Taylor. In Taylor’s case it took some time before his native city was prepared to recognise his talent. Cecil Taylor was born in 1929 in Maryhill, but he grew up in Govanhill on the South Side. His father was a watchmaker. He left school in 1943 to start work. The first recognition came in 1954 when he won a small Jewish drama prize for “Mr. Daziel”. But despite the prize, this play was not produced until 13 years later. In the meantime, Taylor had left Glasgow. In 1957 he settled in Newcastle. Five years later his first play was staged and in 1966 he won national acclaim when his controversial “Bread and Butter”²³¹ opened in London. This was a play about the contrasting lives of two young Jewish couples in the Gorbals. One couple moves to Queen’s Park neighbourhood, the other is not so successful. Essentially the play deals with the difference between ideals and reality. Real life proves harsh, but the play is humorous and rich in language. Human weakness, such as the lack of courage, and the use of half-baked theories (Marxism) are also vividly portrayed. The play indicates that Taylor found it hard to come to terms with his Jewishness. He once remarked that in Glasgow as a Jew “you shut the curtains on a

²²⁹ JE 12/1/1962.

²³⁰ JE 26/1/1962. Compare JE 30/12/1955 when he used Burns in “The adress to the fress” to complain about food. Modern creed “that’s never kened a proper feed.” Nostalgically he reminisced about kosher food, sweet and sour loaves, blintzes and cholent: “A tasty, halesome, muckle fress.”

²³¹ C.P. Taylor, Bread and Butter, Harmondsworth, 1967.

Friday night so they wouldn't see the candles"²³². Later he returned to the subject of Jewish identity in "Walter"²³³, a play about the Jewish music hall actor Walter Jackson. "Bread and Butter" was initially rejected by the Citizen's Theatre in Glasgow but in 1970 it won the Scottish Television best-play award and a year later it was finally staged in Glasgow. In 1992, ten years after Taylor's death in 1982, his work was celebrated during the Glasgow Mayfest and the Edinburgh Festival²³⁴.

It was not only the dramatists Greenbaum and Taylor who influenced others, Josef Herman, Jankel Adler and Benno Schotz, two painters and a sculptor, would also leave their mark. Josef Herman, born in 1911 in Warsaw, came to Glasgow in 1940. He had left Poland two years earlier. During his first years in Glasgow he concentrated on Jewish themes, in a dreamlike and nostalgic way recalling life in Warsaw from which he had been cut off. He visualised this in a way which according to some critics²³⁵ recalls aspects of Marc Chagall's work. In later life Herman remembered this period as follows.

"I walked the streets of the Scottish city and all I could see was what my memory wanted me to see, a fabric of distant life which was nonetheless part of me; men and women in the refinement of a unique spirit. Most of them poor, certainly, but I saw them in an aura which I can only call enchantment. I could not touch them but I could follow them with a line; I could draw a characteristic detail of their clothing, a characteristic expression, a characteristic gesture of their hands. I was obsessed with hands! Of course I romanticized my scenes. I followed a dream, perhaps a collective dream."²³⁶

Yankel Adler, who came from Lodz, was sixteen years older than Herman and by 1940 already an artist of international repute²³⁷. In 1913 Adler had left Eastern Europe and moved to Wuppertal in Germany and although he returned to Lodz for a brief spell after the First World War, it was in Germany that he found success through "Das Junge Rheinland", a group of progressive young artists. When the Nazis came to

²³² Quoted in JC 31/7/1992.

²³³ SJAC, C.P. Taylor, "Walter", typescript (not dated).

²³⁴ Scotland on Sunday 19/4/1992. In Edinburgh a series of his plays was staged. During the Glasgow Mayfest Taylor's "Good" (C.P. Taylor, Good. A Tragedy, London, 1982) was played.

²³⁵ Jewish Art. Paintings and sculpture by 20th century Jewish artists of the French and British schools (exhibition catalogue), Glasgow, 1979, p. 15.

²³⁶ Josef Herman "Memory of Memories" The Glasgow Drawings 1940-43 (exhibition booklet), Glasgow, 1985, p. 7. See also p. 5 where it is suggested (by Agi Katz as Herman does himself) that during this period he only used Jewish subject-matter, but this is not quite correct. He also produced drawings like "Glasgow workman" and images of West Highland fishermen. Like Macdonald, Herman also designed stage sets for Unity.

²³⁷ For a wide perspective of his work see Jankel Adler Aussenstellung und Katalog (catalogue retrospective exhibition Stadtkunsthalle Düsseldorf), Cologne, 1985.

power he was forced to leave and lived in Paris and Warsaw, where he met Herman for the first time. In 1939 Adler joined the Polish Army and was evacuated to Britain in 1940, where he eventually was demobilised in Glasgow for health reasons. Adler often used Jewish subjects in his work²³⁸.

Herman and Adler were largely unknown in Scotland when they arrived here and they might have moved on shortly after their arrival if not for sculptor Benno Schotz and the Jewish Welfare Board²³⁹. Schotz first helped Herman find his feet and then assisted Adler with some commissions from art friends and Jewish businessmen. Adler set up a studio in West Regent Street and both men had their first Glasgow exhibitions in 1941. To have an exhibition within a year of arrival was extraordinary, but the Scottish art world was traditionally open to newcomers and foreign influence.

Tom Macdonald met Herman in the Unity Theatre. Macdonald recalls how Herman after a while “became a figure of importance to the painters in the West of Scotland. A small group of artists came under his influence, including (sculptor) Helen Biggar, Willison Taylor and myself.”²⁴⁰ Herman and Adler brought a new Continental experience to Scotland, as gallery owner Cyril Gerber puts it: “with the physical and enthusiastic presence of Adler and Herman in their midst, the art movement in Glasgow was tasting a fresh Central and East European flavour for the first time (...)”²⁴¹ Tom Macdonald pays tribute when he wrote the following in 1985.

“Herman helped to stimulate a move away from the academic practice of most Academies and Societies of the Scottish scene, and away from the pervasive ‘French’ influence. Glasgow was indeed lucky that these ‘refugees’ came to the city and stayed long enough to open windows for the less experienced. Without them it would have taken longer to achieve a ‘Modern’ view.”²⁴²

²³⁸ A. Kampf, Chagall to Kitaj. Jewish Experience in 20th Century Art, London, 1990, pp. 72-73, 87. Like many other Jewish artists, Adler used an Expressionist style. The combination of Expressionism and Jewish subject matter does not make an artist's work into Jewish art. So far critics have not been able to agree what should be regarded as Jewish art. There is some agreement about an experience which a number of immigrant Jewish artists of the 20th century shared and which is expressed in their work. See also G. Abramson (ed.), The Blackwell Companion to Jewish Culture. From the Eighteenth Century to the Present, Oxford, 1989, pp. 41-45; Encyclopedia Judaica, volume 3, pp. 540-576.

²³⁹ Schotz, Bronze in my Blood, pp. 161-162.

²⁴⁰ T. Macdonald, “Josef Herman in Glasgow”, in Josef Herman “Memory of Memories”, pp. 13-14, p. 13. After his stay in Scotland, Herman moved to England and eventually settled in Wales, becoming an outstanding British artist.

²⁴¹ Jankel Adler and Josef Herman. Paintings, drawings, watercolours (exhibition catalogue), Glasgow, 1990; compare D. Macmillan, Painting in Scotland. The Golden Age, Oxford, 1986; L. Errington, “Gold and Silver in Shadow: The Dutch Influence in Nineteenth-Century Scottish Painting”, in J.L. Williams, Dutch Art and Scotland. A Reflection of Taste (exhibition catalogue), Edinburgh, 1992, pp. 49-59. There was a traditionally strong Continental influence. During the Golden Age of Scottish painting in the 18th century and early 19th century Scottish artists had been influenced by the Dutch masters. Later, the 19th century Dutch artist Jozef Israels inspired Scottish artists.

²⁴² Josef Herman “Memory of Memories”, p. 14.

Herman's and Adler's influence in Scotland, however, should not be overestimated²⁴³. When they arrived in the city these artists joined a relatively large group of refugees from the Continent who had given the atmosphere in Glasgow a more than usual cosmopolitan flavour. The city's art world had already tasted European styles. During the 1930s an exhibition of modern German art had been held in the McLellan Galleries, organised by Benno Schotz²⁴⁴. And in addition, the painter J.D. Fergusson had returned from France and he had become the centre of some new activities, including the New Art Club. All this came together in the Unity Theatre where artists created stage sets, designed costumes and provided art work. Adler and Herman left Glasgow in 1943. Between 1940 and 1943 they had some direct influence in the city, as in the case of Macdonald, but with respect to other Scottish artists their influence took an indirect route. After they left Glasgow the two settled in England (Herman eventually went to Wales). There they made their major contribution to British art and from there Adler and Herman influenced Scottish artists. Most of their influence therefore reached Glasgow long after they had left the city²⁴⁵. Adler died in 1949. By 1971 the Glasgow museums possessed one picture by Adler, namely "Composition" (catalogue number 2981), purchased in 1953. The fact that there was only one painting might also indicate that Adler's contribution was regarded as more British than Glaswegian in character and that recognition came long after he left Scotland. After leaving Glasgow in 1943, Adler first spent some time in Kirkcubright, a place in Galloway earlier favoured by some of the Glasgow Boys, which might have been suggested to Adler by Fergusson. This shows the influence which Fergusson possibly had on Adler.

Unlike Adler and Herman, Benno Schotz remained in Glasgow, although he also worked for short periods in London and Israel. Schotz, born in 1891, arrived in Glasgow shortly before the First World War to study at the Royal Technical College. He started work in 1914 with the shipbuilding firm of John Brown as an engineer and did

²⁴³ As is suggested in 1979 catalogue Jewish Art, p. 6; compare Jankel Adler and Josef Herman, 1990. The 1979 catalogue states that Adler had direct influence on Scottish artists Robert Colquhoun and Robert MacBryde. If this is correct, it must refer to the period after 1943 when Adler found a studio in London in the same building as Colquhoun and MacBryde.

²⁴⁴ Benno Schotz Retrospective Exhibition, p. 26; Jankel Adler and Josef Herman; C. Oliver, "Wartime Glasgow: The 'Alternative Arts Scene'", in Josef Herman "Memory of Memories", pp. 9-10, p. 9. Oliver believes the exhibition was in 1938 and contained art which had been forbidden by the Nazis. Gerber (Jankel Adler and Josef Herman) calls it an exhibition of German Expressionist Art. According to the Schotz catalogue, the exhibition was in 1939 and was called "Twentieth Century German Art".

²⁴⁵ For this perspective see Jankel Adler and Josef Herman; compare Oliver in Josef Herman "Memory of Memories", pp. 9-10; British Paintings. Summary Catalogue (Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum), Glasgow, 1971, p. 94; E. Roditi, "The Jewish Artist in the Modern World", in C. Roth, Jewish Art. An Illustrated History, London, 1971, pp. 286-312, pp. 294-296. During the early 1970s Adler was still not widely recognised. Roditi, in his contribution to Roth's Jewish Art, mentions Adler's influence on the Rhineland painters. Gerber and Oliver write that Schotz was Lithuanian, which is not correct. He came to Glasgow from Estonia.

not become a professional sculptor until later. His first exhibition was held in 1917 (for the first three years he used the name Shotts rather than the more German-sounding Schotz²⁴⁶) and in 1920 he was elected as an artist member of the Glasgow Art Club. His membership meant recognition of his talents by his fellow artists which was echoed in the press. In 1923, Schotz began to exhibit in the Royal Academy and in 1926, when he had his first one-man show in Reid's Gallery, he joined the Royal Glasgow Institute of the Fine Arts. Finally, in 1937 he became a member of the Royal Scottish Academy²⁴⁷ after being an associate member. The status of Academician indicates that his talent was now fully recognised.

Initially, Schotz had difficulty establishing himself as a professional sculptor. He received some commission through John Keppie, a non-Jewish friend, but well into the 1930s he had to rely for a steady income on the dressmaking business of his wife Milly. Throughout the years, his main work was in portrait sculpture, a field in which he gained a wide-spread reputation. In 1938 Schotz received his first commission for a church composition. In this case, the order came from the Roman Catholic church and his work was to be displayed during the Empire Exhibition. Schotz writes that his friend the architect Jack Coia helped him to get the commission²⁴⁸.

Schotz's work consists of portraits, compositions and abstracts which he started later in life. It can be argued that Schotz was inspired by the work of Jacob Epstein, an American Jew who settled in London and who had chosen Jewish immigrant life New York as subject matter. Schotz considered Epstein as an elder brother with whom he had an inherited tradition in common²⁴⁹. Schotz used general Scottish, Christian and Jewish subjects in his work. In the last category there is a number of portraits of Zionist leaders and the already mentioned "Unto the Hills". One work has Jewish immigration in Glasgow as its subject. This is "(Ura) The Exile", a wood carving of a Jewish woman from Russia "who had lost her roots"²⁵⁰.

Schotz became a leading artist in Scotland and exercised influence through his many activities and his post as Head of Sculpture and Ceramics at the Glasgow School of Art, which he held from 1938 until he retired in December 1960. Schotz's talents were widely recognised, but his influence did not spread beyond the circle of professional

²⁴⁶ Schotz, Bronze in my Blood, pp. 53, 63. He writes that he was employed by Brown, which was unusual for a Jewish immigrant, because he understood technical terms in Russian.

²⁴⁷ For these biographical details see Benno Schotz Retrospective Exhibition, pp.25-26; Schotz, Bronze in my Blood, pp. 72-74, 85-86, p. 94.

²⁴⁸ Schotz, Bronze in my Blood, p. 127.

²⁴⁹ K. Schwarz, "Jewish Sculptors", in Roth, Jewish Art, pp. 313-327, p. 321; compare Kampf, Chagall to Kitaj, pp. 48-49; Schotz, Bronze in my Blood, pp. 91, 94. Schwarz mistakenly writes that Schotz was director of the Glasgow School of Art. The index in Roth's book lists the sculptor as Schatz.

²⁵⁰ Benno Schotz. Portrait Sculpture, p. 8. The wood carving (in Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum) was made in 1926. The woman modelled for the sculptor in 1919.

artists. Compared to other Jewish immigrants and immigrant children Schotz was rather an exception. In his early days, before 1917, there were few other Jewish pupils at the Glasgow School of Art but none of them reached a similar position²⁵¹.

Jews were well represented in Glasgow's theatre world and in the visual arts they did quite well considering the context they worked in, but they made no contribution to Scottish literature before the Second World War. Drama and visual art were more accessible means whereby Jews in Glasgow could express themselves than literature. The English language formed a barrier to the first generation of immigrants. The second generation advanced in drama and later in literature. The Scottish art world was open to these newcomers and welcomed their influence. Greenbaum's work, reflecting left-wing thinking within Glasgow Jewry, helped to create a contemporary social awareness in contemporary political thinking. Taylor's work did not have a similar influence. The work of visual artists like Herman and Adler had a limited influence during the time they worked in Glasgow.

²⁵¹ See Art Exhibition. Festival of Jewish Arts (catalogue), Glasgow 1951; British Painting. Summary Catalogue (Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum), p. 10; Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 178-179, 206; P. Harris, J. Halsby, The Dictionary of Scottish Painters 1600-1960, Edinburgh, 1990; Jewish Art (1979), p. 23; D. Macmillan, Scottish Art 1460-1990, Edinburgh, 1990; Schotz, Bronze in my Blood, pp. 64, 97, 180; G. Melly, It's all writ out for you. The life and work of Scottie Wilson, London, 1986; G.M. Waters, Dictionary of British Artists Working 1900-1950, Eastbourne, 1975, 2 volumes, vol. 1, p. 10; F. Worsdall, "Introduction" in Hannah Frank. Drawing and Sculpture (catalogue), Glasgow, 1988. This concerned David Hillman, son of Rabbi Hillman, who moved to London, Saul Yaffe who also left the city, and Joseph Ancill, a close friend of Schotz. Ancill, born in 1896, graduated in 1917. He specialised in portrait painting in the academic tradition. In 1945 he portrayed Lord Provost James Welsh who donated the painting to Glasgow Museums and Art Galleries in 1947. Ancill became a largely neglected painter after the war. Waters (published in 1975) contains an entry on Ancill, but Harris/Halsby and Macmillan fail to mention him. The friendship between Ancill and Schotz was severed in 1951 when jealousy arose after Ancill, unlike Schotz, was not included in the art exhibition of the Festival of Jewish Arts. Two other Jewish artists who originated from Glasgow are Hannah Frank and Robert Scottie Wilson.

Conclusion

In the years between 1880 and 1939 the Jewish population of Glasgow underwent a remarkable transformation. The number of Jews in this city grew enormously. From a small group of people who came from England before 1880 and whose families had come from several countries on the Continent, it developed into a large community of mainly Eastern European origin. Eastern European immigrants, arriving in significant numbers since the 1860s, were looking for safety, employment and business opportunities. Some came to Glasgow to travel to America, but got stranded. These people initially settled in the neighbourhoods near the Clyde, and subsequent movements out of the original area of settlement into the suburbs or the city symbolised their social progress. Integration of these people into Scottish society developed along several lines, leading to a variety of experiences.

From a small group of retailers, wholesalers, merchants and manufacturers in the old city centre and the West End of the city, Glasgow Jewry grew to become a large, socially mixed community living on the South Side and to a lesser extent in the West End. The newer immigrants mostly found employment in occupations in Glasgow's clothing and retail trades. From a largely commercially occupied group before 1880, Glasgow Jewry as a whole moved more into manufacturing with the influx of large numbers of immigrants at the turn of the 20th century, but after the First World War the pattern shifted somewhat back to commerce.

The emphasis on commerce in Glasgow Jewry was a result of several factors. First, Glasgow's economy traditionally had a strong commercial element and offered many opportunities for small businesses, some in trades in which Jews had had a traditional expertise. Secondly, the system of Jewish welfare stimulated people to gain an independent economic status. This, in combination with a wish to better oneself, stimulated social progress. On the eve of the Second World War, the growing financial stability of the Jewish population helped many young Jews to enter a professional occupation and advance further in society. But not everybody was successful and many people failed in business. The clothing industry in 1939 still had a large Jewish workforce and within this workforce there was an ageing group which found it difficult to make any social progress. Despite working hard all their lives, many immigrants were at the end still poor.

In addition to growing financial stability in the Jewish population as a whole, the traditional importance of learning among Jews and the participation of immigrant children in the Scottish education system stimulated upward social mobility. Many young Jews were able to choose higher education, profiting from the opportunities

which Scottish education offered them. One of the main differences between Glasgow and English cities during the period between 1881 and 1939 was that there was not a Jewish school in Glasgow. Opposition to such a school came from the local education authorities and from groups within Glasgow Jewry. Consequently, Jewish immigrant children in Scotland went to public schools, which helped them to advance in Scottish society. Education thus played a very important role in the process of integration of Jewish immigrants in Glasgow. The participation in general education also widened the gap between the first generation of immigrants and their children who grew up in Glasgow.

Traditionally an ambivalent attitude towards Jews in general existed in Scotland and the initial reaction of the non-Jewish population in Glasgow to the influx of Jewish immigrants was negative. As in England, Jews as aliens were associated with wage cutting, crime and political left-wing extremism. The idea which existed in England among non-Jews that Jewish immigrants deprived them of housing accommodation did not, as such, exist in Glasgow, but in this city they gained a reputation of being bad tenants. At times, the expression of such feelings, which was felt by Jews to be derogatory towards them as a group, caused anxiety and fear. This should not be surprising because many Jews in Glasgow had recently witnessed persecution in Russia. Such anxiety occurred, for example, during the anti-alien propaganda of the 1890s, the Slater-trial early in the 20th century and the rise of Nazism in the 1930s.

In this, the general concept of respectability in Scottish society also played an important role. The Jewish reputation of being bad tenants defined them as not being respectable. Dirt and poverty were always associated with a failure to live a decent and respectable life. Being poor as a result of personal negligence, for example, was regarded as being deficient in self-respect. In order to avoid the further growth of such feelings and to gain social acceptability, Jews tried to show that they were respectable. They did so in several ways.

The leadership of Glasgow Jewry aspired to being accepted as good citizens. The existence of anti-Jewish feelings formed the background for the somewhat uneasy relation between the group of Jews who had settled in Glasgow before 1880 and their descendants, the older settlers, and the group of immigrants who arrived after 1880. The leaders of the older, more established settlers felt that the presence in the city of a large number of poor Jewish immigrants might endanger their social position and rather than let them depend on parish poor relief, they helped the newcomers to make a livelihood. At the same time the older settlers tried to control the immigrants by means of charity and the provision of religious services, urging them to adjust to their standards and to Scottish society in general.

The synagogue of the older settlers opened in 1879 at Garnethill illustrates this. The new building was meant to impress the general population but it was also built to attract all the Jews living in Glasgow because it was thought that when the immigrants came to the synagogue some influence could be exercised over them. In the eyes of many immigrants, however, Garnethill was the synagogue of people who practised an unacceptable form of Judaism. They established a variety of independent congregations on the South Side. Still, the differences should not be overestimated. There may have been different reasons for the fact that the older settlers did not start a Reform congregation, such as the relatively small number of older settlers in Glasgow, but the fact that no Reform congregation was found at Garnethill meant that immigrants were able to attend the services there or at least to continue to cooperate with Garnethill when they created their own institutions. It should not be overlooked that some of the representatives of the group of older settlers, like Julius Pinto, had not arrived in Glasgow until the 1870s and can almost be regarded as members of the group of newcomers. Some immigrants who enjoyed an early business success in Scottish society, like Ben Strump and Isaac Speculand, formed a bridge which crossed the gap between older settlers and immigrants.

Garnethill initially dominated the immigrant institutions in Glasgow. It should also be noted, however, that during the early years of the 20th century only one out of every ten Jews in Glasgow rented a seat in one of the synagogues which was controlled by the older settlers or the congregations associated with Garnethill. Unlike the situation in many English cities, the domination of the older settlers in Glasgow ended early in the 20th century when they were overwhelmed by the sheer number of newcomers and the rise of an immigrant middle class. In 1906, that is relatively early when compared to the situation in English cities, the older settlers in Glasgow had to give up their attempts to control the immigrant congregations. Their own congregation was more or less taken over by immigrants after the First World War.

Several initiatives were directed at the immigrant children to help them to adjust to Scottish society. This was done through the system of congregational Hebrew classes and the establishment of organisations aimed at facilitating adjustment to general society, for example, by teaching the virtues of discipline, cleanliness and thrift. The older settlers had started such initiatives, but the immigrant leadership which arose from a group of successful workshop owners and businessmen continued to urge their people to adjust themselves to Scottish society by such means. This was, of course, part of a process of settling down and trying to better oneself, but it was also an expression of a striving for respectability and civic acceptability, an ambition which was fuelled by the general attitude towards Jews.

In addition, Scottish society demanded conformity. Jews felt the need to adapt their

rituals to suit Scottish inclinations and customs. In their striving for respectability and civic acceptance the congregation of the older settlers built their synagogue at Garnethill and encouraged immigrants to build similar places of worship. They made changes in synagogue ritual which were sometimes adaptations of Christian practices. The striving for respectability can also be recognised elsewhere: in Jewish welfare work and education, and with individual successful Jewish workshop owners and businessmen who sought recognition of their status as leaders of the congregations and later in secular groups such as friendly societies and Zionist organisations. They were followed by students, labour leaders, women and young professionals. New organisations constantly offered opportunities for those who would otherwise have been frustrated by being unable to participate fully in general social, political and cultural life.

There are more indications of how Glasgow Jewry itself wanted to develop in order to advance its members' interests. Under the influence of the trade union movement, friendly societies and Zionist organisations, Jews in Glasgow began to operate as political groups. Attempts were made to influence politicians. The Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, for example, attempted to better the position of Jewish aliens. The communal leadership of Glasgow Jewry preferred not to use public activity, but to utilise contacts they had built up with local politicians on an informal level. It was believed that public activities such as petitions and demonstrations would endanger the position of the Jews. Some Jewish groups, however, were more outspoken and after 1918 publicly attempted to influence politicians on the issues of anti-Jewishness, Fascism and Palestine. These groups consisted mostly of people who adhered to left-wing politics and who opposed the communal leadership. Their actions can also be regarded as part of a power struggle within the Jewish community.

The attitude towards Jews in general did not prevent them from taking part in Glasgow's public life, although before 1939 most Jewish politicians from Glasgow sought not to emphasise their Jewishness. Jews were also well represented in the theatre world and in the visual arts they did quite well considering the context they worked in. The second generation immigrants advanced in drama and later in literature. The Scottish art world was open to these newcomers and welcomed their influence, producing some notable figures such as Benno Schotz for instance. Avrom Greenbaum's work, reflecting left-wing thinking within Glasgow Jewry, also helped to create a contemporary social awareness and played a part in contemporary political thinking.

The transformation in Glasgow Jewry was also a product of changes which affected Jews as much as non-Jews. Ritual changes, for example, while partially inspired by non-Jewish customs and influenced by the Anglo-Jewish establishment and the Reform movement, were also needed to accommodate the changing needs of the members of the

congregations, and they resemble the alterations which were made in Protestant churches and parishes.

This development took place in all Jewish congregations, but not with the same speed and it did not take the same shape everywhere. Older settlers and immigrants had originally established a variety of congregations, which differed in size and style. The older settlers were the first to make ritual changes. Some immigrant leaders wanted to follow this example, but only hesitatingly. Other congregations refused to alter their synagogue services. When it came to religion many immigrants looked to the Eastern European past for inspiration. The greatest differences over how far to change thus occurred in the field of religion.

After the First World War the congregations in general went into decline. People's customs and lifestyle changed. Religion, originally the sole means of identifying Jewishness, was being supplemented by new ideologies such as Socialism and Zionism. A large number of friendly societies took over responsibilities which had previously belonged to the congregations, like burial of the poor and relief in times of illness, death and unemployment. During the 1930s new institutions, like Jewish Institute and the Workers' Circle, became communal centres, a position which had previously been occupied by the synagogues. Zionism, in offering a more secular Jewish ideology, became a powerful instrument in preserving Judaism.

On the eve of the Second World War there was still a distinctive Jewish lifestyle in Glasgow. Religious habits had changed, old institutions gone into decline, but new ideologies and communal centres had emerged. The gap between the first generation of immigrants and young people, however, was growing in terms of religion, education, language, occupations, social status and participation in Glasgow's public life. During the 1920s, some local Jewish leaders began to express the fear that the youth might be lost to Judaism. There is little evidence to suggest that this was really happening. Instead, a new generation of Jews was growing up, without the experience of Eastern Europe Judaism, who might eventually, in the words of Benno Schotz, "feel at one" with the Scottish people. The integration of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe into the Scottish society meant disintegration of an Eastern European way of life, but not an abandonment of their Jewish heritage.

Appendix

Table 1.1: Estimated numbers of Jews in British cities 1901-1939
(between brackets percentage of total population)

City	1901	1914	1922	1939
London	97,000 (2.12)	150,000 (2.02)	170,000 (2.28)	233,991 (2.85)
Manchester	22,000 (4.04)	30,000 (4.19)	32,000 (4.47)	37,500 (3.79)
Leeds	12,000 (2.79)	25,000 (5.38)	25,000 (5.61)	30,000 (6.16)
Glasgow	6,000 (1.02)	7,000 (0.92)	14,000 (1.07)	15,000 (1.37)
Liverpool	5,000 (0.73)	7,000 (1.04)	7,000 (1.04)	7,500 (0.88)

Sources: I. Harris (ed.), The Jewish Year Book 1901-1902, London, 1901; idem, 1914; idem, 1922; The Jewish Year Book, 1939, London, 1939.

Table 1.2: Jews on Glasgow valuation rolls 1881-1911

	1881	1911
Dalmarnock	1	6
Calton	2	22
Mile End	1	3
Whitevale	2	4
Dennistoun	1	4
Cowlairs	-	1
Townhead	-	4
Blackfriars	16	44
Broomielaw	-	3
Anderston	-	2
Exchange	-	5
Blythwood	14	3
Sandyford	12	7
Park & Woodside	7	38
Kelvinside	-	14
Cowcaddens	1	4
Maryhill	-	4
Hutchesontown	4	38
Gorbals	30	173
Kingston	7	12
Kinning Park	-	2
Govanhill	-	32
Langside	-	40
Pollokshields	-	2
Total	98	473

* each column indicates how many times Jewish names, taken from a sample of 800 Jewish names, occurred in these years.

Sources: Scottish Record Office Edinburgh, New Register House, Glasgow Valuation Rolls 1881 and 1911.

Table 2: Number of seatholders in United Synagogue of Glasgow synagogues 1902-1914

Synagogue	1902	1903	1904	1911	1912
Garnethill	141	138	138	361	
Great Synagogue	300	300	350		626
Chevra Kadisha	180	180	180	250	

Sources: Collins, Second City Jewry, pp. 139-145, 225; SJAC, MBG printed report 1/9/1911-31/8/1912 and SJAC, MBUSG 29/3/1903, 13/3/1904, 4/6/1906. The 1911 number for the Chevra Kadisha was said to include the seatholders of the small Poale Tsedek synagogue in Oxford Street.

Table 4.1. The estimated number of Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow, and Talmud Torah and cheder pupils 1908-1963

Year	Jewish schoolchildren in Glasgow	<u>Talmud Torah</u> pupils	<u>Cheder</u> pupils	<u>TT + cheder</u> pupils	Receiving no or private Jewish education
1908	-	376*	-	-	-
1914	1,600	-	-	600	1,000
1920	-	500	-	-	-
1926	-	718	-	-	-
1929	2,300	-	-	800	1,500
1931	-	440	-	-	-
1932	1,955	-	-	738	1,217
1934	-	356	-	-	-
1935	1,886	313	407	720	1,166
1936	-	298	-	-	-
1958	1,804	-	-	-	-
1963	1,706	-	-	-	-

* 1908 was a pre-World War One peak year for the Talmud Torah, in the years before 1914 the number of pupils mostly varied between 250 and 350. The pupils at Talmud Torah and Hebrew classes were mostly between 7 and 13 years of age. The 1914 estimate only concerns Jewish children in the primary school age in the Gorbals. The 1929 estimate concerns Jewish children in Glasgow between 5 and 15 years of age, the 1932 and 1935 Jewish children in Glasgow between 5 and 17 years of age (minimum school leaving age at this time was 14). Of the total number in 1935, 1344 children were aged from 7 to 13 years. The post-World War Two figures show the number of Jewish pupils on primary and secondary schools in Glasgow and the southern suburbs (the minimum school leaving age at this time was 15).

Sources: JC 27/3/1914 ; JE 3/5/1929, 8/8/1930, 29/8/1930, 4/3/1932, 24/3/1933, 20/9/1935; SJAC, M. Friedlander, "The History of the Talmud Torah", in Talmud Torah Jubilee Brochure (1949); P. Vincent, "Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", in Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. VI, nr. 2 (Dec. 1964), pp. 220-231.

Table 4.2 Jewish pupils at Gorbals Public School 1913-1914

Year	1913	1914
Total number of pupils	1260	1243
Total number of Jewish pupils	769	768
Jewish pupils in percentage of total number of pupils per division:		
infant division	64.8%	68.5%
junior division	60.2%	62.5%
senior division	61.8%	61.5%
Jewish pupils in supplementary class*:	133 (51.9%)	— (42.5%)

* The supplementary class consisted of pupils between 12 and 14 years of age. No figure is given for the number of Jewish pupils in that class in 1914.

Source: SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 28/5/1913, 25/11/1914.

Table 4.3 Estimated percentage of Jewish children of total number of pupils at Gorbals Public School 1905-1937

Year	Percentage of Jewish pupils
1905	43%
1913	61%
1914	66%
1923	57%
1933	33%
1937	26%

Source: SRA, Logbook Gorbals Public School 12/6/1891, 23/9/1892, 11/1/1905, 13/3/1906, 28/5/1913, 25/11/1914 , 21/8/1923, 22/9/1933, 22/9/1937.

Table 4.4 Choice of subjects of students at Glasgow University in 1936-1937 (in percentages)

Subject	Jewish students	Non-Jewish students
Medicine	68.6	25.5
Arts	13.7	37.5
Law	7.8	13.0
Science	7.8	13.5
Engineering	1.9	6.0
Theology	—	4.5
	- - -	- - -
Total	99.8	100.0

Source: G. Block, H. Schwab, "Jewish Students: A Survey of their Position at the Universities of Britain", in The Jewish Yearbook 1938, pp. 365-374, p. 371.

Table 6. Parliamentary election results in Gorbals 1918-1948

Year Perc.	Electorate	Turnout	Candidate	Votes	
1918	40,765	53.2	Rt.Hon. G.N. Barnes (Co. Labour)	14,247	65.7
			J. Maclean (Labour)	7,436	34.3
			majority: 6,811		
1922	40,251	75.1	G. Buchanan (Labour)	16,478	54.5
			J.E. Harper (-)	8,276	27.4
			J. Maclean (Ind. Communist)	4,027	13.3
			F.J. Robertson (-)	1,456	4.8
			majority: 8,202		
1923	40,331	63.5	G. Buchanan (Labour)	17,211	67.2
			R. McLellan (Unionist)	8,392	32.8
			majority: 8,819		
1924	40,483	73.0	G. Buchanan Labour)	19,480	65.9
			R. McLellan (Unionist)	10,092	34.1
			majority: 9,388		
1929	49,004	68.5	G. Buchanan (Labour)	25,134	74.8
			M. Bloch (Unionist)	8,457	25.2
			majority: 16,677		
1931	47,372	70.0	G. Buchanan (ILP)	19,278	58.1
			M. Bloch (Unionist)	11,264	34.0
			H. McShane (Communist)	2,626	7.9
			majority: 8,014		
1935	46,076	66.1	G. Buchanan (ILP)	22,860	75.0
			M. Bloch (Unionist)	5,824	19.1
			A. Burnett (Labour)	1,786	5.9
			majority: 17,036		
1945	46,394	56.8	G. Buchanan (Labour)	21,073	80.0
			I.A. Mactaggart (Unionist)	5,269	20.0
			majority: 15,804		
1948	50,243	50.0	A. Cullen (Labour)	13,706	54.5
			W. Roxburgh (Unionist)	7,181	28.6
			P. Kerrigan (Communist)	4,233	16.9
			majority: 6,525		

Source: F.W.S. Craig (ed.), British Parliamentary Election Results 1918-1949,
Chichester, 1983 (3rd edition), p. 589.

Glossary

- Aliyah A calling-up to the Reading of the Law during the synagogue service, also used in connection with emigration to Palestine/Israel
- Amida Devotional synagogue prayer
- Bar mitzvah Coming of age ceremony for boys at the age of 13
- Bat chayil Ceremony for girls which was similar to bar mitzvah
- Beth Din Ecclesiastical court of at least three members which administers Jewish law
- Beth Hamedrash Place to study Jewish law
- Bimah Reader's desk in synagogue
- Blintzes and cholent Traditional dishes
- Chadaram Classes for Jewish religious education (single cheder)
- Chanukah Festival to commemorate the rededication of the Temple
- Chevroth Voluntary groups formed for religious purposes, often constituting a congregation and associated with social and charitable functions (single: chevra)
- Chazan Synagogue reader (also Cantor, plural chazanim)
- Cohanim Descendants of the Temple priests (single: cohen)
- Duchan Blessing which was traditionally recited by cohanim
- Eretz Israel The historical Land of Israel
- Galuth Exile
- Kosher Food fit according to Jewish dietary law
- Issur Rabbinical prohibition
- Landsleit Persons originating from the same area in the Pale
- Maggid Preacher
- Minyan Prayer meeting or the quorum of 10 adult men which is required for communal prayer (plural: minyanim)
- Parnass and Gabai Laymen conducting synagogue service, also referred to as Senior and Junior Warden
- Rav Rabbi
- Shechita The slaughter of cattle and poultry for food in a manner prescribed by Jewish dietary law by a properly qualified shochet
- Shekel Annual subscription to the Zionist movement (plural: shekelim)
- Shiva Mourning for the death
- Shochet Ritual killer (plural: shochetim)
- Shul Synagogue
- Sifrei Torah Scrolls containing Torah
- Smicha Rabbinical authority
- Talmud Oral law
- Talmud Torah School for Jewish religious education
- Torah Holy Scripture or the law which Moses received from God
- Treife Not kosher
- Yeshiva Talmud high school or centre of advanced Jewish studies

Sources

	page
Primary sources	
A1. Manuscript sources	305
A2. Newspapers and magazines	306
A3. Printed primary sources	307
Secondary sources	
B1. Books	308
B2. Articles	314
B3. Reference works	317
B4. Theses	317

A. Primary sources

A1. Manuscript sources

Glasgow University Archives:

Report by Mess.T. Binnie & Son on Mount Florida and Gorbals Properties,
Glasgow 13/2/1901;
Business Records Centre, Index Calendar of Confirmations;
Scottish Theatre Archive, section Jewish Institute Players.

Private collection:

Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Representative Council.

Scottish Jewish Archives Centre:

Alteration plans Chevra Kadisha;
Blue & White Bazaar brochures;
Cash Book Building of New Synagogue (Garnethill);
Communal Record Garnethill (1911);
Correspondence M. Bloch, A. Yuile and John Hamilton & Son;
C.P. Taylor, "Walter", typescript (not dated);
Folder Jacobs Affair;
Friendly society member's contribution card Ch. Frank (1913);
H. Shapiro, "The Circle in Scotland", from Golden Jubilee Book 1909-1959
(photocopy);
Handwritten article M. D. Dryan;
Leaflet "To Jewish Parents A Timely Reminder", April 1937;
Leaflets and photographs collections;
Letters Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation to the Rev. Katz 28/1/1914;
Medical card Gabriel Garvarten;
Membership card and syllabus Glasgow Zionist Literary Circle 1924-1925;
Minute Book Garnethill;
Minute Book Garnethill Synagogue Women's Guild;
Minute Book Glasgow Hebrew Congregation;
Minute Book Glasgow Hebrew Philanthropic Society;
Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Education Board;

Minute Book Glasgow Jewish Volunteer Association;
 Minute Book Pollokshields Congregation;
 Minute Book South Portland Street;
 Minute Book United Jewish Youth Movement;
 Minute Book United Synagogue of Glasgow;
 Oral History Project interviews;
 Programme JNF Annual Purim Carnival Ball 7/3/1939;
 Programmes Jewish Institute Players and Avrom Greenbaum Players;
 Register of Births, Marriages and Deaths of the Glasgow Hebrew Congregation;
 Reports J.M. Adler 11/2/1937 & 12/2/1937;
 Speech H.M. Langman April 1939;
 United Palestine Appeal Financial Statements & Reports 1945-1946.

Scottish Record Office, New Register House and West Register House, Edinburgh:

Calender of Confirmations;
 Census of Scotland, 1871, Enumerators' Books;
 Census of Scotland 1891, Enumerators' Books;
 Court Of Session papers;
 Dissolved Company Files;
 Glasgow Valuation Rolls 1861, 1881, 1891, 1911.

Strathclyde Regional Archives:

Admission register Gorbals Public School
 Applications for relief, Parish of Govan Combination;
 Correspondence Town Clerk Depute;
 Dean of Court Proceedings;
 Domesday Book of Glasgow Members of Council;
 Glasgow Municipal Commission on the Housing of the Poor (1902-1905);
 Logbook Gorbals Public School;
 Merchants House Records;
 Register of Pedlars Certificates.

University of Sheffield Archives:

Zaidman papers.

A2. Newspapers and magazines

Daily Record and Mail
Der Poylisher Yidl
Edinburgh University Jewish Society Magazine
Edinburgh Star
Evening Dispatch
Glasgow Chronicle
Glasgow Evening Citizen
Glasgow Evening News
Glasgow Hebrew College Magazine
Glasgow Herald
Hadardar, Magazine of the Glasgow Jewish Student Society
Jewish Chronicle

[Jewish Echo](#)
[Jewish Leader](#)
[Lancet](#)
[Mail on Sunday](#)
[North British Daily Mail](#)
[Scotland on Sunday](#)
[Scots Magazine](#)
[Scottish Field](#)
[Sunday Post](#)
[The Bailie](#)
[The Builder](#)
[The Circle](#)
[The Eagle](#)
[The Expositor](#)
[The Jewish Voice](#)
[The Observer](#)
[The Times](#)
[Youth News](#)

A.3 Printed primary sources

[50th Anniversary Brochure Glasgow Jewish Representative Council](#), in SJAC.
[Annual Report for 1931, Board of Deputies of British Jews](#), London, 1932.
[Annual Report of the Glasgow Trades Council 1905-1906-1907](#), Glasgow, 1907.
[Art Exhibition. Festival of Jewish Arts](#) (catalogue), Glasgow 1951.
[Benno Schotz Portrait Sculpture](#), Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum exhibition catalogue, Glasgow, 1978.
[Benno Schotz Retrospective Exhibition](#) (catalogue), Edinburgh, 1970.
[British Paintings. Summary catalogue](#) (Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum), Glasgow, 1971.
[Census of Scotland 1891](#), Edinburgh, 1891, 2 volumes.
[Census of Scotland 1911](#), London, 1912, 3 volumes.
[Corporation of Glasgow, Minutes](#), in SRA.
[Cosmo Innes \(ed.\), Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis. Munimenta Ecclesie Metropolitanae Glasguensis a sede restaurata seculo ineunte xii as Reformatam Religionem](#), Maitland Club, 1843.
[Dryan, M.D. and Rubinstein, A.L., The Holy Sabbath](#), Glasgow, not dated, in SJAC.
[Financial Statement Glasgow Hebrew Public Burial Society 1912-1913](#), in SJAC.
[Financial Statement and Report Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation 1915-1916](#), in SJAC.
[Garnethill Souvenir Jubilee Brochure](#) (1929), in SJAC.
[Garnethill Synagogue Centenary Souvenir Brochure](#), Glasgow, 1979, in SJAC.
[Glasgow Annual](#).
[Glasgow Jewish Year Book 1937-1938](#), in SJAC.
[Glasgow Jewish Year Book 1938-1939](#), in SJAC.
[Glasgow Trades' and Labour Council Annual Report 1926-1927](#), Glasgow, 1927.
[Glasgow Trades' Council Annual Report 1912-1913-1914](#), Glasgow, 1914.
[Glasgow United Trades' Council Report 1887-88](#), Glasgow, 1888.
[Glasgow United Trades' Council Report 1888-89](#), Glasgow, 1889.

Glasgow United Trades' Council Report 1890-91, Glasgow, 1891.
Glasgow United Trades' Council Report 1894-95, Glasgow, 1895.
Glasgow United Trades' Council Report 1903-1904, Glasgow, 1904.
Hannah Frank. Drawings and Sculpture (catalogue), Glasgow, 1988.
Harfield, G.E., Commercial Directory of the Jews in Great Britain, London, 1894.
House of Lords. Sessional Papers, session 1888.
Jankel Adler and Josef Herman. Paintings, drawings, watercolours (exhibition catalogue), Glasgow, 1990.
Jewish Art. Paintings and sculpture by 20th century Jewish artists of the French and British schools (exhibition catalogue), Glasgow, 1979.
Jewish Year Books.
Joseph Herman. "Memory of Memories". The Glasgow Drawings 1940-43 (exhibition catalogue), Glasgow, 1985.
Langman, H.M., Hebrew Primer of Hebrew Reading and Writing with Bible Stories and Short Prayers for Jewish Children, Glasgow, 1931, in SJAC.
Levy, J., Assimilationist Kindergarten, Glasgow, 1944, in SJAC.
Lindsay, D.E., Report upon a Study of the Diet of the Labouring Classes in the City of Glasgow 1911-1912, Glasgow, 1913.
Minutes Corporation of Glasgow Education Department, in SRA.
Minutes of the Education Authority of Glasgow, in SRA.
Post Office Glasgow Directories.
Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Golden Jubilee Brochure (1927-1977), in SJAC.
Queen's Park Hebrew Congregation Jubilee Brochure (1956), in SJAC.
Report and Recommendations Glasgow Municipal Commission on Housing for the Poor (1904), in SRA.
Royal Commission on Alien Immigration. Reports from Commissioners, Inspectors, and others: Alien Immigration, Cd1742-1743, 27 volumes, 1903-1904.
Speech given by Rev. I. Hirshow MA BMus. on the occasion of his Twenty-fifth Anniversary as Reader at Garnethill Synagogue Glasgow, Glasgow, 1946, in SJAC.
Talmud Torah Jubilee Brochure, Glasgow, 1949, in SJAC.
The Best One-Act Plays of 1937, London, 1938.
The Corporation of the City of Glasgow. Laurieston/Gorbals Comprehensive Development Area, 1965. Survey Report, in SRA.
The Times House of Commons 1929, London, 1929.
The Workers' Circle Friendly Society. Diamond Jubilee, 1909-1969, London, 1969.
Tom Macdonald 1914-1985. Paintings, drawings, and theatre designs (exhibition booklet Third Eye Centre), Glasgow, 1986.
Trial of Oscar Slater. Report of Proceedings, in WRH.
TUC Annual Reports 1892, 1893.
Willox, D., Members of Glasgow Corporation, 1907-10. A Poetical Sketch, Glasgow, n.d. (circa 1911).
70 Years, Glasgow, 1981, in SJAC.

B. Secondary sources

B1. Books

- Alderman, G., London Jewry and London Politics 1889-1986, London, 1989.
- The Jewish Community in British Politics, Oxford, 1983.
 - The Jewish Vote in Great Britain since 1945, Glasgow, 1980.
- Anderson, R.D., Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland, Oxford, 1983.
- Anderson, W.E.K., The Journal of Sir Walter Scott, Oxford, 1972.
- Aris, S., The Jews in Business, London, 1970.
- Avineri, S., The Making of Modern Zionism. The Intellectual Origins of the Jewish State, London, 1981.
- Banton, M., Racial Theories, Cambridge, 1987.
- Baron, S., The Russian Jews under Tsars and Soviets, New York/London, 1964.
- Berend, I., Ranki, G., Economic Development in East-Central Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries, New York, 1974.
- Bermant, C., Ben Preserve Us, London, 1965.
- Coming Home, London, 1976.
 - Jericho Sleep Alone, London, 1964.
 - Point of Arrival: A Study of London's East End, London, 1975.
 - The Patriarch, London, 1982 (paperback edition).
 - The Second Mrs. Whitberg, London, 1976.
 - Troubled Eden. An Anatomy of British Jewry, London, 1969.
- Blair, G., Biographic and Descriptive Sketches of Glasgow Necropolis, Glasgow, 1857.
- Bodnar, J., The Transplanted. A History of Immigrants in Urban America, Bloomington Indiana, 1987.
- Bone, T.R. (ed.), Studies in the History of Scottish Education 1872-1939, London, 1967.
- Brown, C.G., The Social History of Religion in Scotland since 1730, London, 1987.
- Buckman, J., Immigrants and the Class Struggle: The Jewish Immigrant in Leeds 1880-1914, Manchester, 1983.
- Burrowes, J., Incomers, Edinburgh, 1987.
- Jamesie's People, Edinburgh, 1984.
 - Mother Glasgow, Edinburgh, 1991.
- Campbell, R.H., The Rise and Fall of Scottish Industry, 1707-1939, Edinburgh, 1980.
- Caplan, J., From Gorbals to Jungle, Glasgow 1960.
- Memories of the Gorbals, Edinburgh, 1991.
- Cesarani, D. (ed.), The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry, Oxford, 1990.
- Cleland, J., Examination of the inhabitants of the City of Glasgow and the County of Lanark for the Government Census of 1831, Glasgow 1831.
- Cohn, N., The Pursuit of the Millennium. Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages, London, 1957.
- Warrant for Genocide. The Myth of the Jewish World-Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, London, 1967.
- Collins, K.E. (ed.), Aspects of Scottish Jewry, Glasgow, 1987.
- Collins, K.E., Go and Learn. The international story of Jews and Medicine in

- Scotland, Aberdeen, 1988.
- Second City Jewry: the Jews of Glasgow in the age of expansion, 1790-1919, Glasgow, 1990.
- Conan Doyle, A., The Case of Oscar Slater, London, 1912.
- Cowan, E., Portrait of Alice, Edinburgh, 1976.
- Spring Remembered. A Scottish Jewish Childhood, Edinburgh, 1974.
- W. Cunningham, Alien Immigrants to England, London, 1897.
- Cunnison, J., and Gilfillan J.B.S. (ed.), The Third Statistical Account of Scotland. Glasgow, Glasgow, 1958.
- Daiches, D., Glasgow, London, 1977.
- Two Worlds. An Edinburgh Jewish Childhood, Edinburgh, 1987 (reprint).
 - Was. A pastime from time past, Glasgow, 1990 (paperback edition).
- Davies, N., God's Playground. A History of Poland, Oxford, 1981, 2 volumes.
- Denton, H. (with Wilson J.C.), The Happy Land, Edinburgh, 1981.
- Devine, T.M. and Mitchison, R. (eds.), People and Society in Scotland. Volume I, 1760-1830, Edinburgh, 1988.
- Dobschiner, J.-R., Selected to Live, London/Glasgow, 1978 (paperback edition).
- Doxat, J., Shinwell Talking. A Conversational Biography to Celebrate his Hundredth Birthday, London, 1984.
- Endelman, T.M., Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History 1656-1945, Indianapolis, 1990.
- Fishman, W.J., East End Jewish Radicals 1875-1914, London, 1975.
- Fleming, J.R., A History of the Church in Scotland, 1843-1874, Edinburgh, 1927.
- Frankenstein, E., Justice for my People. The Jewish Case, London, 1943.
- Fraser, W.H. and Morris, R.J. (eds.), People and Society in Scotland. Volume II, 1830-1914, Edinburgh, 1990.
- Fraser, W.H., The Coming of the Mass Market, 1850-1914, London, 1981.
- Freedman, M. (ed.), A Minority in Britain, London, 1955.
- Gainer, B., The Alien Invasion. The Origins of the Aliens Act of 1905, London, 1972.
- Gaitens, E., Dance of the Apprentices, Glasgow, 1948.
- Gallagher, W., The Last Memoirs of William Gallagher, London, 1966.
- Gallagher, T., Glasgow: The Uneasy Peace, Manchester, 1987.
- Gans, M.H., Het Nederlandse Jodendom - de sfeer waarin wij leefden. Karakter, traditie en sociale omstandigheden van het Nederlandse Jodendom voor de Tweede Wereldoorlog, Baarn, 1985.
- Memorboek. Platenatlas van het leven der joden in Nederland van de middeleeuwen tot 1940, Baarn, 1971.
- Garrard, J.A., The English and Immigration 1880-1910, London, 1971.
- Gartner, L.P., The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914, London, 1973 (2nd edition).
- Generations of Memories. Voices of Jewish Women, London, 1989.
- Gibb, A., Glasgow. The Making of a City, London 1983.
- Gilbert, M., Jewish History Atlas, London, 1985.
- Glasser, R., Growing Up in the Gorbals, London, 1987 (paperback edition).
- Gorbals Boy at Oxford, London, 1990 (paperback edition).

- Gorbals Voices, Siren Songs, London, 1991 (paperback edition).
- Golding, L. , The Jewish Problem, Harmondsworth, 1938.
- Gould, S.J. and Esh, S. (eds.), Jewish Life in Modern Britain, London, 1964.
- Greenberg, L., The Jews in Russia, New Haven/London, 1965, 2 volumes.
- Grossman, C., A Temple Treasure. The Judaica Collection of Congregation Emanu-El of the City of New York, New York, 1989.
- Gutman, A., A Story of a Dream. The Aliyah of the 'Oleh Zion' from Glasgow to Merchavia, Ramat Efal, 1990 (in Hebrew).

- Haddow, W.M., My Seventy Years, Glasgow, 1943.
- Handley, J.E., The Irish in Modern Scotland, Cork, 1947.
- The Irish in Scotland, Glasgow, 1964.
- Holmes, C., Anti-Semitism in British Society, 1876-1939, London, 1979.
- Holmes, C. (ed.), Immigrants and Minorities in British Society, London, 1978.
- Homa, B., Footprints on the Sands of Time, Gloucester/Chippenham, 1990.
- House, J., Square Mile of Murder, Glasgow, 1984 (revised edition).
- Hudaly, D., Liverpool Old Hebrew Congregation 1780-1974, Liverpool, 1974.
- Hunt, P., Oscar Slater. The Great Suspect, London, 1951.
- Hutchison, D., The Modern Scottish Theatre, Glasgow, 1977.

- Israel, J.I., European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism 1550-1750, Oxford, 1985.

- Jackson, J.A., The Irish in Britain, London, 1963.

- Kadish, S., Bolsheviks and British Jews. The Anglo-Jewish Community, Britain and the Russian Revolution, London, 1992.
- Kampf, A., Chagall to Kitaj. Jewish Experience in 20th Century Art, London, 1990.
- Katz, D.S., Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603-1655, Oxford, 1982.
- Katz, J., Exclusiveness and Tolerance. Studies in Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times, Oxford, 1961.
- From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700-1933, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1980.
- Jews and Freemasons in Europe 1723-1939, Cambridge Massachusetts, 1970.
- Out of the Ghetto. The social background of Jewish emancipation 1770-1870, Cambridge Massachusetts, 1973.
- Katznelson, I., City Trenches. Urban Politics and the Patterning of Class in the United States, Chicago/London, 1981.
- Kokosalakis, N., Ethnic Identity and Religion. Tradition and Change in Liverpool Jewry, Washington D.C., 1982.
- Krausz, E., Ethnic Minorities in Britain, London, 1972.
- Leeds Jewry. Its History and Social Structure, Cambridge, 1964.
- Kinchin, P., Kinchin J., Baxter, N., Glasgow's Great Exhibitions 1888, 1901, 1911, 1938, 1988, Wendlebury Bicester, 1988.
- Kuppner, F., A Very Quiet Street, Edinburgh, 1989.
- Kushner, T., The Persistence of Prejudice: Antisemitism in British Society during the Second World War, Manchester 1987.

Kushner, T. and Lunn, K. (eds.), Traditions of Intolerance: Historical Perspectives on Fascism and Race Discourse in Britain, Manchester, 1989.

Laqueur, W., A History of Zionism, London/New York, 1976.

Lebzelter, G.C., Political Anti-Semitism in England 1918-1939, Oxford, 1978.

Leipman, F., The Long Journey Home. The Memoirs of Flora Leipman, London, 1987.

Levin, S.S. (ed.), A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life 1870-1970, London, 1970.

Levitt, I., Poverty and Welfare in Scotland, 1890-1948, Edinburgh, 1988.

Levy, A., The Origins of Glasgow Jewry 1812-1895, Glasgow, 1949.

- The Origins of Scottish Jewry, a paper for the Jewish Historical Society of England 13/1/1958.

Levison, F., Christian and Jew. The Life of Leon Levison 1881-1936, Edinburgh, 1989.

Lewis Rifkind (Commemorative volume of essays issued on behalf of the Lewis Rifkind Memorial Book Committee in conjunction with Glasgow Poalei Zion), Glasgow, undated (probably 1938).

Leydesdorff, S., Wij hebben als mens geleefd. Het Joodse proletariaat van Amsterdam 1900-1940, Amsterdam, 1987.

Lipman, V.D., A Century of Social Service: The Jewish Board of Guardians, London, 1959.

- A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858, Leicester, 1990.

- Social History of the Jews in England 1850-1950, London, 1954.

Lunn, K., Hosts Immigrants and Minorities. Historical Responses to Newcomers in British Society 1870-1914, Folkstone, 1980.

Maan, B., The New Scots. The Story of Asians in Scotland, Edinburgh, 1992.

Macmillan, D., Painting in Scotland. The Golden Age, Oxford, 1986.

- Scottish Art 1460-1990, Edinburgh, 1990.

McKenzie, J., Gorbals Children. A Study in Photographs, Glasgow, 1990.

McLean, I., The Legend of Red Clydeside, Edinburgh, 1983.

McLeish, R., The Gorbals Story, Edinburgh, 1985.

McRoberts, D.M. (ed.), Modern Scottish Catholicism 1878-1978, Glasgow, 1979.

Melly G., It's all writ out for you. The life and work of Scottie Wilson, London, 1986.

Newman, A. (ed.), Migration and Settlement. Proceedings of the Anglo-American Jewish Historical Conference, London, 1971.

- Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain, papers for a conference of the Jewish Historical Society of England, 1975, not published.

- The United Synagogue, 1870-1970, London, 1977.

Niethammer, L. (ed.), Lebenserfahrung und kollektives Gedächtnis. Die Praxis der 'Oral History', Frankfurt a/M., 1983.

Orde, J., Story of the Barony of Gorbals, Paisley, 1919.

Park, W., The Truth About Oscar Slater, London, not dated (1927).

Parkes, J., An Enemy of the People: Antisemitism, Harmondsworth, 1945.

- Phillips, A., A History of the Origins of the First Jewish Community in Scotland - Edinburgh 1816, Edinburgh, 1979.
- Poliakov, The History of Anti-Semitism, London, 1974, 3 volumes.
- Pollins, H., Economic History of the Jews in England, East Brunswick New Jersey, 1982.
- Ramsay, T., Stranger in the Hall, Ramshorn, 1988.
- Rennap, I., Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Question, London, 1942.
- Renwick, R., Lindsay, J., History of Glasgow. Volume I, Pre-Reformation Period, Glasgow, 1921.
- Riddell, J., The Clyde. An illustrated history of the river and its shipping, Fairlie (Ayrshire), 1988.
- Rischin, M., The Promised City: New York's Jews 1870-1914, New York, 1962.
- Robbins, K.G., Nineteenth-Century Britain. Integration and Diversity, Oxford, 1988.
- The Eclipse of a Great Power. Modern Britain 1870-1975, London/New York, 1983.
 - The First World War, Oxford, 1985 (paperback edition).
- Rose, N., Chaim Weizmann. A Biography, New York, 1986.
- Roth, C., A History of the Jews in England, Oxford, 1964 (3rd edition).
- Jewish Art. An Illustrated History, London, 1971 (2nd edition).
 - The Rise of Provincial Jewry. The early history of the Jewish communities in the English countryside, London, 1950.
- Roughead, W., Trial of Oscar Slater, Edinburgh/London, 1910.
- Roxburgh, J., The School Board of Glasgow, 1873-1919, London, 1971.
- Schotz, B., Bronze in my Blood. The Memoirs of Benno Schotz, Edinburgh, 1981.
- Scotland, J., The History of Scottish Education, London, 1969, 2 volumes.
- Seton-Watson, H., The Russian Empire, 1801-1914, Oxford, 1967.
- Sherman, A.J., Island Refuge. Britain and Refugees from the Third Reich 1933-1939, London, 1973.
- Shinwell, E., Conflict Without Malice, London, 1955.
- The Britain I Want, London, 1943.
 - The Labour Story, London, 1963.
- Sigsworth, E.M., Montague Burton. The Tailor of Taste, Manchester, 1990.
- Slaven, A., The Development of the West of Scotland: 1750-1960, London/Boston, 1975.
- Smith, A.D., The Ethnic Origins of Nations, Oxford, 1986.
- Smout, T.C., A Century of the Scottish People 1830-1950, London, 1988 (paperback edition, 2nd impression).
- A History of the Scottish People 1560-1830, London, 1972 (paperback edition).
- Smout, T.C. and Wood, S. (eds.), Scottish Voices 1745-1960, London, 1991 (paperback edition).
- Stuart Cohen, A., English Zionists and British Jews: The Communal Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1895-1920, Princeton (New Jersey), 1982.
- Taylor, A.J.P., English History 1914-1945, Oxford, 1976 (reprint).
- Taylor, C.P., Bread and Butter, Harmondsworth, 1967 (Penguin series New English Dramatists, number 10).

- Good. A Tragedy, London, 1982.

Thompson, P., The Voice of the Past, Oxford, 1988 (revised paperback edition).

Treble, J.H., Urban Poverty in Britain 1830-1914, London, 1979.

Tzelnikler, A., Three for the Price of One, London, 1991.

Wasserstein, B., Herbert Samuel. A Political Life, Oxford, 1992.

White, J., The Rothschild Buildings: Life in an East End Tenement Block, 1887-1920, London, 1980.

Williams, B., The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740-1875, Manchester, 1985 (paperback edition).

Winston, C., The History of Lodge Montefiore, Glasgow No. 753, 1888-1988, Glasgow, 1987.

Wistrich, R., Antisemitism. The Longest Hatred, London, 1992 (paperback edition).

Worsdall, F., The Tenement: a Way of Life. A Social Historical and Architectural Study of Housing in Glasgow, Edinburgh, 1979.

Wrigley, E.A. (ed.), Nineteenth Century Society, Cambridge, 1972.

Zevenbergen, C., Toen zij uit Rotterdam vertrokken. Emigratie via Rotterdam door de eeuwen heen, Zwolle, n.d. (1990).

Zubrzycki, J., Polish Immigrants in Britain. A Study of Adjustment, The Hague, 1956.

B2. Articles

Adelson, J., "The Expulsion of Jews with Polish Citizenship from Bavaria in 1923", in Polin. A Journal of Polish-Jewish Studies, volume 5 (1990), pp. 57-73.

Anderson, R.D., "Education and the state in nineteenth-century Scotland", in Economic History Review, volume 36 (1983), pp. 518-534.

Aspinwall, B., "The Welfare State within the State: The Saint Vincent de Paul Society in Glasgow, 1848-1920" in W.J. Sheils, D. Wood (ed.), Studies in Church History, volume XXIII (1986), Voluntary Religion, pp. 445-459.

Benas, B.B., "A Survey of the Jewish Institutional History of Liverpool and District", in Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England, volume XVII (1951-1952), pp. 23-37.

Benski, T., "Glasgow" in A. Newman (ed.), Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain, papers for a conference of the Jewish Historical Society of England, 1975, not published, pp. 4-12.

Bermant, C., "Jews who fled from fear and found a brave new world in Scotland", in The Observer 12/2/1989.

Block, G. and Schwab, H., "Jewish Students: A Survey of their Position at the Universities of Britain", in The Jewish Yearbook 1938, pp. 365-374.

Block, G.D.M., "Jewish students at the Universities of Great Britain and Ireland - excluding London 1936-1939", in Sociological Review, 34 (3 & 4, 1942), pp. 183-197.

Brown, C.G., "Religion, Class and Church Growth", in W. H. Fraser and R.J. Morris (eds.), People and Society in Scotland, volume II, 1830-1914, Edinburgh, 1990, pp. 310-335.

- "The Costs of Pew-renting: Church Management, Church-going and Social Class in Nineteenth-century Glasgow", in The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, volume 38, number 3 (July 1987), pp. 347-361.

Cahen, J., "De wens om assimilatie probleemloos te interpreteren", in De Gids, volume 153 (1990), number 2, pp. 126-130.

Cesarani, D., "The Anti-Jewish Career of Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Cabinet Minister", in Journal of Contemporary History, volume 24 (1989), pp. 461-482.

Collins, K.E., "The Jews of Glasgow: Aspects of Health and Welfare 1790-1920", in History Teaching Review Year Book, volume 5 (1991), pp. 31-37.

Daiches, D., "The Bible in English Culture", in Jewish Chronicle 27/1/1956.

Errington, L., "Gold and Silver in Shadow. The Dutch Influence in Nineteenth-Century Scottish Painting", in J.L. Williams, Dutch Art and Scotland. A Reflection of Taste (exhibition catalogue), Edinburgh, 1992.

Fetscher, I., "Zur Entstehung des politischen Antisemitismus in Deutschland", in H. Huss and A. Schröder (eds.), Antisemitismus. Zur Pathologie der bürgerliche Gesellschaft, Frankfurt a/M, 1965, pp. 9-34.

Finestein, I., "Jewish Immigration in British Party Politics in the 1890s", in A. Newman (ed.), Migration and Settlement. Proceedings of the Anglo-American Jewish Historical Conference, London, 1971, pp. 128-144.

Gallagher, T., "Protestant extremism in urban Scotland", in Scottish Historical Review, volume 64 (1985), pp. 147-156.

Glasman, J., "Architecture and Anglicization: London Synagogue Building 1870-1900", in Jewish Quarterly, volume XXXIV (1987), number 2, pp. 16-21.

Goldstein, J., "The Beginnings of the Zionist Movement in Congress Poland: The Victory of the Hasidim over the Zionists", in Polin. A Journal of Polish-Jewish Studies, volume 5 (1990), pp. 114-130.

Heide, A. van der, "Joodse Historiografie", in Theoretische Geschiedenis, volume 34 (1986), number 3, pp. 405-408.

History Today (Glasgow: City of Cultures, 1630-1990. Urban History through a Scottish Mirror), volume 40 (1990).

Holmes, C., "Alexander Ratcliffe. Militant Protestant and Antisemite", in T. Kushner and K. Lunn (eds.), Traditions of Intolerance. Historical Perspectives on Fascism and Race Discourse in Britain, Manchester, 1989, pp. 196-217.

Hutt, C. and Kaplan, H., A Scottish Shtetl. Jewish Life in the Gorbals 1880-1974, Glasgow, 1984 (brochure).

Jamilly, "The Architecture of the Contemporary Synagogue", in C. Roth (ed.), Jewish Art. An Illustrated History, London, 1971 (2nd edition), pp. 273-285.

- Katz, J., "The Concept of Social History and its Possible Application in Jewish Historical Research", in Scripta Hierosolymitana, volume III (1956), pp. 292-312.
- "Vom Ghetto zum Zionismus. Gegenseitige Beeinflussung von Ost und West", in Leo Baeck Institute Bulletin, volume 64 (1983), pp. 3-14.
- Kenneth, Bro., "The Education Act, 1918, in the Making", in Innes Review, volume XIX (1968), pp. 91-128.
- Kiernan, V.G., "Britons Old and New", in C. Holmes (ed.), Immigrants and Minorities in British Society, London, 1978, pp. 23-53.
- Kölmel, R., "German-Jewish Refugees in Scotland", in K.E. Collins (ed.), Aspects of Scottish Jewry, Glasgow, 1987, pp. 55-84.
- Kuznets, S., "Immigration of Russian Jews to the United States: Background and Structure", in Perspectives in American History, volume IX (1975), pp. 35-124.
- Livshin, R., "The Acculturation of the Children of Immigrant Jews in Manchester", in D. Cesarani (ed.), The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry, Oxford, 1990, pp. 79-96.
- Maitles, H., "Fascism in the 1930s: The West Of Scotland in the British Context", in Scottish Labour History Journal, number 27 (1992), pp. 7-22.
- Marrus, M., "European Jewry and The Politics of Assimilation: Assessment and Reassessment", in Journal of Modern History, volume 49 (1977), number 1, pp. 89-109.
- Morrison, B., "Dancing Down Memory Lane", in The Scots Magazine, volume 136, number 6 (March 1992), pp. 593-596.
- Mosse, G.L., "German Jews and Liberalism in Retrospect", in Leo Baeck Institute Year Book, volume XXXII (1987), pp. XIII-XXV.
- Newman, A., "A Short History of Garnethill", in Garnethill Synagogue Centenary Souvenir Brochure, Glasgow, 1979, pp. 55-60.
- Peebles, H.B., "A Study in Failure: J. & G. Thomson and Shipbuilding at Clydebank, 1871-1890", in Scottish Historical Review, volume 69 (1990), pp. 22-48.
- Robbins, K.G., "The Imperial City", in History Today, volume 40 (1990), pp. 48-54.
- Rodger, R., "Employment, wages and poverty in the Scottish Cities 1841-1914", in G. Gordon (ed.), Perspectives of the Scottish City, Aberdeen, 1985, pp. 25-63.
- Rodger, R.G., "Business Failure in Scotland, 1839-1913", in Business History, volume XVII (1985), pp. 75-99.
- Rubin, G.R., "Race, Retailing and Wartime Regulation: The Retail Business (Licensing) Order 1918", in Immigrants & Minorities, volume 7 (1988), number 2, pp. 184-205.
- Treue, W., "Zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland", in Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, volume 75 (1988), pp. 360-370.

- Vincent, P., "Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", in The Jewish Journal of Sociology, volume VI, number 2, Dec. 1964, pp. 220-231.
- "The Measured Intelligence of Glasgow Jewish Schoolchildren", in The Jewish Journal of Sociology, volume VIII, number 1, June 1966, pp. 92-108.
- Volkov, S., "Antisemitism as a Cultural Code. Reflections on the History and Historiography of Antisemitism in Imperial Germany", in Leo Baeck Institute Year Book, volume XXIII (1978), pp. 25-46.
- Williams, B., "Anglo-Jewish History", in Scottish Economic and Social History, volume 11 (1991), pp. 74-77.
- "The Anti-Semitism of Tolerance: Middle-Class Manchester and the Jews 1870-1900", in A.J. Kidd and K.W. Roberts (eds.), City, Class and Culture: Studies of Cultural Production and Social Policy in Victorian Manchester, Manchester, 1985, pp. 74-102.

B3. Reference works

- Abramson, G. (ed.), The Blackwell Companion to Jewish Culture. From the Eighteenth Century to the Present, Oxford, 1989.
- Encyclopedia Britannica. A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences and General Literature, Edinburgh, 1881 (9th edition).
- Encyclopedia Judaica, Jerusalem, 1971.
- Harris, P., Halsby, J., The Dictionary of Scottish Painters 1600-1960, Edinburgh, 1990.
- Jewish Encyclopedia, New York/London, 1903.
- Jewish Encyclopedia, New York/London, 1906.
- Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, 1916.
- Knox, W. (ed.), Scottish Labour Leaders 1918-1939. A Biographical Dictionary, Edinburgh, 1984.
- Lamb, J.A., The Fasti of the United Free Church of Scotland 1900-1929, London, 1956.
- Pevsner, N., Fleming, J., Honour, H., A Dictionary of Architecture, London, 1975 (revised edition).
- Placzek, A.K. (ed.), MacMillan Encyclopedia of Architects, London/ New York, 1982.
- Richards, J. (ed.), Who's Who in Architecture from 1400 to the present day, London, 1977.
- Scott, H., Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae. The Succession of Ministers in the Church of Scotland from the Reformation, Edinburgh, 1920.
- Slaven, A., Checkland, S. (ed.), Dictionary of Scottish Business Biography 1860-1960, volume 1, The Staple Industries, Aberdeen, 1986), volume 2, Processing, Distribution, Services, Aberdeen, 1990.
- Waters, G.M., Dictionary of British Artists Working 1900-1950, Eastbourne, 1975, 2 volumes.
- Williamson, E., Riches, A., Higgs, M., The Buildings of Scotland. Glasgow, London, 1990.
- Yarwood, D. (ed.), Encyclopedia of Architecture, London, 1985.

B4. Theses

- Arkel, D. van, Antisemitism in Austria, University of Leiden, 1966.

- Blass, G., Historical Study Report on Garnethill Synagogue, report for University of Strathclyde, Department of Architecture and Building Science, not dated.
- Buckman, J., The Economic and Social History of Alien Immigration to Leeds, 1880-1914, University of Strathclyde, 1968.
- Gonshaw, R.E., The Development of Synagogue Architecture in Liverpool, Royal Institute of British Architecture, Liverpool, 1975.
- Kölmel, R., Die Geschichte deutsch-jüdischer Refugees in Schottland, Heidelberg, 1979.
- Maitles, H., Anti-Semitism in Scotland 1914-1945, University of Strathclyde, 1992.
- O'Neill, F., Foreign Immigration to Glasgow 1870-1914, University of Strathclyde, not dated.
- Sweeney, I. E., The Municipal Administration of Glasgow, 1833-1912. Public Service and the Scottish Civic Identity, University of Strathclyde, 1990.