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This study of the Jewish question was initiated as a result of a personal curiosity about the religious aspects in English life in the nineteenth century. England faced incredible political problems during this period because of her religious tests. The aim of this paper is to indicate the nature of Jewish disabilities and to reveal the final settlement of this vexing problem. Consequently, the major area of study involves the years 1830 to 1858. An additional chapter has been included briefly discussing the remaining disabilities which applied to Jews during the latter part of the nineteenth century. As a result, it is hoped that the reader may better comprehend and appreciate one aspect of life in Victorian England.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his deep appreciation to all the members of the Department of History at Omaha University who provided welcome encouragement and advice during the course of this study. It is of course with much admiration and appreciation that I note the kindness and great assistance given by Professor A. Stanley Trickett to this beginning historian. His patience, concern, and guidance throughout my graduate studies were invaluable. Also, appreciation is given to Professor William Petrowski for making my stay as a graduate assistant very enjoyable and educational. Specifically, sincere thanks is extended to Miss Ella Jane Dougherty, the Inter-Loan Librarian, without whose help this study would have been impossible. In addition, appreciation is also extended to Miss Olive Graham, a fellow graduate assistant, for her advice.

G.R.F.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREFACE</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chapter

### I. JEWISH OATH DISABILITIES

9

- Definition of the Oaths Problem
- History and Contents of Oaths
- The Oaths Problem

### II. CIVIL DISABILITIES

34

- Definition of Civil Disabilities
- Jewish Occupational Restrictions
- Municipal Offices: Judges, Aldermen, Mayor, Sheriff

### III. CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, 1830-1850

49

- Roman Catholic Emancipation
- Parliamentary Reform Bills
- Progress Evident

### IV. STRUGGLE FOR EMANCIPATION

71

- Arguments Against Relief
- Destruction of Christian Nation
- and Parliament
- Unconstitutional Reform
- No Precedents
- Admittance of Non-Christian Religions
- Jews are Aliens
- Unqualified to Rule

v
Arguments for Emancipation
Arguments Against Those Proposed By
Anti-Jewish Forces
Colonial Pressure
Liberal, Progressive Country

V. JEWISH RELIEF, 1850-1858 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 104

Attempts At Relief, 1850 to 1856
Salomons and Rothschild
Relief Bills
Relief, 1857-1853
Rothschild
Oaths Bill of 1858
Lucan's Compromise
Emancipation

VI. THE AFTERMATH . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 129

Emancipation and State Offices
Entrance Into the House of Lords
Entrance Into Universities

CONCLUSION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 137

APPENDIX A . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 142

APPENDIX B . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 143

APPENDIX C . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 145

APPENDIX D . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 146

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 147
INTRODUCTION

The years from 1830 to 1860 in England are best characterized as years of revolutionary change in the areas of social, economic, and political life. These comparatively few years are actually the initial years of achievement during which Englishmen solved many long-term problems. It was during these years that a successful solution to the problem of Jewish disabilities was formed. For the Jew, these decades saw the endless political frustrations of past years largely removed. In 1830, even though English feeling toward the Jew was changing, he was theoretically still an enemy of the State, and medieval legislation and attitudes concerning the Jew prevailed. Old traditions of hatred and slander prevailed and the English people, at least in theory, seemed determined that the Jew continue to be deprived of the rights of citizenship. Strangely enough, Englishmen would borrow money from the Jew and would accept his military service, yet they would not allow the Jew to represent them in Parliament.

---


Because the Jews before 1830 were subjected to political and civil disqualifications, they may be said to have had neither political nor civil rights. Though a few Jews did rise to the top in economic life, most English Jews lived in poverty. Even their rights to own and possess land was questioned by Parliament. "There was no Act of Parliament that legalised their presence--but they were in England. Whether they had a right to hold land and country, nobody challenged their possession."\(^3\)

Together with the Dissenters and Catholics, the Jews were deprived of many civil rights. They were barred from entering the legal profession, gaining high rank in the military, holding municipal offices, voting, attending certain universities, and sitting as members of Parliament. Prejudice, indifference, and religious hatred were the impossible obstacles to Jewish emancipation.\(^4\) Thus, the number of disabilities placed on the Jew was considerable.

These thirty years from 1830 to 1860 reveal a marked change in the attitude toward the Jew. "The public attitude in general became either absolutely indifferent to the question of Jewish citizenship or decidedly in favour of


Throughout the entire period, the agitation for Jewish reform was continuous. In the passage of the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829, the first efforts of agitation were visible. The Duke of Wellington as Prime Minister believed the final settlement of the Jewish problem would soon follow Catholic Emancipation. The Jews began attempts at reform in 1830.

Actually, in several areas, including that of parliamentary exclusion, restrictions placed on the Jew were the result of accident rather than of design.

None of the statutes which incapacitate the Jews, in this respect, were passed with the intention of imposing any restrictions upon them. When these Acts were made, their case was never contemplated or considered. . . . they were never thought of, and consequently, no care or attention was paid to their rights or interests.

Before a study of the Jewish question can begin, such questions as the Jewish population and the economic status of the English Jew must be considered. Since no accurate population statistics are available before 1801, it is necessary to rely on population statistics that, at

5McCarthy, Our Own Times, p. 143.


best, may be unreliable. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, a London magistrate estimated the Jewish population of London at 20,000. For the rest of England, he suggested that the total Jewish population might be five or six thousand. There were six synagogues in London and twenty other places of Jewish worship outside of London. In 1831 with the accession of William IV, the Jewish population of England was 30,000. Approximately two-thirds of this number were resident in London. Other major Jewish populated cities in England were Portsmouth, Plymouth, Birmingham, and Liverpool, although in some cases the Jewish population in these cities was not over one hundred.

As a result of the extensive British involvement in war during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, some of the poorer Jewish immigrants to Great Britain had been able to raise their economic status from that of the lowly "old-clothes position" of previous years.

---


10Ibid., p. 319.

11Roth, Jews in England, p. 241. Furthermore, Blunt estimated 20,000 Jews in London and 17,000 outside. Pellatt suggested 25,000 Jews in total.

12Ibid., p. 242.
Nevertheless, the greater number of Jews were found among the poorer elements of society. "So large was this preponderance that it is computed that of the 2,500 members of the Sephardic community in 1829, 1,200 were in receipt of relief from the synagogue, and a further number were on the verge of pauperism."\(^{13}\) The few occupations that had brought Jews to positions of wealth were found in finance, stockbroking, and the general merchant trades. "Jewish professional men were few. Jews were still excluded from the Bar, and although they had been found in the other branch of the legal profession for many years, the number of Jewish solicitors was small."\(^{14}\) There existed only one known Jewish architect in all of England at this time.\(^{15}\)

Perhaps the most prominent of all Jewish families of this time were the Rothschilds. It was in the future of this family that the ultimate success of the emancipation movement would be realized. The family of Nathan Meyer Rothschild was closely associated with the English government during the years of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe. The family's wealth was legendary, and the financial assistance extended to the government by the English branch of

\(^{14}\)Ibid.
\(^{15}\)Ibid.
the House of Rothschild had done much to assure political
stability.  

Among other prominent Jewish families were the
Goldsmids.

But it had been during the Napoleonic wars that this
series reached its culminating point in the brothers
Goldsmids, who were on terms of some intimacy with the
sons of the reigning monarch, whom they not only enten-
tained on many occasions in their houses, but even took
with them to synagogue one Friday evening in 1809.
Such intercourse inevitably opened many doors which
would otherwise have remained closed; . . .

Nevertheless, Barnard Van Oven, a distinguished
English Jew, warned his opponents against misrepresenting
the true wealth possessed by Jews. "The wealth and power
of the whole body of Jews thrown into one scale, and then
compared with that of three or four of the aristocracy of
England, would shrink into insignificance; . . ."

In the area of education, Jews were again restricted.
The opportunity of going to schools of higher learning was
out of the question, no matter how wealthy they were. Also,
formal education in England was restricted to those of the
Christian faith. Since conversion was out of the question,
the Jew was excluded from much formal education. There

17 Ibid.
18 Barnard Van Oven, An Appeal to the British Nation
on Behalf of the Jews (London: Effingham Wilson, 1830),
were two main types of Jewish schools in the nineteenth century, the private school for those who could afford the expense and the public school which was connected with a charity. "By 1850 more than 2,000 pupils attended Jewish day schools in London and the provinces, . . . ."19 After 1850, these Jewish schools were allowed to receive money from the State to support its operations.20 The poor educational opportunities only confirmed the Jew's lowly state of poverty.

Another issue of Jewish life in nineteenth-century England concerned Jewish marriage laws. Since the settlement of the Jews in England and until the Registration Acts in 1836, the question concerning the validity of Jewish marriages had been one of vital importance to the nation. This was one of many issues that hinged upon the fact that the legality of their presence in England was doubted. Questions as to whether foreign Jews were legally admissible into the country without an act of Parliament were seriously debated by lawyers of that time.21


20Ibid., p. 434.

21Ibid., p. 94.
Legislation was enacted assuring the English that Jewish marriages performed before 1837 were valid.22 Many opponents of the Jews questioned such statutes.23 This segment of Jewish life in nineteenth-century England helps to indicate the utter scorn for the Jew which was typical of the general attitude at this time. This attitude of scorn and contempt was the basic premise for all arguments proposed by anti-Jewish forces during the struggle for emancipation.


CHAPTER I

JEWISH OATH DISABILITIES

The nature of the Jewish political problem is best depicted through a study of the oaths required of all Englishmen who sought public office. In any such study, the problem, or disability, must be clearly defined; the historical background for these oaths must be understood; and finally, time must be devoted to the attempts made to remove the disabilities caused by the oaths.

During the first third of the nineteenth century, it was the position of the Quakers to object to taking any and all oaths. The Roman Catholic could not swear in opposition to his religious beliefs in Transubstantiation, the veneration of the Virgin, or the sacrifice of the Mass, all of which were denied in the oaths which the Parliamentary Test Act of 1670 imposed. The Jew could not possibly take his oaths "on the true faith of a Christian."1 After 1830 however, the Quakers and Catholics were released from the disabilities presented in the oaths. Thus, the Jew alone remained in political bondage and was barred from holding any civil, high

1Emden, Jews of Britain, p. 130.
military, or corporate office. He was also strictly limited in the areas of education, voting, and in the occupations connected with the administration of the law. While the restriction was not the result of any one specific act of exclusion; nevertheless, the requirement regarding sworn oaths had the result of maintaining the Jews in a political and social ghetto.

It should be noted that for any oath to be effective, the person taking the oath must believe in a superior being. In an oath, a confession or declaration is made; and by reciting the words, the person invokes the vengeance of his God. The main vehicle for Jewish exclusion was contained in the phrase "on the true faith of a Christian" and the requirement that all oaths be taken on the New Testament. To the orthodox Jew, such a requirement would be intolerable. And no sincere Hebrew could consent to being sworn except according to Jewish custom. In addition, for such a person, the reciting of a Christian oath upon the New Testament

---

2 McCarthy, Our Own Times, p. 144.

3 Ibid.


would hardly be binding on his conscience, and the pro-
fessing Jew who took such an oath on a book in which he
did not believe would be guilty to contempt of court.  

However useful oaths might be in civil and judicial
cases for preventing perjury, the oaths required for
entrance into parliamentary service held no security
against misconduct.  

The taking of such oaths did not

 guarantee a Christian belief, and Benjamin Disraeli, in
a speech in the House of Commons in 1847, pointed out
that such Christian oaths had not prevented Gibbon and
Hume, unbelievers, from holding parliamentary office.

Why then was the religious, God-fearing Jew penalized?
As a result of the supposed defects in the Christian oaths,
pro-Jewish forces argued that the oaths should be changed
so that the honest men, regardless of religion, would not
be unjustly excluded from Parliament. The argument
advanced against such a proposal was, that in spite of
the possibility that a few cases of non-believers taking
the oaths and becoming political office holders could be

---


7"Letter from Sir Robert Peel to the Electors for
the Borough of Tamworth," Edinburgh Review, January to
April, 1848, Article IV, p. 166.

8Gibbon, of course, was noted for his anti-Christian
attitude as expressed in The Decline and Fall, and Hume
was known for his doctrine of skepticism. Joseph Hender-
shot Park, British Prime Ministers of the Nineteenth Century,
Policies and Speeches (New York: New York University Press,
1950), p. 214. Hereafter cited as Park, Policies and
Speeches.
cited; in a large majority of cases, the oaths did accomplish the purpose of excluding non-Christians and should not be altered or abolished.

Thus, the disability facing the Jew was in the obligation imposed upon every new member of Parliament to take the Oath of Abjuration which contained the clause, "and I swear this on the true faith of a Christian." This obligation was first imposed after the Revolution of 1688 in the reign of William III and was confirmed in later years by additional legislation. If the elected person refused to take the oath, his election was annulled; and new writs were issued providing for a new election.9 The struggle for Jewish emancipation properly began with the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 when the Tories proposed a substitute for the existing Sacramental Test. This was a declaration that the candidate for office would not use his power to interfere with the Established Church. However, in the House of Lords, the Bishop of Llandaff proposed an amendment to the bill which inserted the words "upon the true faith of a Christian." This traditional phrase had the effect of turning the Declaration into a religious test, and thus assuring the exclusion of non-Christians from office. This clause was not directed

against the Jews. In fact, Lord Holland thought it was
directed at the deists and infidels of the nineteenth
century. As it will become evident, the successful
solution to the problem of the disabling oaths would
also solve the entire Jewish problem for full emancipation.

The use of the oath as a sacred instrument has
existed from the earliest of times. Indeed, since early
Jewish history, man had used the solemn oath as a means
for gaining allegiance or some truth. The use of Christian
oaths was known to the Romans. The Christian oaths were
to keep the Empire strong and God-fearing. So it was that
England, too, from the earliest of times used oaths. Oaths
took on special significance under the feudal system. It
was in 1678 that a new test act required members of Parlia­
ment to take the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance and to
declare that worship according to the Church of Rome was
idolatrous. This the Jews could do, but they were faced
with exclusion by the Oath of Abjuration.

The Oath of Supremacy proclaimed that the British
monarch was the head of the Church of England. This idea
was first advanced in the English Reformation under Henry
VIII. The Act of Supremacy of 1559, enacted by Queen
Elizabeth's first Parliament, provided that the sovereign

---

10 Ursula Henriques, Religious Toleration, p. 183.
11 Ibid., p. 137.
was the supreme governor in the realm of spiritual as well as temporal matters. The sovereign had supreme judicial authority over ecclesiastical law through royal judges. Thus, the Oath of Supremacy presented no disability for the Jew as a requirement for the taking of his seat in Parliament.12

In 1606, Parliament passed an act greatly increasing Roman Catholic disabilities by imposing a new oath of allegiance, expressly denying certain papal powers. This oath was a result of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605. At first, the oath in no way would have hindered the Jew fulfilling any political office requirements for 1670. However, in 1610 another bill was passed which included the words "on the true faith of a Christian." The inclusion of these words at this early time was intended solely to separate those Roman Catholics who pledged allegiance to the Crown from those who believed papal power supreme.

The last clause of the Oath of Allegiance was unacceptable to a Jew. It read as follows:

And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words without any equivocation or mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever: and I do make this

12 For a full reading of the Oath of Supremacy see Appendix A.
recognition and acknowledgment heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian. So help me God.13

The oath was changed in 1688 by the Bill of Rights. But it is important to note the fact that the final words, now for the first time introduced, were retained in other oaths, such as in the Oath of Abjuration. These words would for a long time prove to be the major obstacle in the struggle for political emancipation.14 The words "on the true faith of a Christian" were intended not to exclude the Jews, but to give a greater importance to the oath which a Roman Catholic took when he took political office.15

The act of abjuring was a solemn repudiation or renunciation of something or someone upon an oath. The Oath of Abjuration was taken by members of Parliament, clergy and laymen, against the right of the House of Stuart to the Crown. The Oath of Abjuration was introduced under William III and enforced by later parliamentary legislation.16 By a special statute, the oath contained the words "on the true faith of a Christian."


14Ibid.


16For a full reading of the Oath of Abjuration see Appendix B.
The other two oaths were void of any such expression by the time of the Glorious Revolution. The Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy were imposed by different statutes fixed under an act by William and Mary, repealing a previous act under Charles II which originally contained such expressions of faith.\textsuperscript{17}

The Oath of Abjuration under William III was to remove all claims which the deposed Stuart family might advance as being legitimate and supreme. The name and royal rights of the Pretender were being recognized in France; and Louis XIV, then in the height of his power and ready to promote English conflicts for personal advantage, did present a real threat to the Crown at this time.\textsuperscript{18} Parliament simply wanted to exclude the supporters of the House of Stuart. The words "on the true faith of a Christian" were inserted for the sake of giving more solemnity and force to the oath. Thus, the oath was not intended to exclude Jews. Jews could and did oppose the Pretender, but Jews could not take the Christian oath.

After a while it became evident that there would be no need for introducing another bill to remove the

\textsuperscript{17}Hansard, CXIII (1850), p. 301.
Jewish disability because the House of Commons could merely circumvent the oath. This was the situation with Pease, a Quaker. He was the first member of the Society of Friends to be admitted into the House of Commons. He had, moreover, refused the oath and demanded to make affirmation of the oath in the form of an affidavit confirming the essence of the oath. Pease was permitted the request and was allowed to take his seat in Parliament.¹⁹ As a safeguard against false testimony, the principle alternative to the oath was the affirmation; the witness declared his intention to tell the truth. Affirmation was originally a concession to those whose religious scruples prevented them from taking oaths. However, this precedent was not followed in the case of the Jew. Thus it was that the Jews came to be accidentally excluded from all state offices because of this last fatefully drawn clause.

In 1722, all Englishmen were required to take the Oath of Abjuration for the security of the present king's person and government. All who would not take such an oath were to register their names and estates. A significant point was that a provision in this case provided that professing Jews would be allowed to omit the words "on the true faith of a Christian" just as they did when

they were required to give evidence by the oath in
court. 20 If this procedure would have been adopted for
parliamentary oaths, these thirty years would not have
known the constitutional struggle faced by the Jews of
England. Since the problem of the Jewish disability
was seated in the oaths required of all office holders,
an understanding of the purpose and importance of the
Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration is
fundamental.

Because of the implications involved with the
necessary oaths, the struggle for emancipation was a
constitutional issue. There were naturally many attempts
made to remove the disabling clause in the Oath of Abju­
ration. It was not until 1858 that such efforts were
successful. What were some of these attempts, and what
effect did these efforts manifest on the struggle? Two
major points representing these unsuccessful attempts
can be seen in Rothschild and Salomons. These two cases
exemplify the entire oath problem and movement; there­
fore, these cases must be considered.

On February 19, 1850, a bill was introduced into
the House of Commons to enable persons who refused on
religious grounds to be sworn to substitute an affirmation

20 H. S. Q. Henriques, The Return of the Jews to
for the Oath of Abjuration. In this case a bill proposed that persons should appear before the Clerk of the Peace or sheriff and make a declaration of their objections on religious grounds to the oath. Then, these persons would obtain a certificate stating such as the following: "I, A. B. of C. do solemnly and sincerely declare, That I believe the taking of an oath to be forbidden by my Duty towards God." An affirmation was as valid as an oath and would be punishable in the same manner as if the oath itself had been taken. The bill was defeated with the argument that the oath was a requirement of being seated as a member of Parliament and could not be changed without altering the oath and the Constitution itself.

In 1847, Baron Lionel de Rothschild, a well-known Jew, was first elected to Parliament. On presenting himself before the Clerk of the House to be sworn in, he omitted the words "on the true faith of a Christian" since in all conscience he could not be bound by the oath. As a result, he was asked to withdraw. This he did. In 1851, he again presented himself to take the oaths after having been reelected by the voters of London. He refused to take the oaths upon the New

\[21\text{BSP, 1850, I, p. 37.}\]
\[22\text{Ibid., pp. 37-40.}\]
Testament; therefore, a great debate ensued. The Baron asked to be sworn on the Old Testament, not on the New Testament. Sir Robert Inglis, a leading opponent of Jewish emancipation, strenuously objected to the idea since the oath was to be taken in the Redeemer's name and because, as he maintained, the New Testament was more important to the Christian although Inglis did not want to under-rate the Old Testament. He said he even objected to taking the oath on the whole Bible since by law the New Testament alone was to be used. He could not see any justification for changing the law, because they were a Christian community.23

W. P. Wood, a pro-Jewish member, warned his peers that this was a constitutional issue, not a religious issue. Rothschild, who had twice before been elected as a representative for the city of London, was entitled to his rights and to the common privileges of every British subject until the Constitution by a special act disbarred him. Thomas Anstey pointed out that it would be ridiculous to assume that a Jew could take an oath on anything except the Old Testament.24 The Jewish request in his opinion had to be granted. He proceeded to show that if the Baron had been called before the Court as a

witness, he would have taken the oath on the Old Testament. He could not possibly submit to the New Testament required for parliamentary membership. Osborne thought that it was a question of prejudice against progress, intolerance and bigotry against civil and religious liberty. How could the House give a Jew one oath as a witness and another unacceptable oath as a requirement for sitting in Parliament? This was inconsistent.

Sir Frederick Thesiger believed the real problem was one involving not the Old Testament, but the actual words in the Oath of Abjuration. He said that to give way to this Jewish demand would in effect be a needless concession, since eventually the Baron would be faced with the final clause in the Oath of Abjuration, "I swear this upon the true faith of a Christian." John Stuart even denied Rothschild's right to a defense by counsel. All, he declared, should be decided by Parliament and custom. The debate was adjourned for three days. A major argument for the adjournment was that opposition members declared that Rothschild had deliberately caught Parliament

25 Ibid., p. 317.
26 Ibid., p. 321.
27 Ibid., p. 323.
28 Ibid.
29 Ibid., p. 326.
completely off guard and time was needed to consider the
Baron's rapid, unexpected moves.\textsuperscript{30} One member, Richard
Spooner, mentioned the fact that several parliamentary
members had gone home to Scotland; and as a result, more
time was needed.\textsuperscript{31} Indeed, representative Wortley
specifically warned the Jewish forces against trying to
take the House by storm or surprise!\textsuperscript{32}

After three days of adjournment, the debate on the
oath continued. The point was finally made that there
were actually two questions before the House: the form
of swearing to the oath and the oath to be sworn.\textsuperscript{33}
Several members including Sir James Graham believed that
the Baron should be asked if he could take the oaths on
the Old Testament. If he could not, then logical reasoning
concluded that there would be no point in granting his
initial request.\textsuperscript{34} Lord John Russell, the leader of the
Jewish forces, said that if the words "I am a Christian,"
or "I profess myself a Christian," were contained in the
oath, it might then have been inconsistent for such an
oath to be administered upon the Old Testament. But that

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., p. 329.
\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., p. 328.
\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., p. 308.
\textsuperscript{33}Ibid., p. 398.
\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., p. 298.
was not the case. The original intention of using the words "on the true faith of a Christian," he declared, was to give a solemnity and sanction to the oaths with regard to the Roman Catholics, who might have been suspected of questionable loyalty to the Crown, but never was it intended to exclude the Jews. He proposed that the Christian words should not be omitted by Parliament but that Rothschild in this special case should be allowed to take an oath binding on his conscience. This could be done by a simple House resolution. The problem was a judicial issue, not a religious one.

During the heated debate, the views of St. Augustine were presented on the topic of oaths—supposedly to benefit the aspirations of the Jews. St. Augustine wrote that the important thing in taking an oath was not by which deity you believed, but if you believed that your deity was an avenger of falsehoods. The Jews did believe this, so the argument was presented; why would not their form of oath be valid? Other arguments favoring Jewish demands on the oath change revealed that when an act was passed by Parliament, it could not explain every problem which would arise in its application; common law or reason

must prevail. Common law amounted to common sense. Where the law was specific for a given case, it should be upheld; but reason was the basis of all law, and it must be used in deciding cases not clearly defined by a statutory law. Thus, according to reason, the Jews must be fully liberated. When the division was finally called, the House of Commons divided upon the question: should the Baron be allowed to take the oaths on the Old Testament? The results were: Ayes 113, Nayes 59, a majority of 54.

Thereupon, Rothschild presented himself to take the required oaths on the Old Testament. Part of the battle for political emancipation had been won. He took the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy. When swearing the Oath of Abjuration, he said the entire oath, leaving out the words "on the true faith of a Christian." The Clerk directed him to withdraw. Joseph Hume immediately demanded that Rothschild had taken the oath as it was binding on himself. Debate continued over this point. The question properly was, had Rothschild taken the Oath of Abjuration as the requirement demanded? Wood realized that the entire question revolved around this question: whether

---

38Ibid., p. 446.
39Ibid., pp. 452-454.
40Ibid., pp. 486-487.
or not the words "on the true faith of a Christian" were a portion of the abjuration or the invocation by which he sanctified the oath. To find the answer, Wood referred to the oaths or lack of oaths taken by the Quakers. During the reign of George I, the words "on the true faith of a Christian" were substituted as "and I do make this recognition, acknowledgment, renunciation, and promise, heartily, willfully and truly," for the affirmation taken by Quakers. The whole effect and substance was substituted in the affirmation without the disabling clause; it was clear that these objectionable words were not part of the real substance of the oath and could furthermore, be discarded by a Jew. Previously, in the great case of Omychund and Baker, it was decided by the courts that oaths were to be administered to everyone according to the form of their religion. In the reign of George II, laws were enacted that insured the fact that oaths would be given in ways and means which would be binding on the conscience. But this was never known to have been granted in cases for parliamentary oaths, only for judicial matters.

41 Ibid., pp. 492-494.
42 Ibid., pp. 494-495.
43 Ibid., pp. 503-504.
The Attorney-General took a different view. To hold that these few words were an extra and unnecessary part in the form of the oath appeared to him to be a dangerous doctrine and an outrage. He did not believe that the words were something distinct and separate from the oath itself. Only an act of Parliament could change the law, and he preferred this method instead of granting a special, single dispensation to the Jewish representative from London. Furthermore, what prevented another person from leaving out another part of the oath because he said it was not binding on his conscience? This unregulated denial would result in a complete rejection of the oath. Indeed, as opponents of the Jews reiterated, Rothschild should not judge for himself what was binding; this should be done by Parliament. The Attorney-General did admit that the oath in its present form was useless, foolish, and unnecessary; yet it was kept in tact since it was still a statute. The Baron had not taken the oath in the manner required to qualify for his seat in the House.

---

44 Ibid., p. 508.
46 Ibid., p. 511.
Anstey quickly pointed out that if the oath question were given to the courts, many precedents could be cited to show how oaths were frequently and radically changed. If Rothschild did take only two of the three oaths, would his seat be legally vacant according to existing laws? If his seat was not vacant by law, then the issuance of a new writ for a new election would be improper. The Act of William III contained the penalty of disability in the Oath of Abjuration. Wood thought that this legislation was repealed by later acts under George I which provided relief for the Jews. Since the laws of William III resulted in the Jewish problem, Wood explained the acts under George I repealed the act of William III by implication. Alderman Sidney pleaded that if this was a judicial question and the House was to act as the judge, then he appealed to the members to be judges and put aside all prejudices and party allegiances to decide the case fairly and justly. To tell the citizens of London that they could not choose a proper member to represent them would be an eighteenth-century idea. A third election would be absurd.

---

48 Ibid., pp. 513-514.
49 Ibid., pp. 518-520.
50 Ibid., p. 519.
51 Ibid., pp. 521-522.
52 Ibid., p. 522.
A division was called to keep the words "on the true faith of a Christian" in the oath. The division results were: Ayes 221, Nays 117, majority 104. Voting in favor of retaining these words were Palmerston, Russell, and Thesiger. Opposing such an inclusion to the oath were Osborne, O'Connell, Wood, and Hume. 53

After debate resumed on the Jewish question, the Attorney-General remarked that there were three topics to be considered in an oath: first, the effect or substance of the oath; then, the form of the words in which that substance was expressed; and finally, the manner in which the oath was to be taken. 54 The problem was whether the words expressing the substance could be varied for religious scruples. Could there not be a danger in trying to separate the words from the substance? 55 As the Attorney-General interpreted present law, the parliamentary seat was not vacant since the two required oaths, Allegiance and Supremacy, had been taken. Nevertheless, the seat should not be occupied. He proposed that the present affairs be left suspended; Rothschild would be left out of Parliament but there would be no vacant seat for an

53 Ibid., pp. 525-528.
54 Ibid., p. 772.
55 Ibid.
election. In the next session a bill would have to be enacted to solve "this monstrous state of things." 56

Sir Joseph Hume referred to the Lord Denman's Act which provided that every natural-born subject was authorized to swear in the form most binding on his conscience. 57 This Rothschild had done. The Solicitor-General proceeded to show that the acts permitting the Jews to omit words in the Oath of Abjuration were, but for only certain specific cases, not including Parliamentary oaths. 58

A final division was called on the issue. The question was that Rothschild had not taken the Oath of Abjuration as appointed by the law and as a result was not entitled to his seat in Parliament. The division results were: Ayes 166, Nays 92, majority 74. Voting for the question were Thesiger, Walpole, and Viscount Palmerston. Voting in opposition and therefore in favor of Rothschild were Disraeli, Ricardo, O'Connell, Hume, and Wood. 59 Rothschild failed in his oath struggle. The verdict proved to be the standard for all Jewish relief attempts before 1858.

---

56 Ibid., p. 776.
57 Ibid., p. 781.
58 Ibid., p. 805.
59 Ibid., pp. 811-813.
In response to this debate, Van Oven wrote a letter to The Times. He purported that the words "on the true faith of a Christian" did not imply any declaration of Christianity. If they were intended as a declaration of faith, the words would have been "on my true faith and hope in my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." He concluded that the three oaths could be administered on either the Old or the New Testament; that they could be taken by either Jew or Christian; and that they did not contain any declaration of Christianity. The disabling words, in his opinion, could be said by all, but would be meaningless.

Another major incident involving the disabling oaths occurred at the time Salomons requested to be sworn in order to take his duly elected seat in Parliament. Immediately preceding this historic event, the House of Commons had passed a bill for the relief of all Jewish subjects. The House of Lords rejected it by a majority of thirty-six. On June 28, 1851, David Salomons had been elected as a Liberal Party member to Parliament during a bye-election in Greenwich. He had previously been in several unsuccessful contests as a Liberal candidate, at Shoreham in August 1837, at Maidstone in June 1841, and at Greenwich in 1847. In July, 1851, he

60"To the Editor of The Times," The Times (London), July 21, 1851, p. 5.
successfully requested to be sworn on the Old Testament. He took the Oath of Abjuration; but like Rothschild before him, he omitted the objectionable clause. It was declared that he had not taken the oath in the proper form. Ignoring the request to withdraw, Salomons took a seat on the bench for the Liberal Party members. When a second request was made by the Speaker, Salomons withdrew. Three days later he again entered the House. The Prime Minister had said that the Government did not intend to start proceedings against him, even if he did take a seat. 61

Emotions were freely expressed in the continuing debate. In the course of the excitement that ensued, Salomons was asked by a Liberal Party member what he proposed to do. Thus invited, Salomons rose and addressed the House, being not only the first member of the Jewish faith to have previously voted in the House of Commons, but also the first to address it. His speech was very impressive and generally well received by the members. 62 Further debate occurred, and Salomons took part in two more divisions. He was finally removed peaceably from the House by the Sergeant-at-Arms. The House finally

---

62 Ibid., pp. 79-80.
decided that Salomons could not legally take his seat until he had taken the oath in the prescribed form.\textsuperscript{63}

Salomons was placed on trial in January, 1852, but not by the Government. The issue was whether the words, "on the true faith of a Christian," were merely a form of affirmation, or were they purposely inserted to obtain a declaration of Christian faith? Were the words inserted for the distinct purpose of making certain that none but Christians could take the oath? As indicated earlier, most members, whether pro- or anti-Jewish relief, admitted that such exclusion was not the original intent of the oath. No one was thinking about the Jews when the words were drawn. Still the Court of the Exchequer decided by three votes to one that the words must be kept in the oath and could be taken only by a Christian. The Court ignored the examples of Bolingbroke and Gibbon as being unchristian members of Parliament.\textsuperscript{64}

The importance of the Salomons case was that the law required an oath to be binding as written. Judge Martin was the lone dissenting member for the Court in this case. His peers distinguished between a judicial oath and an oath required for entrance into Parliament. The Court did not have the power to alter the required oath form

\textsuperscript{63}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 80.

\textsuperscript{64}\textit{McCarthy, Our Own Times}, pp. 150-151.
as established by Parliament. It was ruled irrelevant that the words "on the true faith of a Christian" in the Oath of Abjuration were inserted to bind the consciences of Roman Catholics, not Jews. The Chief Justice, Lord Campbell, openly declared that he regretted that any such oath was ever assembled as to exclude the Jews, and it was his wish that it be repealed.65 "We entertain no doubt whatever that, according to the existing law, Jews are excluded from sitting in either House of Parliament."66 It was against this decision that Salomons wanted to make an appeal to the House of Lords, but was restrained by the Jewish Board of Deputies, partly because of the high costs of an appeal which would be financed by the Board.67 Here the oaths issue rested until the eventful years of 1857-1858.

---

66 Ibid., p. 485.
67 Ibid.
CHAPTER II

CIVIL DISABILITIES

Although the major disability under which the English Jew worked was his exclusion from Parliament, he nevertheless, suffered because of many other restrictions. Generally such restrictions were characterized as civil disabilities. The Jew, to cite an example, was limited in his choice of occupations. Before 1830, local positions such as justices, sheriffs, aldermen, and mayors were ones that a Jew could not aspire to obtain because of the required Christian oaths. In addition, the right to vote and enter universities was denied the Jew. Most of these civil disabilities, however, as contrasted to the greater political disability, exclusion from Parliament, were removed several years before it became possible for Jews to serve in the Lords or Commons of the realm. Such removal of civil disabilities encouraged pro-Jewish forces and, if it can be argued that the beginnings of Jewish emancipation are to be found in Catholic Emancipation of 1829, it can be said further that the rapid development leading to final Jewish emancipation was spurred on by the removal of civil disabilities in the period following the advent of the age of reform which began in 1830.
In 1831, restrictions on Jewish traders in the City of London were removed.\(^1\) Previously, the Jew was either totally excluded from trading in London or else was subject to special fines because of his "obnoxious" religion. In the past, a Jew who wished to become a free citizen of London was required to take oaths on the New Testament. This, of course, he could not do. Public opinion on the subject was revealed in 1829 when the Court of Common Council decided that Jewish grievances should be investigated.\(^2\) As a result, the Common Council decided, in 1831, that to alleviate this grievance, the oaths might be taken in a form acceptable under the teachings of the religion of the person swearing the same.\(^3\)

Soon the Jew was permitted to trade within London and was admitted to skilled artisan professions from which he had previously been excluded. Because guilds and corporations excluded Jews from membership, economic hardships resulted for many poverty-stricken Jews.\(^4\)

These economic and occupational problems were often the

---


\(^3\) Hyamson, *David Salomons*, p. 52.

subject of reform agitation; and, in 1833, as a demonstration of the changes taking place, it should be noted that Francis Goldsmid became the first Jewish barrister when he was called to the Chancery Bar. Later in 1842, another Jew, John Simon, was appointed to the bar by the Honorary Society of the Middle Temple. As a result of these changes, another area of activity was opened to English Jews—that of jury service. In 1835, the earliest record of such service is found when a Jew was appointed to the Grand Jury at Kirkdale, located in North Riding, Yorkshire.

Prior to 1821, and the repealing of the Test and Corporation Acts, no person dissenting from the Church of England could hold any municipal office without incurring penalties. With the repeal in 1828, the following declaration had been substituted for the requirement of taking the Lord's Supper and was required of all candidates for admission to any corporate office.

'I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare upon the true faith of a Christian, that I will never exercise any power, authority, or influence which

---

5 Roth, Jews in England, p. 255.
6 Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, p. 391.
7 Ibid.
8 "Eligibility of Jews to Municipal Offices," The Times (London), February 19, 1841, p. 5. See also Hyamson, David Salomons, pp. 52-54.
I may possess by virtue of the office of to injure or weaken the Protestant Church, as it is by law established in England, or to disturb the said Church, or the bishops and clergy of the said Church, in the possession of any rights or privileges to which such Church, or said bishops and clergy, are or may be by law entitled.

Subsequently, in The King v. Humphrey, the Court of the Exchequer Chamber had declared that the signing of this declaration was required before any person could be sworn into office.

In 1835, David Salomons, a major figure in Jewish emancipation, was elected sheriff of London and Middlesex. Questions immediately arose as to Salomons' position in regard to the required declaration. An important step in the direction of the relief of Jewish disabilities was made by the introduction in the same year of the Sheriff's Declaration Bill by Sir J. Campbell. While Jews were not specifically mentioned in the text, the Act, which passed both Houses of Parliament and the Crown without the slightest opposition, directed that the declaration required of Sheriffs should not violate the person's

---

9"Eligibility of Jews to Municipal Offices," The Times (London), February 19, 1841, p. 5.

10Ibid.

11Ibid.

12The Attorney-General and later Lord Campbell.

conscience. Shortly after being elected sheriff, Salomons was chosen by vote of his fellow citizens as an Alderman for Aldgate. Two years later, another Jew, Moses Montefiore was elected to the same Sheriffdom. Thus, in 1835, Jews were successful in removing the restriction on the sheriff's office.

In the field of education, the Jew also suffered restrictions. Jews were excluded from English public schools by compulsory prayers and by regulations in the school charters. On a higher level, the University of Oxford required all candidates for a degree to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles of faith. This excluded all but members of the Church of England. Cambridge allowed

14 Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, pp. 386-387.

15 Alderman in English history was the earldorman, chief, or elder. Later the office referred to a position similar to a city council.


17 Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, p. 387. In 1841, Queen Victoria conferred upon him the right to have supporters to his "coat of arms," a privilege usually limited to peers of the realm. His work was most significant in the area of foreign work concerning Jewish questions in the East.


Jews to become students and to go through the examination, but did not confer degrees or grant scholarships. In 1836, the University of Dublin conferred a degree upon Nathan Lazarus Benmohel, a Jew, for the first time in English-Jewish history. University College, London, the first non-sectarian school which admitted Jews, was established by Isaac Goldsmid in 1826 for the purpose of higher education. In 1837, London University allowed Jews to receive degrees which other older English institutions had not permitted.

During the course of a commission's inquiry into the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the following account was provided by a Mr. Pryme from Cambridge.

'The non-admission of Dissenters I shall touch very lightly on. At Cambridge they allow a much greater latitude than at Oxford. In the course of the last year a Jew was second in the examination. He remained at Cambridge unable to take his degree because of the oaths which he could not take. . . but the heads of the Universities are so in love with these oaths, which though they took they never observe, that they petitioned Parliament not to be exempted from them.' Furthermore, Goulburn of Cambridge University explained that according to one oath required for the Master of Arts,

\[\text{Ibid.}\]

\[\text{Roth, Jews in England, p. 255.}\]

\[\text{Stephen King-Hall and Ann DeWar, editors, History in Hansard 1803-1900 An Anthology of wit, wisdom, non-sense and curious observations to be found in the Debates of Parliament (London: Constable and Company, 1952), pp. 70-71.}\]
the person was to preach once in five years at St. Paul's Cross (an Anglican Church). After ten years, he still had not preached his first sermon; this was a typical case. The hollow effect of this oath requirement was to exclude the Jew.23

In 1846, legislation was passed abolishing some of the previous educational restrictions placed on the Jew. The Religious Opinion Belief Bill provided that the Jew was to be subject to the same laws as all English citizens who dissented from the Church of England in respect to their schools, places for worship, and education. Further clauses provided that Jewish teachers should be given protection of the law against "willful, malicious, and contemptuous" disturbances.24 The purpose of the bill was to remove all doubts with regard to the rights of the Jews to acquire and hold property in connection with their worship and education. When the bill passed into law, this action was regarded as a taste of complete removal of Jewish disabilities.25

Prior to 1841, little actual progress had been made for the total removal of the civil disabilities. The only

23Ibid., p. 71.
25Emanuel, Extracted from the Minute Books, pp. 52-53.
reform made was the passing of Campbell's Bill in 1835 which enabled a Jew to serve as a sheriff, but the Jews were still excluded from other local positions. Even though Salomons was elected by the ward of Aldgate to be their representative to the Court of Alderman, that body annulled the election. Salomons, as a Jew, was unable to take the declaration of faith. Consequently, the office of sheriff was the only office to which a Jew might aspire. In Parliament during 1837, a bill was presented for the purpose of altering the declaration made by persons holding municipal offices. Originally, the bill provided relief to only the Quakers and Moravians. Efforts were made by Jewish leaders, especially Salomons, Goldsmid, and Moses Montefiore, to extend the coverage to Jews. In December, 1837, George Grote, an historian and member of Parliament from London, moved that the bill be extended to include all classes. Following his motion, most of the speakers in Parliament held similar liberal views. Inglis, although acknowledging the high qualifications which the Jews possessed, opposed the motion on the belief that those who did not believe in a common Christianity should not vote for it. Matthew Baines was not averse to the motion, since he believed it to be most desirable.

---

27Ibid.
Nevertheless, he personally did not want to make the bill so all-inclusive. He suggested limiting the benefits to only Christians not previously provided for, such as Separatists.28

The government sympathized with the Jewish problem. However, the government, out of fear that any support for the Jews would endanger the whole relief measure, was obliged to keep silent on the issue.29 On the division concerning Grote's amendment for Jewish relief, the Jewish cause received another defeat. The amendment lost by 16 votes, 156 in favor and 172 opposed.30

In 1841, Edward Divett introduced a bill in the House of Commons providing relief for Jews elected to municipal offices.31 Its aim was to abolish the disabling declarations for these positions. On the second reading, the bill was again strenuously opposed by Inglis. It was Inglis' position to firmly protest against surrendering the principle of the Constitution previously required to obtain a Christian confession.32 In spite of such

28Ibid.
29Hyamson, David Salomons, p. 57.
30Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, p. 388.
31Ibid., p. 389.
opposition, the bill on the second reading passed by a favorable vote of 113 to 24.

More discussions followed on the third and final reading. William Gladstone, at this time opposing Jewish reform, argued that it was not possible to draw a line between admitting Jews to municipal offices and admitting Jews to Parliament. It was his contention that Parliament was a Christian body and could not therefore allow Jews to legislate over a Christian nation. Likewise, they were unacceptable for positions in local government. Such municipal reform would in fact destroy the distinctive Christian character of the Constitution.33 "There were many Jews, doubtless, who would discharge those duties well, but still it was the duty of the state to choose those who, as a class, were most competent for the duties to which they were appointed."34 Another member also voiced similar concerns for such proposed Jewish municipal reforms.

Thomas Macaulay favored the proposed Jewish relief since it would render Jews eligible for Parliament at some future time.35 He saw no danger from such reform since

33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
35 Ibid., p. 66.
the Jews were not a numerously significant sect.\textsuperscript{36} Henry Goulburn opposed the bill because a Jewish magistrate could not support and administer Christian laws. On a call for a division, the relief bill passed the Commons for its third reading by a majority of 77, 108 to 31.\textsuperscript{37}

During the debate of the Bill in the House of Lords, the measure was strenuously opposed. On the third reading, the bill was especially opposed by the Bishop of Llandaff, the Earl of Winchelsea, the Earl of Galloway, and the Bishop of London. While respecting the Jew, they opposed the principle of such reform. The problem, as the Bishop of Llandaff expressed it, was whether Parliament was ready to destroy the constitutional principle of the country and to do away with the Christian religion.\textsuperscript{38}

The Bishop of St. David's thought the Christian religion would be in no danger from such Jewish municipal relief. The Marquess of Bute and the Earl of Wicklow also favored Jewish reform.\textsuperscript{39} On the call for the division, the bill was defeated on its third reading by a majority of 34, 64 to 98.\textsuperscript{40} Again, the Jews were defeated at the

\hspace{1cm}\textsuperscript{36}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{37}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{38}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 67-68.
\textsuperscript{39}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Ibid.}
hands of the House of Lords. But hope was seen by the Jewish forces in the Colonial Secretary's speech before the House of Commons in which he expressed a favorable consent to the removal of all Jewish disabilities.\textsuperscript{41}

In 1844, Salomons was again elected Alderman for Portsoken. The election resulted as before in 1837; the Court of Alderman pronounced the election null and void. Soon thereafter, the Court presented a more liberal spirit. This new attitude was evident when no further objections were raised by the Court when Lyndhurst, the Lord Chancellor, in 1845, introduced into the House of Lords a measure for Jewish relief. The bill became law without opposition. The act substituted a declaration of allegiance for the Declaration of 1828, which had been a substitute for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.\textsuperscript{42}

Salomons was reelected in 1847 as alderman and was quietly admitted to the Court.\textsuperscript{43}

The Relief Bill of 1845, proposed and supported by Sir Robert Peel's government, was the climax to Jewish municipal reform. The successful Relief Bill substituted the following declaration for the previous disabling declaration:

\textsuperscript{41}Emanuel, \textit{Extracted from the Minute Books}, p. 41.
\textsuperscript{42}Picciotto, \textit{Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History}, p. 389.
\textsuperscript{43}Hyamson, \textit{David Salomons}, p. 57.
I, A. B., being a person professing the Jewish Religion, having conscientious scruples against subscribing the Declaration contained in an Act passed in the ninth year of the reign of King George the Fourth, intituled, 'An Act for repealing so much of several Acts as imposes the Necessity of receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as a Qualification for certain Offices and Employments', do solemnly, sincerely, and truly declare, That I will not exercise any power or authority or influence which I may possess by virtue of the office of _____ to injure or weaken the Protestant Church as it is by law established in England, nor to disturb the said Church or the Bishops and Clergy of the said Church, in the possession of any right or privileges of which such Church or the said Bishops and Clergy may be by law entitled.  

Parliament declared the declaration as valid as the original oath.

Thus, municipal offices in England were opened to the Jews. A Jew could now become a sheriff, alderman, or magistrate. "He could administer the laws, but he could not participate in making them." Nevertheless, progress was made in removing municipal restrictions. Advancements were also made in the area of social adjustment as seen in the acceptance of Jews by the wealthier class. Such progress was realized in 1841 when Goldsmid was made a baron, the first Jew to receive such a hereditary English title.  

---

44 BSP, 1845, III, pp. 317-318.
45 Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, p. 391.
46 Roth, Jews in England, p. 255.
In 1855, Salomons was elected Lord Mayor by the Court of Alderman. It was said that "...all helped to make his year of office as Lord Mayor one of exceptional brilliance and popularity." One principle which Salomons tried to practice was that a person could be a nonconformist in religious matters without offending the religious feelings of others. He believed that as mayor he was in a sense the head or representative of religion for London. Salomons' mayoralty was not only a great personal success, but it was also a success for the cause of religious liberty.

In the years 1830 to 1855, most of the disabilities were abolished one by one, until in the end only parliamentary emancipation remained. The parliamentary debates of 1830 to 1855 reflected the new antagonism of the middle class toward the continuance of religious disabilities. (In 1753, it was this same middle class which agitated against any relief of religious disabilities.) Thus, it became possible by a gradual process to eliminate Jewish civil disabilities. "The progress of the movement for

---

47 Hyamson, David Salomons, p. 67.
48 Ibid., p. 73.
49 Ibid.
the removal of the disabilities of the Dissenters and Roman Catholics logically implied a change of attitude towards the Jews." The last link in Jewish emancipation was yet to come. Nevertheless, the process of reform had been started; and victory, it seemed, could not be avoided for long.

51Ibid., p. 250.
CHAPTER III

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM, 1830 TO 1850

Before efforts for removal of political disabilities can be analysed, an understanding of the Jewish Board of Deputies is needed. The Jewish Board, or Committee, was composed of prominent representatives from the various synagogues within London.¹ In the constitution of the Committee formed in 1835, the preamble said that the sole purpose of the Board was to represent Jewish interests in political concerns. Consisting of twenty-two members, it was not to take part in politics as a political party, but was to concern itself with the safeguarding of natural and political rights of Jews.² One of the main duties performed by the organization was to investigate all legislation introduced into Parliament that might affect the rights of citizenship of Jews. As an independent committee, the Board had no legislative or statutory power. It was not


a Jewish Parliament.\textsuperscript{3} The power and influence of this body would be comparable to the present day lobbyist. As a lobbying interest for the Jews, the Board led the way during the thirty years struggle for emancipation. It was this same Board which had supported Salomons' bid for parliamentary office in 1851.\textsuperscript{4}

The original draft of the legislation to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts of 1828 would have freed the Jews from all political disqualifications in the future. However, the Bishop of Llandaff had moved that the words "on the true faith of a Christian" be inserted in the new declaration that was required of any person assuming public office. This motion was passed, marking the first parliamentary defeat of the persons seeking to secure the removal of Jewish disabilities.\textsuperscript{5}

Before 1830 no efforts were made by the Jews in England to obtain their political freedom. The attitude of most Jews can be described as one of sheer apathy.\textsuperscript{6} The Catholic emancipation in 1829 left the Jews as the

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 189.

\textsuperscript{4}The efforts by the Board were very costly as the bill was paid by the contributions from the various synagogues. The Jewish expenses connected with the Reform Bill of 1830 was £ 1,000. Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, p. 384.

\textsuperscript{5}Roth, Jews in England, pp. 250-251.

\textsuperscript{6}Ursula Henriques, Religious Toleration, p. 179.
only section of the English population still prevented from the exercise of their political rights on the basis of religious belief. "Although the Catholics and other Christian dissenters were admitted into the body politic, the Jews were still kept without its limits." At the time of the passage of the legislation to assure Catholic emancipation, Parliament showed strong political sympathy for the removal of Jewish disabilities as well. Nevertheless, the Duke of Wellington as Prime Minister requested that any Jewish reform be introduced later in 1830, since the excitement aroused by the grant of political emancipation to the Roman Catholics would have died down by then.

The year 1830 marked the official beginning of the Jewish emancipation struggle, and the Jewish and Christian attitude towards the political discrimination changed from apathy to agitation for relief. This new attitude was expressed in the multitude of petitions presented to Parliament in support of Jewish relief. In 1830, Lord Ashburton presented a petition for Jewish relief signed by 14,000 merchants, bankers, and traders from London. William Huskinson, then a representative from Liverpool,

7Roth, Jews in England, p. 251.
9Hyamson, David Salomons, p. 74.
presented a petition signed by nearly 2,000 persons, including several Church of England clergy. A petition was also signed by over 1,000 London Jews. This petition, presented by Robert Grant, the Whig representative from Inverness, contained the signatures of such prominent Jews as the Rothschilds, the Goldsmids, Cohen Lucas, Montefiore, the Salomonses, and Mocatta. Thus, the people of England were ready to alleviate the political injustices facing the conscientious Jew.

On April 5, 1830, Grant introduced into the Commons a bill to remove all disabilities restricting British Jews. The bill entitled "A Bill for the Relief of those subjects professing the Jewish Religion" provided a substitute oath for the previous oaths required for political office. Major opposition centered around the king; his cousin, the Duke of Gloucester; and his sister, the duchess.

Surprisingly enough, debate on the first reading of the Bill was heated. The first reading, supported by Lord

---

10Margoliouth, History, pp. 234-235. See also Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, p. 383.

11The Mocatta private family library in London has numerous articles on the Jewish problem written by Jewish contemporaries of the struggle. Consequently, these sources were not available to this writer although some of the references were available from other sources.

12BSP, 1830, II, pp. 461-462.

John Russell and O'Connell, the Catholic emancipator, passed by a majority of eighteen. Likewise, debate on the second reading was intense. O'Connell, an ardent Jewish relief supporter, made several effective speeches proclaiming Jewish emancipation. He noted that as a Christian Parliament, they were not practising the Christian principles of charity and liberality. He felt Parliament was hypocritical in the exclusions it placed on the Jews. Later, in another speech, O'Connell compared Catholic emancipation with the proposed Jewish relief. He mentioned that since the Jews were a small, insignificant group in England, as compared to the large numbers of now emancipated Catholics, Jewish relief would not endanger the present religion of the nation. He would support the reform on the principle of rights.

Lord John Russell was the leading speaker in support of Jewish relief. "Roman Catholics and Unitarians were allowed to sit in Parliament, although the one considered the Church of England an apostacy, and the other a corruption." Russell maintained that religion no

14 McCarthy, Our Own Times, p. 145.
15 Hansard, XXIV (1830), Second Series, p. 793.
16 Ibid., p. 795.
17 Ibid., p. 799.
longer came into question when the Constitution guaranteed the rights of British citizenship. According to the Constitution, no man was excluded from holding offices because of his religious beliefs. The only basis for exclusion from public service was questionable loyalty to the King and the State. Furthermore, if those who voted for Catholic emancipation would not vote also for Jewish emancipation, it would prove that their earlier vote was cast out of political fear and hypocrisy.  

Henry Brougham questioned the effect of these Christian oaths. "They might exclude an honest man from the House, a dishonest man they would not reject." He once again gave Gibbon and Bolingbroke as examples of infidels who were admitted by these Christian oaths.

In a lengthy article published in the Edinburgh Review, Jewish disabilities were attributed to the fact that people did not understand the real purpose and end of government. According to English political thought, the people should rule. This principle had been ignored, resulting in political disabilities for the Jews. In a forceful and convincing manner, the article revealed the inadequacies and illogical principles used in anti-Jewish arguments.

\[18\text{Ibid.}, pp. 798-799.\]
\[19\text{Ibid.}, p. 809.\]
\[20\text{Ibid.}, p. 810.\]
But why a man should be less fit to exercise that power [to run a government] because he wears a beard, because he does not eat ham, because he goes to the synagogue on Saturdays instead of going to church on Sundays, we cannot conceive.

The points of difference between Christianity and Judaism have very much to do with a man's fitness to be a bishop or a rabbi. But they have no more to do with his fitness to be a magistrate, a legislator, or a minister of finance, than with his fitness to be a cobbler. Nobody has ever thought of compelling cobblers to make any declarations on the true faith of a Christian.21

In addition, the article referred to the argument that the Jew could not legislate for a Christian country. Since England did have Jewish subjects, Parliament should have been permitted to have Jewish members. The argument against this was that it would be impious to let a Jew sit in Parliament. But, at the same time, a Jew could be a close adviser to the King in important financial matters. "The scrawl of the Jew on the back of a piece of paper may be worth more than the royal word of three kings..."22 "Where wealth is, there power must inevitably be."23 Up to this point, political power had been denied the Jew, thus breaking one of the main principles of English political thought.


22 Ibid., p. 366.

23 Ibid., p. 367.
If there be any proposition universally true in politics, it is this, that foreign attachments are the fruit of domestic misrule. . . . If the Jews have not felt towards England like children, it is because she has treated them like a step mother.  

The arguments presented in favor of Jewish relief were based on the principles of religious liberty, another right held dear to Englishmen. The opponents also argued along this same principle: to admit a Jew into a Christian Parliament would soon destroy the Christian character of the country. "Another member begged the House 'in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ to preserve the religion of Christianity, the religion of the State, from being defiled by the introduction of the Bill'."  

Furthermore, it was argued that a Jew was not actually a citizen of England since he longed for his real home in Palestine. Sir Robert Peel stressed this alien condition of the Jew by making the following statement: "The Jew is not a degraded subject of the State, he is rather regarded in the light of an alien--he is excluded because he will not amalgamate with us in any of his usages or habits--he is regarded as a foreigner."  

---

24 Ibid., p. 368.  
26 Hansard, XXIV (1830), p. 804.
Banks asserted that even if an atheist were to be admitted into Parliament, "... in his opinion, there was a moral power in the House which would strip him of all influence, and reduce him to utter insignificance." Trant also drew upon the religious question for his comments. It was his belief that the English people, although they permitted Catholics and Dissenters political freedom, nevertheless, wanted to keep the country Christian. His appeal to Christianity was made in the statement: "... were not the Jews of the present day the descendants of those who crucified our Saviour, and [they] said, 'let his blood be on us and our children?" On the division for the second reading of Grant's Relief Bill, the Jewish cause was defeated by a majority of 63 with the vote recorded as 165 in favor and 228 against. This defeat was but one of many reversals that occurred before 1858. In spite of this failure, the reform attempt did provide hope for the future. The public was aroused; Jews became politically conscious. Those who opposed Jewish admission to Parliament were prepared to grant relief in other areas such as the civil disabilities previously discussed.

---

27 Ibid., p. 739.
28 Ibid., p. 737.
29 Ibid., p. 814.
30 Ursula Henriques, Religious Tolerance, p. 188.
In 1833, Grant again introduced a bill for the removal of all Jewish political disabilities. The first reading was unopposed. In May, when the bill was read for a second time, Sir Robert Inglis directed debate against the measure. Nevertheless, the measure passed its second reading by a large majority. The third reading also passed by a large majority.31

The highlight of the debate in the Commons was a speech by Peel in which he spoke in defense of his vote for Jewish relief. He noted that unless the Jewish opponents could show how Jewish beliefs were dangerous to the sovereign and State, the religious oaths were illegal. He could not understand why the Jew could execute laws and yet not be able to legislate the law.32 "Sir, my opinion is that you cannot permanently maintain that exclusion; and, if you cannot, why not remove it now?"33 "It is for these reasons--because I believe it to be in conformity with the enlarged and comprehensive spirit of the British constitution that these disqualifications

31Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, p. 384. The first Jewish political reform legislation to pass the House of Commons.
32Margoliouth, History, p. 236.
33Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, pp. 384-385. See also Parks, Policies and Speeches, p. 71.
should no longer exist; . . .", and as a Christian, he would forgive the errors of those who trespassed against him.34

In the House of Lords, the Bill was under the direction of Lord Bexley. The most prominent supporters of the reform were the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Chichester, the Lord Chancellor (Lord Lyndhurst), the Duke of Sussex, the Marquis of Westminster, and Lord Melbourne.35 Dr. Whately, the Archbishop of Dublin, presented a logical, impartial, and convincing argument in support of the reform. The Duke of Sussex presented a petition to the Lords signed by 7,000 inhabitants of Westminster who favored Jewish relief.36 Another petition in favor of Jewish relief was signed by 23,398 merchants, bankers, and traders of London. The Lord Chancellor presented a petition in favor of reform from Edinburgh signed by 6,200 persons.37

As expected, the Bill was strongly contested by the conservative body. Those opposed were the Bishop of London, the Earl of Winchilsea, the Duke of Gloucester, the

34 "Progress of Jewish Emancipation Since 1829," The Times (London), February 7, 1848, p. 8.
36 Parks, A History of the Jewish People, p. 140.
37 Hyamson, David Salomons, p. 75.
and the Duke of Wellington. The two Dukes spoke out against reform because the Jews denounced Christianity. Similarly, the Archbishop of Canterbury opposed such reform because the English government should remain Christian while still being friendly to all who came to England. The Earl of Winchilsea said that the Bill contained blasphemy and impious thoughts.

Among the various arguments presented by the opposition was the idea that the Jews themselves did not actually support these reform efforts. "The mass of the Jews shrank from taking part in any public agitation; they were afraid of the consequences that protests might produce and terrified of arousing a spirit of rancour." And again, "The wealthier Jews, for the most part financiers and stockbrokers, had still less to complain of, and were not eager for a fight because social emancipation was virtually completed already since the middle of the eighteenth century; . . . there was no hurry for emancipation."

---

38 Emden, Jews of Britain, p. 133.
40 Ibid., p. 1555.
41 Ibid., p. 1562.
When the vote was taken for the second reading, the Jewish cause again lost. This time the defeat was by 50 votes, 104 against and 34 in favor. 42

On April 24, 1834, Grant introduced "A Bill for the Relief of His Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish religion." 43 Once again the Bill easily passed the Commons by a majority of thirty-six votes. 44 In the House of Lords, the Bill was supported by Lord Bexley and the Earl of Radnor and opposed by the Earl of Malmesbury and the Earl of Winchilsea.

The Earl of Radnor made a religious appeal on behalf of the Jews. By using the Parable of the Good Samaritan, the Earl explained that the Christian should love his neighbor, in this case, a Jew. This was Christ's command to his followers. On this basis, the disabilities must be removed. 45 The Marquess of Westminster asserted that the small number of English Jews would in no way endanger the Christian religion. He believed the problem involved religious toleration. 46

---

42 Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, p. 385.
43 BSP, 1834, II, p. 587.
45 Hansard, XXIV (1834), p. 726.
46 Ibid., p. 721.
Again, the leader of the opposition was the Archbishop of Canterbury. "The legislature forms the character of the country. To preserve Christianity, the legislature must be made of only Christians. England would receive God's Blessings only as long as it remained Christian." The Earl of Winchilsea said to pass such a bill would be an insult to God. Others protested the Relief Bill as being unchristian and physically harmful to the nation. God would no longer protect their land from destruction as was the case in Poland.

The second reading was defeated by the Lords as usual. The vote was 38 in favor and 130 against, a majority of 92. In response to a petition signed by 2,000 persons from Sunderland in favor of a relief bill, the Duke of Wellington spoke out against such passage. In defending his position, Wellington said that the Jews had never enjoyed any special privileges as the Roman Catholics had. Therefore, there could be no argument of restoration of rights as Catholics had previously argued. Wellington cited that the condition of the Jews had changed so greatly since Edward I that the Jews enjoyed more privileges now than perhaps what they deserved. The Catholic

\[47\]Ibid., p. 725.

\[48\]Ibid., p. 732.

\[49\]Ibid., p. 731.
and Jewish cases for emancipation were entirely different in stature and circumstances.50

In 1836, Spring-Rice, later Lord Monteagle, reintroduced Grant's Bill of 1833.51 Passage of the Bill, attempted by Melbourne's Whig administration, failed once again. This time, however, more support was expressed in favor of the Bill in both Houses of Parliament. The defeat of the Bill for Relief was due mainly to the lateness of the session. It had in fact passed several readings in the House of Lords. This postponement was fatal to the reform.52

In 1837, a petition was presented to the Archbishop of Dublin asking for his continued support for Jewish emancipation. The petitioners acknowledged that the Jews as British subjects were the only religious group still persecuted. Furthermore, this exclusion of Jews was noted anxiously and scornfully in other British domains.53 It was in 1837 that Salomons decided that to solve the problem successfully the Jews must use the same tactics which the Catholic, O'Connell, had previously used. Salomons believed

50Park, Policies and Speeches, pp. 71-72.
51BSP, 1836, IV, pp. 267-270.
52Margoliouth, History, p. 244. See also Roth, Jews in England, p. 253.
53Emanuel, Extracted from the Minute Books, p. 29.
parliamentary methods to be too slow. It was indeed a combination of elections and parliamentary methods which provided final success.

In 1847, Baron Lionel de Rothschild was elected to Parliament from London. This inaugurated the use of election means to obtain success. In the election, the top four candidates were selected as London's representatives. Rothschild was third out of nine candidates. He received 6,792 votes. Lord John Russell received the most votes and also represented London in Parliament. Some Jewish opponents tried to prove that a political bargain was made between Russell and the Jews in his election victory.

Petitions from Alyesbury to the House of Commons demanded that Jewish disabilities be removed. And the citizens of London maintained their rights to select and elect their choice for parliamentary representation without outside interference in the lawful election process.

---


55 Chapter I related the parliamentary outcome involving Rothschild's election victories.


In December, 1847, Lord John Russell presented legislation before the Commons to remove all Jewish disabilities. Sir Robert Peel again spoke out in defense of the measure. Gladstone and Disraeli were also among the Bill's supporters. Disraeli argued for the measure on the basis of the closeness of Judaism to Christianity. Disraeli believed the Jews to be a highly noble people. The Jews were not only capable of leadership, but were lawfully and morally worthy of such public trust, as implied by the British Constitution. In this case, Disraeli, as a Tory, supported Whig efforts at Jewish reform.

Lord John Russell based his pro-Jewish arguments on the theory that every Englishman was entitled to all honors and advantages of the British Constitution. Peel again strongly supported the Jewish position as he had previously done in 1833. He called for the Christian Parliament to put an end to the religious persecutions still prevailing in England. Peel was confident that the Church of England

---


59 This was the same year he published *Tancred*, his last political novel which concerned Jewish tradition.

at that time was the strongest it had ever been and could not be endangered by a few Jewish votes.61

The position taken by the Jewish forces was the stand and position of the English people. By March, 1848, sixty-three towns and cities had petitioned in favor of the removal of Jewish disabilities. Jedburgh in Roxburghshire, Scotland, was the only town that petitioned against such reform. In total, 841 petitions signed by 298,211 persons demanded Jewish relief; whereas, 768 petitions signed by 54,127 persons asked that the Relief measure be defeated.62

Sir Inglis, Ashley, Newdegate, Stafford, and Walpole all disagreed with the unchristian bill. Sir Robert Inglis based his argument on preserving the Christian character of the government and country.63 Augustus Stafford did not view the Jews as being persecuted because of their religion. Catholic emancipation was logical since they were a Christian body.64 The same logic would exclude Jews. Burghley also spoke out: "If you alter this oath to suit a Jew, you will next be proposing to do away with the prayers

61 Margoliouth, History, pp. 286-293.
62 "Jewish Disabilities," The Times (London), March 10, 1848, p. 5.
64 Hansard, XCVI (1848), pp. 221-224.
which are offered up daily in this House, because he says that he cannot join in them. If you do away with this oath, you will open the door to any infidel, whether heathen or Mussulman, . . ." Thomas Cochrane gave France as an example of a country who had lost her "religious devoutness" because she gave complete equality to all religions. Walpole said that Catholic emancipation resulted from the threat and potential danger of a large civil war involving this numerous segment of English society. Catholic emancipation was done out of fear, but fear was not the case with the Jews since they were so small in number. Therefore, this relief was a needless concession. Spooner argued that to pass such relief would be to deny Christ.

The three readings of the Bill passed with large majorities in the Commons, 256 to 186, 277 to 204, and finally 234 to 173.

The Relief Bill failed the second reading in the Upper House by a vote of 163 to 128. Lord Lansdowne, who

65 Ibid., p. 227.
66 Ibid., p. 241.
67 Hansard, XCVI (1848), p. 264.
68 Ibid., p. 499.
69 Ibid., p. 536. Voting in favor of the second reading were: Anstey, Disraeli, Sir G. Grey, Gladstone, O'Connell, Palmerston, Peel, Pusey, Ricardo, Russell, and Wood.
70 Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, pp. 392-393.
sponsored the Bill in the House, appealed to the Lords to review the history of England. In doing so, it was evident that Jewish disabilities never existed nor were ever meant to exist. The Constitution since the Magna Charta despised such exclusions, and Jewish emancipation had to be granted.\textsuperscript{71} Dr. Thirlwall, Lord Brougham, and a prominent Tory, Lord George Bentinck, all spoke eloquently in behalf of progress.\textsuperscript{72} Bentinck took the same position which Wellington often took in similar political circumstances. Bentinck believed Jewish emancipation to be inevitable as a political necessity. He could not, therefore, vote against destiny.

\ldots \textsuperscript{Tories} worried Lord George into resigning the leadership of the party. By a curious irony, the man who stepped into his shoes in the House of Commons, Benjamin Disraeli, was himself a Jew by birth, and was still more strongly attached to the cause of Jewish emancipation than his dismissed chief.\textsuperscript{73}

The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Earl of Winchilsea, the Earl of Derby, the Bishop of Oxford, and the Earl of Ellenborough all strenuously objected to such unchristian actions.\textsuperscript{74}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{71} Margoliouth, History, pp. 1-2.
\bibitem{72} Picciotto, Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History, pp. 392-393.
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Soon after Rothschild was reelected to Parliament in 1849, Lord John Russell brought another Jewish relief bill before Parliament. The purpose of the bill was to allow the Jew to substitute another form of an oath for the disabling Christian oath. Gladstone and Disraeli both supported the bill. It was, however, rejected by the Lords in June, 1849. Rothschild applied for the Chiltern Hundreds and left his seat vacant. He was again reelected by the citizens of London by a large majority over Lord John Manners.

Thus, the years 1830 to 1850 saw the continuous struggle for Jewish relief. Yet through the struggles, definite hope for a future victory could be seen in the changing attitude of the English people. This new attitude was exemplified in the countless pro-Jewish petitions and in the ever decreasing majorities formed by the stubborn House of Lords. Several reasons were attributed to the lack of complete Jewish emancipation by 1850. "The controversy which accompanied the early

campaigns for Jewish Emancipation was carried on with comparative moderation. The voice of anti-Semitic prejudice occasionally emerged, as in the venomous diatribes of Cobbett . . . a violent opponent of the Jews. "The failure to storm the political stronghold was not surprising. The Whigs, with honourable exceptions, were somewhat half-hearted. The Jews themselves lacked the strength of unity. Some of the merchants let it be known they would be quite satisfied with half-measures." Although Salomons' views regarding the best method for achieving Jewish emancipation was not immediately followed by the pro-Jewish forces, ultimately his method provided success. It was the use of elections which created parliamentary crisis after crisis and resulted in final victory.

---

77 Ursula Henriques, Religious Toleration, p. 191.
78 Ibid., pp. 188-189.
CHAPTER IV

STRUGGLE FOR EMANCIPATION

During the period from 1830 to 1858, in the many debates in Parliament on the Jewish question, a large number of arguments were presented, both pro and con, concerning Jewish relief. The history of the struggle can clearly be traced by a review of the numerous arguments, when carefully analysed, provides a highly valuable key to an understanding of the measures and steps employed in the fight for freedom for the Jews of Great Britain. Throughout, the attitudes and firm convictions of the speakers, while often repetitious, showed that the supporters of legislation for the removal of disabilities were both eloquent and convincing. In addition, the reasoning of both the proponents and opponents was generally directed at either the religious or constitutional consequences of Jewish relief.

The most vital argument against Jewish relief was that it would destroy the Christian character of the nation and Parliament. The attitude expressed by Coke, a seventeenth century English chief justice, was characteristic not only of British courts in 1830,
but also of the House of Lords as they spoke out against the Jews. His prejudiced attitude was expressed as: "... 'for between [Jews], as with the devils, whose subjects they are, and the Christian there can be no peace.'"¹ Since Jews were considered enemies of the Christian religion, their admittance to Parliament would be dangerous.

Walpole frequently alluded to the fearful consequences of allowing Jewish political equalities. He attempted to show that ever since the Conquest, "the axiom that Christianity was part and parcel of the law of England" was true.² Walpole also spoke in reference to the Christian Parliament when he maintained that the legislature must be Christian in order that Christian laws be enacted. The Church must be protected by Christian rules and principles. Since the nation had always been Christian, Christianity was therefore part of the fundamental law of the State. This fundamental law could not be altered without the consent of the people and Parliament. He could not see that any

¹Roth, Jews in England, p. 249.

A general history of early English-Jewish history indicates the constant opposition of the State from Henry II to final expulsion under Edward I. Jews were never accepted as equals in all areas of English life. If Jews were tolerated, it was most likely for financial benefits received by the country.
sufficient reason had been made for a change of such magnitude. 3

The argument for the preservation of the Christian religion had a very patriotic appeal, and it was used frequently to sustain a state of emotional opposition to Jewish relief. Due to the extreme nationalism of this position, arguments against it were often weak and ineffective.

Henry Bruce said that not only would Jewish reform tend to unchristianize the assembly and the country, but it would also sweep away all national recognition of their allegiance to God. "It [relief] was calculated to remove no practical grievance, and was, therefore, utterly useless. In fact, he considered it was not only ridiculous, but indecent and monstrous to propose it." 4 Later he said, "One of the functions of the House was the promotion of true religion, for that was the best way to promote the peace and prosperity of society." 5

Nevertheless, it was argued that reforms toward Jewish emancipation would be regression to a heathen

---

3 Margolicouth, History, pp. 56-57.
4 Hansard, XCVII (1848), p. 1214.
5 Ibid., p. 1215.
condition of religious indifference. Any reform in this area would indicate an attitude of indifference to the religious character of the nation on the part of Parliament.

Cohrane, in speaking before the Commons, warned the House against the dangers of religious indifference. When using France as an example of the lesson to be learned, he stated that here was a country full of "wretchedness" due to its apathetic attitude in maintaining the Christian character of the country. Since France had thrown off all her Christian obligations, she had lost her devotion to the true worship of God. Cohrane warned that this would also happen to England if religious toleration was granted the unchristian sect. The Christian character of the nation was its source of national happiness.

"... because we believe that the more Christianity is blended with every act, whether public or private, of our earthly life, the nearer will our human nature be raised to the divine."  

---


Others maintained that Parliament had a paternalistic obligation to the people. Even though countless petitions and London elections expressed voter sympathy on the Jewish question, the House of Lords believed that the majority of English subjects was indifferent to the matter. The Lords felt that the people were refraining from anti-Jewish agitation out of a belief that their Christian legislature would never permit such a religious atrocity to ever be enacted. Hence, the House of Lords remained undaunted in the face of strong support for reform, as seen in elections and petitions.

Sir Harry Goring believed it to be an injustice to the Jew to subject him to holding a public office in a Christian country, a task which would naturally be against his basic interests and beliefs. "He would exclude from the Legislature all who did not profess Christianity. It was the duty of the Government to put down usury, and to prevent gambling in the public securities; and yet by this Bill they proposed to open the House to those persons who were notorious for the commission of both these offences."

Sir Robert Inglis repeated that the government should be administered by Christians and Christian

---

9 Margoliouth, History, p. 61.
10 Hansard, XCVII (1848), p. 1214.
virtues. As a typical opponent of relief, he believed the majority of the people favored his position. The majority of the people favored his position. Sinclair said his sole reason for objecting to reform was the danger that the Jew would contaminate the Christian legislature. Jewish reform would be contrary to Christian ideals. The Duke of Gloucester said, "The safest thing for all concerned was to exclude the Jews from running a Christian State." Since any inclusion of Jews to Parliament was believed to be a mockery of Christianity, prayers which were said in Parliament imploring in Christ's name divine assistance, guidance, and blessing were felt to be an insult to God if Jews were also present. Jews denied Him by whose merits the prayers were offered. Anti-Jewish forces interpreted Scripture to read that Jews were the enemy of the confessor of Christ's name; such people were to be avoided. As a result, by granting Jewish reform, England believed it was opposing the command of God with regard to Jewish unworthiness by

---

treat them as temporal and political equals; the Jew in his unbelief was cursed by Christ. Richard Spooner, as an opponent to Jewish relief, was typical in his use of Scripture to sanction his arguments. "He dared not shrink from the expressions of his conscientious opinion, because if he did so he would be justly charged with denying that blessed Saviour who had said, 'He who denieth me before men, him will I deny before my Father who is in heaven!'\textsuperscript{16} This appeal revealed the careful use of persuasive, emotion-filled arguments. Such arguments proved easily refutable with the aid of further Scriptural interpretations.

Another closely related argument was that through Jewish relief, all other non-Christian religions would be admitted to Parliament. Jewish relief would not only endanger the Christian status of England, it would also force parliamentary relief for infidels and Moslems. In referring to these possible consequences, Lord Mahon said: "If this Bill were passed, every creed would be capable of admission within the walls of Parliament; and it was therefore important that we should not give way now, lest we should be compelled to give way altogether."\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16}Hansard, XCIV (1848), p. 499.
\textsuperscript{17}Egan, The Status of the Jews in England, p. 79.
argument continued, "Then infidelity, no longer silent but blasphemous, might openly appeal to Mr. Speaker for protection; and Sir, this house knows nothing of Christianity," would be an unanswerable reply to every Christian argument." 18 Such were the fears from the consequences of possible Jewish relief.

Lord Burghley also alluded to the problem of universal religious toleration and its potential dangers. In this instance, he was arguing against oath relief. "If you do away with this oath, you will open the door to any infidel, whether heathen or Mussulman, provided, as in this case, he may have money or influence enough to return for any constituency." 19 Incidentally, the fearful argument of the admittance of all non-Christian groups to Parliament was never really answered by Jewish supporters, although some, such as Disraeli, tried to show how Jews were entirely separate, different, and more noble than other non-religious bodies. 20


20 Disraeli's attitude and defense of the Jews will properly be considered under arguments presented by Jewish supporters.
Another argument was that Jewish relief was unconstitutional. By law and tradition, Jewish political disqualifications had always existed. To provide any relief would alter the Constitution itself. The Bishop of London, a fierce opponent of the Jews, believed it his duty to oppose relief to non-Christians because of England's Christian Constitution. The exclusion of the Jews was justified on the basis of the political necessity of the nation to protect itself from danger. There was no doubt in his mind that England had a Christian Constitution, for which he praised God. For national security, the State should keep the disabilities, and the Constitution must be protected from apostacy. Charles Newdegate also mentioned the Christian character of the Constitution. He said that the Constitution tolerated only Christianity. The Constitution must be defended against false charges of "bigotry and prejudice." 

While appealing to the Constitution, Charles Buller made the curious analogy that since by law property ownership was a valid requirement for office, certainly in his opinion, a religious qualification would also be permissible. Furthermore, Viscount Canning, before the House

---

21Hansard, XX (1833), pp. 237-238.
22Hansard, XCVI (1848), p. 282.
23Hansard, XVIII (1833), p. 58.
of Lords, maintained that strictly according to the Constitution, the right of admission to parliamentary office was no right at all. Parliamentary admittance was not the natural right of all Englishmen. Public trust of this nature was lawfully given to those whom the nation at large believed best qualified to represent all interests, not just personal interests. It was assumed that the Jew intended to gratify his own ambition. The idea, that every man (in this case, the Jew) had an automatic right to sit in Parliament, was mistaken.\(^{24}\) Such a right must be earned through trust and confidence.

Indeed, Lord Stanley maintained that the voter was not always the best judge as to who could best serve him. He did not believe that constituencies had the right to disobey the law by electing a person disqualified from office. Furthermore, that voters would insist that the judgment of parliamentary law be abolished was unreasonable.\(^{25}\) The action which the citizens of London pursued when they reelected Rothschild was unlawful. In the same vein, Hornby also questioned the right of the Parliamentary representation of Jews. Since he believed that any introduction of the Jewish population into Parliament would be of no benefit to that assembly or to the country, it would

\(^{24}\) Margoliouth, History, p. 61.

\(^{25}\) Ibid., pp. 71-72.
be no more of an injustice to omit Jews than it would be to refuse to appoint unqualified candidates for office.\textsuperscript{26}

As was emphasized earlier, the initial obstacle to the relief of Jews was the required Christian oaths. In a written defense, the House of Lords upheld their actions by acknowledging the fact that oaths originally were used for the purpose of binding Roman Catholics; nevertheless, it was unreasonable to assume that Parliament never intended the oaths as a necessary Christian confession.\textsuperscript{27} The idea was considered reasonable because even when the words were first written, Jews by law were unable to sit in Parliament. Ever since they first settled in England, their exclusion had been recognized as a principle of rule.\textsuperscript{28}

Still another argument by the anti-Jewish faction was that attempts to justify Jewish emancipation in the light of Roman Catholic emancipation were completely wrong and inaccurate. Walpole correctly stated that the main reason for passing the Catholic Relief Bill was that since a large portion of the inhabitants of the country were Catholic, things were almost in a state of civil war. Thus, the measure passed as a political necessity

\textsuperscript{26}Hansard, XCII (1848), p. 1237.
\textsuperscript{27}Hansard, CLI (1858), p. 156.
\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.
to ensure tranquillity.\textsuperscript{29} This was not at all the case with the Jews. Their minority number made any concession politically unnecessary since they presented no danger. Other European countries had acted out of necessity; England did not need to do so.

It was on the subject of Roman Catholic and Jewish emancipation that the Duke of Wellington was most vocal and ardent in his denunciation of the Jews. Wellington voted for Roman Catholic emancipation, but strenuously opposed any Jewish reform. The bill to emancipate the Roman Catholics, he argued, was much different from the bill to emancipate the Jews. It was no longer thought necessary to continue the restrictions against the Roman Catholics. Furthermore, Roman Catholics had at one time possessed all English rights. They were merely asking to have these rights restored to them. This was not the case with the Jews. As previously mentioned, even the earliest of English Jews did not have political rights. Of course, regulations concerning Jews were relaxed in English colonies, but this was only done to encourage migration to these distant places. No one had considered relaxing the laws at home. Wellington's attitude is typical in that he believed Jews should be satisfied with their position because their condition had

\textsuperscript{29}Hansard, XCVI (1848), p. 264.
vastly improved since Edward I when their residence in England was punishable by death.  

Christian oaths, although not always successful, nevertheless accomplished the purpose of keeping the country Christian. Therefore, the Jewish case was different from the case of the Roman Catholics and Dissenters. Sir Oswald stressed the fact that Roman Catholics were Christians, and the Jews were not. Consequently, Roman Catholic emancipation would still preserve Christianity in England, Jewish relief would not. He believed it would be a mockery to Christianity to support Jewish relief. The measure would open "the flood gates to ultra-toleration" and destroy the English, Christian Parliament. Stafford also argued in a similar manner. Although Roman Catholic loyalty to the throne had been rightfully questioned in the past, the once-prevailing danger no longer existed. Since both Roman Catholics and Dissenters were Christian sects, their religious differences with the Established Church were easily reconcilable. Both Jews and Christians believed in the same God; however, they were radically different.

---

30 Hansard, XX (1833), p. 245.
31 Ibid., pp. 246-247.
32 Hansard, XVIII (1833), pp. 56-57.
Hence, the Jews could not call upon the same arguments used by the Roman Catholics and the Dissenters to achieve their emancipation.33

Another argument tended to be more legal and technical in nature. It was argued that Jews were aliens and as such were void of all English rights. The following statement by Bruce adequately summarized the argument concerning Jews as aliens.

It had been said that every British-born subject was entitled to all the benefits of the British constitution, and that, therefore, the English Jews were entitled to equal rights with the rest of Her Majesty's subjects. But he utterly denied the truth of that argument; the Jews considered themselves as strangers; they did not consider themselves bound in allegiance to the Sovereign of this country in the same manner as were the other subjects of this country.34

The fact that the Jews maintained an aura of disassociation from English society helped to perpetuate the idea that they were aliens.35 The terms alien and

33Hansard, XCVI (1848), pp. 223-224.
34Hansard, XCVII (1848), p. 1218.
35The influence of this popular idea of Jews as aliens was most clearly seen in the Naturalization Bill of 1753. Great agitation swept the country in favor of abandoning all consideration involving Jewish naturalization. It was this action also which deluded anti-Jewish forces a hundred years later into thinking that popular opinion still was anti-Jewish emancipation. Ursula Henriques, Religious Toleration, p. 193.
foreigner were synonymous with disloyalty. Since their true feelings and affections were for Jerusalem, they claimed Jerusalem as their spiritual home and hoped to return some day. "Therefore they could not be loyal citizens of Britain." 

In a series of letters, Goldsmid discussed several arguments proposed by anti-Jewish forces. Among the arguments was the idea that the Jews considered themselves as a separate nation and that their religion forbade their political identification with the State in which they lived. In constant expectation of their return to Palestine, the Jews were unable to give serious allegiance to England.

Others indicated that the mere name of "Jew" expressed in truth that they were a distinct and peculiar nation. Scripture seemed to support the

_The accusation of being foreign was combined with what might be called class objections. The Jewish poor, wandering pedlars or old-clothes men . . . were dishonest and dirty. The class objection shaded into accusations of dishonesty, and so into charges of immorality." Ursula Henriques, Religious Toleration, p. 194._

_37 Ibid., p. 193._

_38 Francis Henry Goldsmid, The Arguments Advanced Against The Enfranchisement Of The Jews, Considered In A Series Of Letters (London: Colburn and Bentley, 1831), pp. 6-17._

_39Egan, The Status of the Jews in England, p. 150. As Spencer Perceval said: "No man could be an Englishman so long as he remained a Jew," Hyamson, David Salomons, p. 75._
proposition that Jews were not to be trusted to pledge allegiance to non-Jewish nations. The fear that the Jews were concerned with advancing themselves at the risk of the country was a vital part of the issue of Jewish aliens.

The Earl of Ellenborough acknowledged the fact that the Jews were not aliens. He saw, however, potential dangers in Jewish relief arising from the national and social character of the Jews. Being citizens of the world rather than subjects of England, Jews should be limited in their political opportunities.40

A final general area of argument was that Jews were not qualified to rule. Although by 1850 all civil or municipal disabilities were removed, exclusion of the Jews from Parliament was still in effect. When the Jews were appointed to the office of sheriff or alderman, they were called upon to perform merely a ministerial or administrative duty. It was quite different to admit Jews to share in the sovereign power of Parliament.41 "But he [Bruce] denied that the office of sheriff or alderman bore any analogy to a Membership of the Legislature."42

41 Hansard, XCVII (1848), p. 1216.
42 Ibid., p. 1217.
Sir Inglis believed the Jew to be incompetent as a legislator or even a voter.\textsuperscript{43} George Hope took the other extreme view in arguing that since the Jews were not a superior or preeminent race, which would justify emancipation, Jewish relief was not needed.\textsuperscript{44} In effect, he, too, said that Jews were not capable of ruling. (This was directly contrary to one of Disraeli's major points for Jewish emancipation.)

Others such as Walpole also denied that Jewish franchise necessarily gave them the right to be elected. He presented the example of the Anglican clergy who could vote but could not be elected to Parliament.\textsuperscript{45} Political disability was also placed on minors and those who did not own enough land as a parliamentary requirement for office.\textsuperscript{46} Thus, the Jew was not being solely discriminated against. His exclusion was as justifiable and natural as these other groups in society.

Just as strenuously as these arguments against relief were expounded, so also the pro-Jewish forces presented a very able and convincing case. The

\textsuperscript{43}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 1240.

\textsuperscript{44}\textit{Egan, The Status of the Jews in England}, p. 69.

\textsuperscript{45}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 80-81.

\textsuperscript{46}\textit{Hansard, XCVI (1848)}, p. 522.
pro-Jewish faction actually presented several additional arguments to those disputing anti-Jewish claims. The idea that admittance of Jews would destroy the Christian nature of the country and Assembly was refuted by many in both Houses of Parliament. Indeed, the argument was that the security of Christianity would not be impaired by the admission of Jews into Parliament. It was perhaps true that the Jews were further removed from the Anglican faith than any other sect or denomination, but this did not mean that the Jews would try to change the Christian faith. This belief was based on the fact that Jews were not a proselytizing people. Jews would not interfere in Christian doctrines; other Christian churches had in the past interfered in most violent manners to each other's faith and worship. According to history, the fear that Jews would destroy the religion of the nation and Parliament was without basis.

Instead of rejecting the Jew, Christians should have accepted them just as Christians accepted Jewish economic and military services. Wood proceeded to explain how he viewed the supposed Christianity of the House. If Parliament could be called Christian, he believed it to be a

---

48 Ibid., p. 42. See also Margoliouth, *History*, pp. 239-240.
negative, not a positive Christianity. They were not acting as Christians in demanding the exclusion of Jews. Others believed that Christian actions against the Jew would soon be comparable only to the atrocities committed by the Spanish Inquisition. Christian fears of the future actions of Jews as a result of possible emancipation must be examined for the truth. Such fears were out of prejudice and ignorance of Jewish life and religion.

Cockburn refuted that the country was Christian. It was not exclusively Christian, and therefore, Parliament should not be exclusively Christian in its membership. It was reasoned that since Jews were a part of the country, Parliament should also contain Jewish members. "... I cannot understand why you should not tolerate the presence of a few of their number in Parliament."

According to history, Peel reiterated, Roman Catholics were excluded from Parliament not because of their worship but because of the danger they presented in their disloyalty to the Government. Such exclusion was therefore right. But this was not always the case with the Jew. Never had the Jew presented a danger to Christian

49 *Hansard*, XCVI (1848), p. 236.
Exclusion of the Jews was based on nonhistorical truths; therefore, the Christian nation was not in danger from Jewish forces. Just the opposite was true. Jews had exhibited fine work in business and proved to be a useful and necessary part of society. Furthermore, the Archbishop of Dublin reminded his peers in the House that for any Jew to be admitted they must be elected by Christian people. Christians could judge for themselves the dangers involved in being represented by Jews in Parliament.

Others believed the exclusion of the Jews to be disgraceful to the Christian Church. They stressed the separation of Church and State in that religious opinions should not be used as a qualification for political office. This was never done in the past. In fact, even admitting that Parliament was a Christian body did not give security against error and prejudice. This was true in the case of the exclusion of Jews. "I [Archbishop of Dublin] own it does, therefore, appear to me to be a scandal rather on

---

52 Ibid., p. 520.
53 Hansard, XX (1833), p. 221.
54 Ibid., p. 234. According to voter statistics there were some 30,000 Jewish voters to 8,000,000 Christians.
our faith, to consider it so frail and brittle, as not to bear touching..."  

In keeping with New Testament Scripture, Wood reminded Englishmen of the Christian principle, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." "If we wished to convert the Jews, we ought to place them on a position of equality with ourselves. . . . we ought not to deepen their blindness by surrounding them with the midst of human prejudice." On the other hand, man should be careful when interpreting those Scriptural prophecies that denounce the Jew. It seemed inconsistent to use Scripture to justify the exclusion of Jews from Parliament and yet grant municipal emancipation. "We should not lose the exclusive title of Christians by admitting Jews into Parliament; for as Christianity was not given by Act of Parliament, so neither by Act of Parliament could it be taken away."  

Anti-Jewish factions argued that the seating of Jews in Parliament would open the doors of Parliament to all non-Christian religions. At the same time, the

---

56 Margoliouth, History, p. 243.  
58 Margoliouth, History, pp. 280-281. See also Hansard, XX (1833), p. 232.  
Bishop of David questioned the difference between Jewish denial of Christ and the beliefs held by Unitarians who were admitted to Parliament. Since Unitarians denied the Trinity, Jews should also be allowed entrance into Parliament. In addition, the work and contributions of such non-Christians as Shaftesbury, Bolingbroke, and Thomas Paine were significant. These men in no way endangered the Christian character of Parliament. Again, Jewish emancipation would not be harmful to Christianity.

Disraeli completely rejected any correlation between the Jews and other non-Christian, atheist groups. Indeed, the Christian Church should be thankful for the Jews. Because of the common heritage, he believed Christianity was an extension of the pure Jewish religion. "In Tancred Disraeli had gone so far as to argue that Christians should be positively grateful to the Jews for having prevailed on the Romans to crucify Christ."

Disraeli's exaltation of the Jew was also expressed in his contention that the Jews were the

---

60 Ibid., pp. 122-123. See also Hansard, XX (1833), pp. 241-242.
61 Margoliouth, History, p. 265.
The Jews, unlike other non-Christians, were basically a conservative people. This characteristic, he believed, would please the English. The Jews realized they were different from other people and, therefore, made no attempt to mingle with others. This being the case, Disraeli felt that the Christian need not fear the Jews, since no points of comparison could be made between the superior Jews and inferior Christian sects. His attitude was also expressed in defending the Jews' ability to rule and lead the people.

Finally, in dealing with the threat of infidels to the Christian Parliament, Lord Bentinck, Disraeli's predecessor, reminded Parliament that while on the cross, Christ asked His Father to forgive the Jews. This was Christ's command to His followers. For this reason, Parliament should not continue to exclude the Jews.

Others tried to show how God in fact did not curse the

---

63 According to Disraeli, the racial superiority of the Jews could be seen in the artists it produced. Mozart and Mendelssohn were outstanding examples of the Jewish race.

64 This was evident in the Jew's strict, traditional approach to Scripture. The Jew was not interested in radical change. Disraeli saw in the Jewish love of wealth further evidence of conservative interests.


Jews, but loved them, as seen in His chastening of their wrongs. Since this was the case, Parliament was wrong in using Scripture to exclude Jews from political rights.  

Next the reformers attacked the constitutional issue. The Constitution was said to be essentially Christian. Therefore, to admit the Jew would be to destroy the Constitution. Some maintained that exclusion of the Jew was lawful because power was not every man's right. Man had a right to be protected from personal injury, and this right the Jew possessed. However, Jewish forces believed the burden of proof concerning Jewish disabilities rested not on the Jews, but on anti-Jewish forces who claimed the Jew was somehow a threat to society. According to the Jews, the basis for excluding Jews was not a constitutionally valid reason for legal exclusion. "It was because men [were] not in the habit of considering what the end of government [was], that . . . Jewish disabilities [had] been suffered to exist so long."  

---

67 Thomas Witherby, A Vindication of the Jews, By Way of Reply to the Letter Addressed by Perseverants to the English Israelite (London: Stephen Couchman, 1909), p. 120.

Furthermore, the purpose of the Constitution was to protect the rights of all subjects. Religious disqualifications against the Jew were never stated in statutes, nor were such disabilities ever intended. The Constitution never provided for the political bondage of the Jews. Indeed, it seemed to disapprove of such action. Consequently, no subject duly chosen and qualified should have been denied his seat in Parliament. Jewish relief became synonymous with national justice because so many of the people, by the means of petitions, supported emancipation of the Jews.  

Parliament could only legally continue to exclude the Jew by the presentation of positive proof justifying the exclusion of Jews from Parliament. Otherwise, the Jew was entitled to all rights and privileges provided British subjects in the Constitution. At the time, the State was entitled to the services of all its natural-born citizens. In fact, the State was hurt, hindered, and endangered by restrictions placed on certain of its subjects.  

---

71 Hansard, XX (1833), p. 238.  
72 Ibid., p. 247.
The English Constitution was composed of, among other things, statutes and traditions. By an act under George I, Parliament had no power to declare a seat vacant if a member refused to take the Oath of Abjuration.\(^3\) As early as the rule of Richard I, and then later, Jews were allowed to swear to oaths according to their own religious form and belief. Also, the Jew was permitted to swear his oath on the Pentateuch.\(^4\)

Peel spoke directly against the argument that Jewish exclusion was lawful, specifically citing the example of the case of clergy and minors. He argued that it was impossible to form an analogy between the two cases. Clergymen voluntarily gave up their rights to govern when they entered their profession. Thus, exclusion was by choice. While it was true that the minor had no political rights, he, nevertheless, attained them within a matter of time. Thus, his exclusion was only temporary. Because of these arguments, the political status of the Jew had nothing in common with the status of clergy or minors.

A third issue, that of the property qualification for office, did not hinder the wealthy Jew from claiming an office. Thus, the three most popular arguments against Jewish relief were disproved. Although there was a

\(^4\)Ibid., pp. 178-179.
constitutional provision for the exclusion of certain groups, Jews were never included among these.\textsuperscript{75}

Contrary to what the anti-Jewish faction contended, there were similarities between the Jewish and Roman Catholic drives for emancipation, other than the religious factor. Roman Catholics had been excluded from Parliament because certain of them had proven to be disloyal to Queen Elizabeth and James I. This original danger had completely passed by 1828. Thus, after two and a half centuries of disabilities, Roman Catholics justly received their freedom in 1829 by the repeal of several statutes restricting them. The relief of the Jew who was not directly excluded by a single act was, as one gentleman said, "... like straining at the gnat, after having swallowed the camel."\textsuperscript{76}

The unrealistic, prejudiced reasoning which had previously restricted Roman Catholics in their political activity was now used against the Jews. The restriction of papists on the basis that they could not hold the king supreme was illogical. Likewise, the idea that Jews were primarily concerned with their own interests at the expense of the nation was also illogical. On these premises, if Roman

\textsuperscript{75}\textit{Hansard}, XCVI (1848), p. 532.

\textsuperscript{76}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 501.
Catholics were emancipated, Jews should be also. Their cases and arguments were similar.

Several members felt a moral obligation to vote for Jewish relief since they had previously voted for Roman Catholic emancipation. The Roman Catholic had no more right to legislate for the Anglican Church than did the Jew. The fact that the Jew was further removed in religious beliefs than other previously restricted Christian groups did not necessarily make him more hostile to the Established Church. The moral obligation surely denoted a relationship between the Roman Catholic and Jewish problems regardless of how the Duke of Wellington viewed the situation. According to the Jews, Wellington's position on the status of both groups prior to the relief issue was not relevant.

Yet another issue under consideration concerned the Jew as an alien. In 1753, a bill was presented to naturalize the Jews of England. However, the public reaction to the measure was overwhelmingly against Jewish relief. It was this incident which led many anti-Jewish forces to

---


78 Margoliouth, History, pp. 238-239. See also Hansard, XVIII (1833), pp. 221-222.

believe Englishmen favored exclusion of the Jews. The bill also emphasized the alien aspect of the Jew's status in England.

If Jews were aliens, the question was asked, to what country did they belong? Any who owed allegiance to another country were considered aliens. This would not apply to the Jew killed while serving England during a war in Europe, nor would it be applicable to a Jew who was born in England of Anglo-Jewish parents. Again, prejudice since the time of Edward I would not permit the Jew to take his lawful place in society. Although their religious beliefs and practices were strange to the Christian, this was not reason enough to consider them foreign or alien. The fact that they were alien was based solely on religious rather than political grounds.

Part of the religious "foreignness" was attributed to the fact that Jews had a mystical communion with each other whether they were in England, France, or Holland. Indeed, they were constantly referred to as the Jewish nation. This did not however, prove that Jews were aliens. Christians, too, had this same mystical union.

80 Margoliouth, History, pp. 279-280. See also Van Oven, An Appeal, p. 27.
81 Hansard, XX (1833), p. 240.
wherever they were located. They also longed for the day when they would be in their eternal land promised by God. Although the Jews were more open about their desire for their promised land, the fact still remained that both faiths looked forward to a day when their temporal possessions would pass away. Yet, Christians were not aliens. Finally, it was noted that, interestingly enough, the Good Samaritan which Christ chose to use as an example of the principle of Christian virtue was a heretic by present-day standards and, even more, was an alien in the land in which he travelled.

Furthermore, Jewish relief should be passed, it was argued, because the Jews were capable of leadership and responsibility, and Jews had recorded success in all their newly won occupational offices. A Jew might now become a magistrate, alderman, sheriff, mayor, and even a member of the Privy Council. Nothing should have prevented Jewish emancipation since the Jew had proven himself in previous public offices. "On the score of industry, talent, property, and loyalty, he was clearly entitled to the same consideration as any other subject of the British Crown."

---

83 Ibid., p. 372.
84 Ibid., pp. 373-374.
86 Ibid., p. 91.
Jewish virtues were industriousness, philanthropy, sobriety, loyalty, and close family associations. All these characteristics were admired by the English and were often the ingredients necessary for success in business and leadership.\(^{87}\) The Jews had accumulated wealth which should have entitled them to some active part in government. This was not the case, as the Christian oaths denied them power and influence.\(^{88}\)

The Jewish forces also criticized the anti-Jewish faction for its inconsistent Jewish policy. "Nay, after you admit his qualification for the privileges and franchises which you have entrusted to him, it becomes incumbent upon you to assign a reason for withholding complete qualification."\(^{89}\) Since the Jew had the ability to serve the nation in all political situations, religion had nothing to do with leadership ability.\(^{90}\)

An additional argument proposed by the Jewish forces concerned the effect which a positive English policy toward the Jews would have in international affairs. By 1841, Jews had all political freedoms in the British colonies

\(^{87}\)Van Oven, An Appeal, pp. 48-50.


\(^{89}\)Hansard, XCVI (1843), p. 520.

\(^{90}\)Hansard, XVIII (1833), pp. 51-52.
of Ceylon, Canada, Australia, South Africa, Barbados, and Jamaica. Consequently, this colonial movement tended to apply pressure on the mother country to do likewise. Pressures from the United States, France, Germany, Holland, and Italy also indicated their liberal positions toward the Jew, as contrasted to England's. "... Jews had not only proved useful citizens, but had distinguished themselves in offices of trust during these years," these words reflected the attitude toward the Jews' ability to help his country.

While England was receiving pressure from these colonies and foreign countries, Peel suggested that England influence other countries by the example of emancipating her Jews. If it was seen that prejudices against the Jews once held in England were removed, other countries would then be more willing to change their policies toward the Jews. The Jews were still being oppressed in many countries such as Poland and Syria. "The authority of the British Parliament would exercise jurisdiction over regions far beyond its sway. No foreign power would hereafter justify its cruelty by our example." 

---

92 Roth, Jews in England, p. 246.
"You will offer consolation to many a wounded spirit, and weaken the force of the prejudices and antipathies which harden the heart against the impulses of humanity; at any rate you will make it impossible to justify those prejudices by the example of England." 94

Finally, it was argued that England was a progressive country. This was exemplified in the great reforms already enacted in the nineteenth century. Jewish forces saw this approaching liberalism as the absence of persecution and bigotry. They made an appeal to this liberal feeling by urging Jewish emancipation. Opponents of the Jews said that liberalism was an enemy of religion. Not only had liberalism led man to doubt the validity of Church teachings; but also, liberalism had set man free to form his own god! Thus, the anti-Jewish forces did not believe the terms progressive or liberal placed on England were good. 95

It should be stressed again that these several arguments were repeatedly presented throughout the struggle for emancipation. The direct influence of religious hatred and prejudice could not be weighed; nevertheless, they were important foundations for many of the anti-Jewish feelings and arguments.

94 Hansard, XCVI (1848), p. 533.
CHAPTER V

JEWISH RELIEF, 1850-1858

As a result of the continual questions created by the election of Rothschild and Salomons, Parliament searched for a means to rid itself of the annoying problem of Jewish disability. Petitions poured into Parliament supporting the Jewish cause.1 Public opinion was clamoring for relief for the Jews, and lobbyists were now supported by many Christians. Thus, efforts were renewed in 1850 to provide Jewish relief; these attempts proved successful through the passage of legislation which corrected the situation.

In March, 1853, Lord John Russell together with Patton and Palmerston introduced "A Bill for the Relief of Her Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion."2 The bill provided that the words "on the true faith of a Christian" could be omitted by Jews taking the required Oath of Abjuration. On second reading, however, the Bill further stipulated that State offices

1Van Oven, An Appeal, p. 29.
2BSP, 1852-1853, III, pp. 753-756.
involving the Church of England would be denied to Jews. The Bill passed all three readings in the House of Commons with large majorities in 1853.

Lord Aberdeen then sponsored the measure in the House of Lords, where, as previously had been the case with such bills, it was defeated on second reading. Lord Lyndhurst continued unsuccessfully for three years to "induce the Peers to accept his relief proposals." He suggested that the three required oaths be combined into one new oath which would omit the "inoperative, idle, and absurd" words. He failed in his attempt.

In 1855, a House of Commons committee investigated the question as to whether Rothschild's seat was vacant since, as a member of the Bank of England, he had made a money contract with the English government. An act in the reign of George III, commonly called the Contract Act, asserted that no members of the House of Commons could receive any advantages from public contracts. If

3"The New Bill on Jewish Disabilities," *The Times* (London), March 4, 1853, p. 6. Such offices of Jewish exclusion were the office of High Chancellor, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, office of Lord Lieutenant or Lord Deputy of Ireland.
4*SSP*, 1852-1853, Divisions of the House, pp. 228-229.
6Committee members included: Walpole, Seymour, Napier, Duncombe, and Disraeli.
Rothschild had made such a contract, he might be declared ineligible to hold a parliamentary seat. During the investigation it was found that, during the period 1800 to 1815, parliamentary members had made loans to, or held contracts with the government and that they had not been dismissed from Parliament. The general consensus of the committee, however, was that Rothschild made a disqualifying public contract and was therefore unable to qualify as a member of the House of Commons. Curiously enough, no action was taken by Parliament on the matter. The committee’s method of attacking the question was very pedantic, and nothing of a substantial nature was proven regarding Rothschild. Committee members seemed inclined to decide the issue by reference to previous dispositions and commitments on the Jewish issue, rather than on the basis of evidence. 7

In 1856, Milner Gibson, the free-trade champion, presented another bill to abolish the Oath of Abjuration. His bill received the support of Palmerston’s government and passed the Commons. Once again, action was stopped by the Lords. All the while, London continued to elect Rothschild, who in turn was immediately disqualified by Parliament. 8 Though at times the struggle seemed doomed, Jewish forces could not be discouraged from their goal.

7BSP, 1855, VII, pp. 401-469.
8Roth, Jews in England, p. 264.
Although success finally came within a year of these attempts, the struggle was in no way made easier. As the leader of the government in 1857, Viscount Palmerston was requested to provide legislation to eliminate the disabling clause in the Oath of Abjuration. Palmerston proposed the substitution of a single oath, called the Substitute Oath, for the three required oaths, which as written, eliminated the words "on the true faith of a Christian."

In defending his proposed Substitute Oath, Palmerston was convinced that the knowledge and ability of the Jews could be of great assistance to Parliament. By virtue of their great property holdings, Jews were interested in the welfare of the country. Jews had a "stake in society" and could be expected to govern in the best interests of the nation. "... by admitting Jews to Parliament we should put the finishing stroke to that system of liberal legislation for the establishment of religious liberty which has of late years made so much progress."

He further brought to the attention of the members that oath-taking was a solemn and sacred act. God had in fact forbade man to use His name in vain. Palmerston

---

9 Emanuel, Extracted from the Minute Books, p. 71.
10 See Appendix C for a full reading of the Substitute Oath.
believed that much of the required oaths was no longer applicable or necessary and was "revolting to the mind of every reasonable man." Thus, by a single oath he relieved Christians from taking the unnecessary oath which was repugnant to their reason and feelings.

Another positive result of the Substitute Oath was the removal of the exclusion of Jews.

The change which I am about to propose would not only relieve a Christian from oaths, which a Christian ought not to be called upon to take, but would also sweep away that portion of one of those oaths which is the only obstacle to the reception of Jews in this House of Parliament.12

However, Thesiger said, "It is a question whether persons who do not profess Christianity are to be possessed of a portion of the supreme power which now belongs to a Christian Legislature."13

In July, 1857, the Earl of Granville defended the Jewish position. He argued that the disabilities were signs of persecution. In reviewing English history, he attempted to show that the confiscation of property and the exile of 15,000 Jews were in fact not only discriminatory acts, but acts of persecution.14 He also argued

\[12\text{Ibid., p. 320.}
\]
\[13\text{Ibid., pp. 332-333.}
\]
\[14\text{The Jews were banished in 1290 by Edward I but were permitted to return under restriction by 1655 under Cromwell.}
\]
that Jewish relief would help in emancipating Jews in other countries. He noted that England was under great stress and obligation from other countries who had liberated their Jews. As Christians, he maintained that it was their duty to forgive the Jews.15

On the other hand, the Earl of Derby opposed any relief for the Jews. "They retain their laws; they retain their peculiar customs. Though among us they are not one of us."16 He reminded Parliament that Jewish interests and principles were alien and foreign to the English. The Jew was entitled to have personal security for his property and to practice his religion; but the Jew, the Earl said, had no claim to the right of participation in Parliament. The power to legislate was confirmed upon those individuals who fulfilled certain qualifications and obligations. "I do not admit that it is persecution, for I think that the Legislature has a perfect right to exercise its discretion and to impose such conditions as it pleases."17

Lord Lyndhurst believed the purpose of the disabling oath was no longer necessary, since the Roman Catholics no

15"Oaths Bill," The Times (London), July 11, 1857, p. 5.
16Ibid.
17Ibid.
longer presented a threat to the Protestant throne. Therefore, Parliament should remove all unnecessary oaths and permit Jewish representation. Furthermore, he said, "If you wish to exclude the Jews from Parliament do it by direct act not by this side means."

Lord Dufferin regarded the Bill as another step in the direction of perfect religious freedom. He believed it to be an injustice to exclude Jews from civil privileges because of their religious convictions. The Earl of Albemarle showed that Bavaria, too, had persecuted the Jews who then fled to freedom in the United States. His point was that the Jewish migration proved damaging to Bavarian economy, and it would do the same in England if these discriminations against Jews continued.

On the call for the division in the House of Lords for the second reading of the Bill, Jewish forces lost again. The vote was 139 in favor and 173 against, making a negative majority of 34.

In August, 1857, a Common's committee was established to investigate whether Parliament was included in the previous act in the reign of William III that provided

---

18Ibid., p. 6.

19Ibid. A similar point or comparison was the mass migration of the Huguenots from France in the seventeenth century.

20Ibid.
that required oaths be taken in any manner in accordance with a person's religious beliefs. After much debate and political maneuvering, the Committee finally presented its report and conclusion. The result of the investigation was the recommendation that this law not apply to Parliament and that no modification of the required Christian oaths be lawfully made for parliamentary cases.

In July, the House of Lords had defeated Lord Lyndhurst's Substitute Oath Bill. In December, Russell proposed a measure with a similar approach. He, also, proposed the formation of one oath to replace the three required oaths. However, this new oath would still contain in its form the words "on the true faith of a Christian." The obsolete words pertaining to the Pretender were omitted. Thus, the measure as sponsored by Russell was "to bring the oath into accord with existing conditions of that day." But along with the proposed single Christian oath, another clause in the Bill provided that the Jew might omit the Christian words.

This, according to Lord John Russell, was a sensible

21 Twenty-five members were nominated by the House of Commons. Nine members was considered a quorum. The committee consisted of among others: Disraeli, Walpole, Gladstone, Russell, Graham, Napier, and Cobbett. Russell was elected the chairman. _BSP_, 1857, IX, pp. 477-478.

22 _BSP_, 1857, IX, pp. 479-484.
and simple way of settling the matter. It removed the injustices unintentionally placed on the Jew, and yet Christians could continue to give a confession of their faith in the Christian oath.\textsuperscript{23} The "Bill to Substitute one oath for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration; and for the relief of her Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish religion" contained eight clauses including the new single oath.\textsuperscript{24} The House of Commons passed the entire Bill to the Lords. While the Lords had no objection to the creation of a new single Christian oath, the Lords were not willing to support the entire measure.

The fifth clause of the Bill provided that the disabling words be omitted when the oath was taken by Jews. Earl Grey appealed to the Lords not to reject the Bill because it was supported by large majorities among the House of Commons and the people. Any obstacle presented by the Lords might produce a conflict between the Houses of Parliament.

\textsuperscript{23} McCarthy, \textit{Our Own Times}, pp. 151-153.

However, Thesiger, now the Lord Chancellor, believed that the Earl's appeal threatened to make the House of Lords inferior to the House of Commons. Thesiger's attitude was encouraged by a petition signed by 320 clergymen asking that the House of Lords not abandon its Christian character by admitting Jews. He contended once again that some rights were not universal. London, in fact, did not have total freedom to select her representatives. However, the voters of London continued to elect Rothschild to Parliament.

"They have no right to violate the Law." The Earl of Granville reiterated the belief that it was dangerous for the Lords to constantly oppose the

---

25 The second Derby-Disraeli administration came into being in February, 1858, as a result of disunion among the Liberals. The Conservative Party was kept in office for a year by the additional support of some ninety independent Liberals, Radicals, Peelites, and Irish who were opposed to Palmerston's return. As the price of remaining in power, the Conservatives had to agree to measures to be passed including Jewish emancipation which they normally would have opposed. Thus they were charged with political inconsistency and infidelity. Philip Appleman, William Madden, and Michael Wolff, editors, 1859: Entering An Age of Crisis (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959), p. 170. Thesiger, however, never could support such an unchristian measure.


27 Hansard, CXLIX (1858), p. 297.

28 Ibid., p. 1764.
Commons. The Commons, he maintained, were elected by their constituents and were, therefore, cognizant of the desires of the people. The Lords were bound to obstruct legislation that did not reflect these desires; but in this case, it was dangerous to continue the obstruction of such a popular measure. Lord Lyndhurst said that by studying the behavior of Jews in foreign countries, it became evident that when Jews were emancipated, they displayed great talents, virtues, services, and won personal distinction.\textsuperscript{29}

On the call for a division to allow the fifth clause of the Bill for Jewish relief to remain in the Bill, the emancipation cause suffered a temporary reversal. The vote was 80 in favor of the relief clause and 119 against, for a majority of 39 votes. Voting for the clause were Norfolk, Anglesey, Grey, Macaulay, and Lyndhurst. Voting in opposition included the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, and Sheffield.\textsuperscript{30}

The Lords then presented reasons for amending the Oath Bill. The fifth clause, which contained the issue of Jewish relief, should be resisted because regardless of the original purpose of the disabling words, the

\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 1777-1778 and 1791.

\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 1793-1797. See also \textit{BSP}, 1858, III, p. 633.
Oath of Abjuration was a requirement for parliamentary office. Furthermore, the omission of Jews in the interest of national security was an accepted English practice. The Jews had never been permitted entrance into Parliament. In addition, the Lords felt that the Jews presented a possible religious threat to the Christian nation. The Lords maintained the admittance of the morally unfit Jew to Parliament was a denial of Christ their Savior. The nation must remain totally Christian even to the point of excluding the Jews.\(^31\)

The problem was now given back to the House of Commons. The Lords had passed the Bill with the amendment which omitted the fifth clause. Therefore, the House of Commons had the opportunity of considering the Lords' suggested amendment. Lord John Russell proposed that the House should disagree with the Lords and restore the clause. After a motion, the House proceeded in accordance with its practice of appointing a committee to present reasons for the support of Jewish relief on behalf of the House of Commons. Thomas Duncombe, the member for Finsbury, proposed that the elected Baron Rothschild should serve on the committee.

Duncombe showed that earlier in the eighteenth century Sir Joseph Jekyll had been appointed to a

\(^{31}\)BSP, 1858, III, pp. 635-636.
committee before he had taken the oaths at the bar. Nevertheless, as anti-Jewish forces mentioned, there was a great difference between the case of Jekyll and Rothschild. Sir Joseph had no objection to taking the oaths. It was just an accident that he had not taken them before he was selected to serve on the committee. The House of Commons had in this previous case decided that it was not necessary for a member to be sworn before he could be appointed as a member of a House committee. The precedent was so strong that the Government did not venture to resist it.32

Nevertheless, both sides entered into a lengthy debate over the differences between the two cases. Russell said that there were certainly differences between the two cases. As he recalled, it was by accident that Jekyll was prevented from arriving in time to take the oaths, and that it was understood that he would take them as soon as the opportunity permitted. Still a precedent had been established for Rothschild.33 Voting or sitting in Parliament during a debate were the only two rights legally denied any person elected to Parliament who had not sworn the


33Hansard, CL (1858), p. 351.
oaths. Thus, oaths had nothing to do with who could be a member of a parliamentary committee.  

However, Gibbons asserted that a committee was part of the House and the rights connected with it. Therefore, members sitting on a committee were sitting in Parliament, and giving a vote in a committee was giving a vote in the House. Likewise, William Whitbread could not see any difference between a vote in a committee and a vote in Parliament. The Solicitor General admitted that there were no statutes preventing the House from nominating Rothschild to sit on the Committee. But another question concerned an act passed in the reign of George II which required all House members to be sworn according to the Christian oaths. If Rothschild voted in the Committee, would this law be violated? The Solicitor General believed it would be a violation.  

On the call for a division, Rothschild, although not sworn, was appointed to the Committee by a majority of 55 votes. The Committee finally met and established

---

34Roth, Jews in England, pp. 264-265.
35Hansard, CL (1858), p. 439.
36Ibid., p. 434.
37Ibid., p. 432.
38Ibid., pp. 440-443. Voting in favor were: Ashley, Disraeli, Greville, Napier, Russell, Ricardo, Wood, and Palmerston. Voting in opposition were: Drummond, Inglis, Newdegate, and Walpole.
a list of reasons for the Commons' disagreement with the Lords' amendment removing the fifth clause from the Oath Bill. Briefly stated, these several reasons for relief were: (1) since the words "on the true faith of a Christian" were originally meant to control Roman Catholics and had nothing to do with excluding the Jews, relief should be granted; (2) the exclusion of British subjects on the basis of religious beliefs was contrary to the idea of freedom of conscience; (3) no charge of disloyalty or unfitness for public trust offices was proven; (4) exclusion based on religious practices was inconsistent with the principles of religious toleration; (5) the people of England wanted Jewish relief; (6) the Jewish cause had been passed by the Commons on numerous occasions with the support of members from both parties; (7) the principle of exclusion was unlawful; and (8) the elimination of the fifth clause was contrary to the purpose and title of the Bill.  

Finally, on May 31, 1858, after further debate, a compromise was suggested. The Earl of Lucan, who had voted repeatedly against Jewish emancipation, now proposed a monumental solution to the problem.

... he felt that some apology was due to their Lordships for asking them to modify a decision to which they had come so frequently and so recently.

---

39Hansard, CL (1858), pp. 529-530.
on this subject; but he was compelled by a sense of duty to use his best endeavours to bring about the settlement of this long agitated question, being deeply impressed with the inconveniences and probable dangers which attended the present position of the two Houses of Parliament; and he therefore felt it to be his duty to offer a suggestion which he thought might lead to a settlement of the question.40

His suggestion was that the Bill be passed by the Lords with the fifth clause. Each House could then on its own resolution decide the proper form of the oath when making its modifications. Each House would regulate the oath for itself.41 The purpose of his compromise was to restore harmony between the two Houses of Parliament. Indeed, members of the House of Commons had threatened to admit the Jews without the consent of the Lords. Lucan believed it most "impolitic and inexpedient to persevere any longer in its absolute rejection."42

The Earl of Stanhope expressed a similar idea when he mentioned that he was afraid that continued resistance to emancipation by the Lords would result in the House being passed over and Jewish relief being granted in spite of repeated attempts by the Lords to block such reform. He pointed out, as Wellington had done in 1829, that

---

40Ibid., p. 1139.
41Ibid., p. 1142.
42Ibid., pp. 1140-1142.
antagonism between the two Houses was dangerous. The question could no longer be averted.\textsuperscript{43}

But the Earl of Clancarty would not change his position. England was a Christian country and had to maintain her Christian Parliament by excluding Jews. He said that Wellington succumbed only after much popular support for the Reform Bill had been shown. Clancarty did not believe any significant amount of popular appeal and support for Jewish relief had been shown. He believed that a majority of the people would probably, "on the first view of the question," be in favor of relief; but the serious, thinking and religious faction of the population was strongly opposed to such relief.\textsuperscript{44} Lord Derby believed the general public was exceedingly apathetic.\textsuperscript{45}

Lord Lyndhurst saw the expression of public support for reform in the election for the House of Commons. Since several parliamentary members advocating Jewish emancipation were continually reelected by the people, their victory indicated that the people favored such relief for the Jews.\textsuperscript{46} He further added that to pass the Oath

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{43}Ibid., pp. 1148-1149.
\item \textsuperscript{44}Ibid., pp. 1155-1156.
\item \textsuperscript{45}Ibid., p. 1164.
\item \textsuperscript{46}Ibid., p. 1182.
\end{itemize}
Bill without Jewish relief would increase Jewish disqualifications. For example, by taking only the Oath of Allegiance, the Jew could always become an attorney or hold offices requiring only the single oath. However, if a new single oath were substituted in place of the Oath of Allegiance with the words "on the true faith of a Christian," the Jew would be excluded to a greater extent than before. If there was a new single Christian oath, some kind of relief for the Jews should be provided. ⁴⁷

Lord Bedesdale feared the establishment of a precedent that would allow each House to arbitrarily pass a resolution on the admittance of the Jew to Parliament. He feared that the extension of the use of resolution would split the two Houses by eliminating cooperation and compromise. The mere use of House resolutions involved the altering of the Constitution and should be carefully considered. His belief was that Lucan's Compromise was dangerous. ⁴⁸

Similarly, Lord Berns objected to dealing with the question on the basis of expedience, compromise, and concession. He would not be forced into admitting the Jews because of such a flimsy excuse. He believed the

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 1179-1180.
⁴⁸Hansard, CLI (1858), pp. 719-720.
question concerned a change in the basic nature of the country. The words "on the true faith of a Christian" were necessary as a Christian test of belief.  

A division was called for the second reading of Lucan's proposal on July 1, 1858. The compromise measure passed by a majority of forty-six votes. The Earl of Derby believed the compromise to be a good one because in giving the option of admitting Jews to the House of Commons, the measure allowed the people to make the ultimate judgment once again on the issue. Moreover, the Earl of Malmesbury had always voted against Jewish relief, but now believed a compromise was politically necessary. Therefore, he wanted the people of England to know that the Lords passed the measure out of political expediency, not out of a moral conviction. He could never accept the principle of the right of the Jews to parliamentary representation.

Others also continued to speak against the compromise. The Earl of Harrington was severely critical of

---

49Ibid., p. 713.
50Ibid., pp. 726-729. Voting in favor were: Newcastle, Salisbury, Lucan, Northumberland, and Cleveland. Opposed were: Archbishop of Canterbury, Marlborough, and Rutland.
51Ibid., p. 927.
52Ibid., p. 1252.
the Jewish attitude towards money. Through their money, the Earl believed, Jews were destroying liberty by supporting despots throughout the world. Since Jews were the great loan contractors of the world, despots relied on their financial support. Furthermore, the Earl said that the world was in debt and suffering because of Jewish money greed; therefore, Jews did not deserve to have their political power increased.\textsuperscript{53} The Marquess of Lansdowne thought the House of Lords was inconsistent. In the same day, the Lords had declared that Jews were morally unfit to sit in Parliament; and then later, the Lords took the initiative in passing a compromise bill admitting this same class of people to govern.\textsuperscript{54} This antagonistic feeling toward the compromise measure was in the minority as the Bill was sent back to the Commons.

Consequently, in July, 1858, the Lords sent two bills back to the House of Commons as the compromise. The first part provided for the single substitute oath which the Lords had never objected to. The second part which provided Jewish relief was Lucan's compromise which allowed a House resolution to decide who should qualify as a parliamentary member. In actuality, the Compromise Bill reinserted the fifth clause into the Substitution Oath on a resolution basis.

\textsuperscript{53}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 1264.
\textsuperscript{54}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 1252.
Similarly, even in the House of Commons, many continued to oppose the reform. Warren could not accept the idea mentioned by another member of the House who said he would support the Bill, even though he acknowledged that the measure was unsatisfactory. The member saw no chance of getting any better solution.\textsuperscript{55} Warren, instead, called the Compromise "patchwork legislation." The two Houses could by resolution contain members of different religions antagonistic to each other: one denouncing the Jew as a moral misfit and the other praising and rewarding the Jew.\textsuperscript{56} Furthermore, he said that the Compromise was without precedent in English history and in opposition to the spirit of the Constitution. He described the measure as "offensive to the Jew" and "derogatory to the dignity of Parliament." It would create dissension and disunion between the two Houses.\textsuperscript{57}

In spite of such House opposition, the Commons passed Lucan's Compromise on its second reading, 156 votes for and 55 votes against.\textsuperscript{58} Likewise, the third reading of the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{55}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 1880.
\textsuperscript{56}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 1881.
\textsuperscript{57}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 1889.
\textsuperscript{58}"The Jewish Relief Act," \textit{Annual Register 1858}, Vol. 100 (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1859), p. 163.
Emancipation was won! After the successful vote, Russell made several resolutions. Among the resolutions was the declaration that the Commons did not believe it necessary to examine and refute the reasons whereby the Lords had originally amended the Oath Bill. The Lords had by their recent compromise provided the means for the admission of Jews to Parliament. Also, it was declared that the House of Commons no longer cared to disagree with the Lords on the subject of excluding the Jews. The House of Commons now had the power to act as it believed necessary on the question of the Jew.

On the same day of July 21, 1858, another act was passed, strictly defining those State-and Church-related offices which the Jew was to be denied because they conflicted with his religion. This disqualification the Jew did not mind since there were certain religious functions which did not concern him. Other dissenting religious sects also were excluded from these Anglican Church offices.  

59 BSP, 1852/1853-1861, Divisions of the House, pp. 228-229.

Thus, on July 23, 1858, Queen Victoria gave her consent to the Oath Bill and the Jewish Relief Act. The three oaths were now consolidated into one which retained the Christian words "on the true faith of a Christian." However, either House could now remove these words if in certain cases it was believed necessary.61

On July 26, 1858, Baron Lionel de Rothschild approached the bar to be sworn according to the required oath. He said that he could not conscientiously take the oath as it was written and was then directed to withdraw. Since Rothschild could not in all conscience be sworn, Russell made a resolution. The simple resolution was agreed to after an ineffective protest by Warren. Lord John Russell then presented a second resolution in the following words:

That any person professing the Jewish religion may henceforth in taking the oath prescribed in an Act of the present Session of Parliament to entitle him to sit and vote in this House, omit the words, 'and I make this declaration upon the true faith of a Christian.'62

But opposition to Jewish emancipation still persisted.

In the ensuing debate, Warren spoke repeatedly against the

---

61 Hyamson, David Salomons, p. 85.

resolution; and Hotham said he could not support it. Walpole regarded the problem as being religious, not political; therefore, he could not support Jewish admittance to the House. So also, Spooner and Newdegate repeated their objections to Jewish relief. Russell confronted Walpole with the fact that it was the opposition, the Lords, who permitted such a reform. 63

Nevertheless, Russell's resolution was seconded by Smith. The resolution passed by a majority of 32 votes, 69 for and 37 against. Thus, the first independent House action taken was to admit Jews to Parliament. 64

It was recorded that when Rothschild again entered the House he was greeted with loud cheers. He took the oath on the Old Testament. After omitting the words "on the true faith of a Christian," Rothschild, a Jew, took his seat on the Opposition benches. "Thus ended the long controversy which had for so many years divided the two Houses of Parliament." 65 So it could be said: "On Monday, 26 July 1858, Baron de Rothschild at last took his seat in the House. Two hundred years after Cromwell's death


64 Hansard, CLI (1858), pp. 2114-2115. Voting for the resolution were: Disraeli, Duncombe, Fox, Roebuck, Russell, and Smith. Those opposed were: Newdegate, Spooner, Walpole, Warren, and Hotham.

the work that had begun reached its culmination, and an English Jew was for the first time recognized as an equal citizen of his native land."66

66 Roth, Jews in England, p. 266.
CHAPTER VI

THE AFTERMATH

Although Jews had won wide civil and political freedom by 1858, they were not totally free British subjects. It is the purpose here to give a brief résumé of the events connected with their emancipation which immediately followed the historic victory of July 23, 1858. At this time, Jews were still not permitted to sit in the House of Lords and were still not allowed to earn degrees at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

In 1859, Salomons was again elected to Parliament as a Liberal from Greenwich. Although he was not the first Jewish member of Parliament, his election victory was indeed a personal triumph and an evidence of the changing temper of times. He ran for reelection in 1865 and 1868, and remained a member of the House of Commons until his death in 1873. As the "watchdog" of Jewish interests in Parliament, he was largely responsible for securing safeguards for Jewish interests in later Factory Acts. Moreover, he helped secure passage of legislation which permitted Jews, who closed their factories and workshops

---

1Hyamson, David Salomons, p. 87.
on Saturdays for religious reasons, to keep them open on Sundays. In 1869, he was made a Baronet, because of his contribution to the Jewish cause.\(^2\)

In April, 1859, a Common's committee was formed to determine the length of time for which parliamentary resolutions would be effective.\(^3\) Questions were raised concerning the special oath resolutions pertaining to Jews. Specifically, it was asked if a House of Commons resolution had to be enacted for each individual Jewish member seated in the same session. Could not one resolution cover all Jewish members for the duration of that Parliament? Another question raised had to do with the question as to whether or not a resolution could be extended beyond one parliament, or even one session of a parliament to subsequent sessions. In other words, would a resolution apply to future sessions or parliaments, or be limited to the duration of the session or parliament in which the resolution was enacted.

The first question was easily settled by the committee. It was decided that each Jew did not need a separate resolution during the same session. The second question was more difficult. Was the resolution binding

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 88.

\(^3\)Committee members were: Duncombe, Walpole, Russell, Henley, Gresham, Hotham and Manners along with eight others.
forever, for just the duration of one parliament, or for one session? If resolutions did not remain in force forever, Jews would be at a disadvantage since they would never be able to take their seats immediately after the election as other members did. The administering of the oaths sometimes extended over a five day period, and members faced complications when they were not sworn before the end of the fourth day, as those that took the oath later than the fourth day needed a special resolution. The committee heard much evidence on the matter of Jewish resolutions and failed to arrive at a unanimous opinion on the issue since many conflicting precedents were found indicating little difference between the resolutions and Standing Orders. Perhaps it is a fair assumption that several members whose views indicated that anti-Jewish feelings were still prevalent despite the success of 1858.

In 1866, the Jewish position was made more secure by the drafting and passage of a new, single oath without the disabling words. At last a Jewish member of Parliament could be sworn on the same oath as his Christian colleagues. The Act of 1866 resulted from a measure proposed in 1865 by Monsell, a Roman Catholic, which omitted the words, "on

---

5Ibid., pp. 41-66.
6See Appendix D for a full reading of the new oath.
the true faith of a Christian," but which had inserted in the oath a solemn pledge to ensure that no party taking the oath would attempt to overthrow the Church of England. After several lengthy and hotly contested debates in 1865, the new oath was passed by the House of Commons, but was rejected by the Lords. Early in 1866, Sir George Grey, speaking for Lord John Russell's government, reintroduced the changed oath bill which carried the Commons by a healthy majority of 298 votes to 51 and was ultimately passed by the Lords.7 "It is remarkable that in the debates in 1865 and 1866 the controversy mainly turned on the Roman Catholic issue; and no one paid much attention to the fact that the measure of 1866, by a side wind, opened the door of the House of Lords to the Jew."8 Most important perhaps, was the fact that the new and simplified oath, passed in 1866, which omitted the phrase which had disqualified Jews, covered membership in both houses of Parliament.

So again, it was through Catholic agitation that Jews were admitted to membership in the House of Lords.9


8Walpole, The History of Twenty-Five Years, p. 179.

9Ibid., p. 178.
These events parallel those connected with Catholic emancipation in 1829. In providing for further Catholic relief, a form of oath was agreed upon which Jews could conscientiously take. "Only atheists remained disabled from sitting in Parliament, and they won admission after a hard fight some years later." The final Jewish political emancipation of 1866, which provided that Jews might be seated in the House of Lords had proved much easier than the earlier struggle for their entrance to the House of Commons! It was not, however, until nearly two decades later, in 1885, that the first Jew, Lionel de Rothschild's son, Nathaniel, was seated as a member of the House of Lords.

Likewise, in education, Jewish freedoms were slowly recognized. Universities had previously been reluctant to admit Jews. Arthur Cohen, recommended to Cambridge by the Prince Consort, became the first Jew to receive a degree from that institution. All undergraduate honors and scholarships could now be given to Jews without the requirement of special tests. All that was required was


that they profess to conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England as established by law. 13

In 1871, when Gladstone was Prime Minister, the Jews saw the abolition of the University Test Acts. Previously, it had been the case at Oxford and Cambridge that in order for a Jew to receive university positions or advanced degrees, he had to make some allegiance to the Established Church. However, since the removal of all such disabling tests, appointments at the Universities were opened to all students who were willing to learn. Lord Salisbury made an amendment, which the Lords accepted but later withdrew after much opposition from the Commons, providing that University teachers make a declaration that they would not teach anything contrary to the Bible. This would have barred Jews; the Bishop of Oxford strenuously opposed the measure as it affected the Jews. At last it could truly be said that full religious liberty was enjoyed by every Jewish subject of England. 14

The Promissory Oath Act of 1871 repealed the section in the Relief Act of 1858 which excluded Jews from various offices of State. It also removed those old forms of oaths and declarations which had been established by former

13 Ibid.

statutes. "With the passage of this Bill into law Jews were placed at last on precisely the same footing as regards political rights as their Christian fellow subjects with one or two insignificant qualifications."15

"The one statutory restriction that still obtains is that, in virtue of the terms of the Act of 1858, Jews cannot exercise ecclesiastical patronage attached to any public office they may happen to hold."16

In 1871, George Jessel was the first Jew appointed Solicitor General. Since 1873, Jews have served as Judges, Privy Councillors, Colonial Governors, Cabinet Ministers, Lord Chief Justices, Secretaries of State, and Ambassadors.17

In 1890, in the course of a discussion on a Bill that proposed to open the offices of Lord High Chancellor and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to all English citizens, irrespective of their religious beliefs, it transpired that, so far as Jews were concerned, the proposed legislation was unnecessary.18

Therefore, in 1890 it was declared that all public offices were open to Jews.

Thus, headway for total Jewish acceptance by the English in all areas of life was seen even after 1858. Despite the fact that 1858 had brought to an end the

15Roth, Jews in England, p. 268.
16Ibid.
17Ibid.
struggle for political emancipation, important concessions and compromises were only later conceded to the aspiring Jew. His final admittance into the House of Lords, English Universities, and other previously restricted State offices indicated the depth of these later reforms. The significance of post-1858 Jewish reform should never be forgotten, as it formalized and safeguarded earlier won Jewish reforms. The events following 1858 brought practical application of Jewish emancipation to daily life. Although the decades of struggle brought political freedom to the English Jew, the reforms following 1858 are also significant in the struggle for total emancipation.
CONCLUSION

After 1830, the conservative, anti-Jewish forces in England had great difficulty generating any real enthusiasm for their attempts to maintain the status quo. Parliamentary majorities often dwindled as a result of the new attitudes and constant demand for the removal of Jewish disabilities. Nevertheless, the consistent opposition of a large segment of the membership of the House of Lords to removal of the disabilities made achievement of the desired actions difficult. Frequently compromise was necessary and the road to political freedom for the English Jews was not an easy one. Vital changes were possible only when the majority of Englishmen began to change their values and attitudes toward political discrimination on the basis of religion, and the day came when they would no longer tolerate such practices.

This historic oath and religious test, developed originally to combat potential dangers to the Protestant establishment in England, sowed the seeds for the disabilities under which the Jews labored. Thus, the problem involved more than any single Jewish exclusion act. In the struggle for removal of such disabilities, historic precedents, statutes, and traditions were not easily cast
aside, for the English Constitution itself had to be taken into consideration. By studying Jewish disabilities from the standpoint of the oaths problem, however, a fuller appreciation and comprehension of the real problem clearly appears. The situations of Rothschild and Salomons reflect, generally, the problems confronting the nineteenth-century English Jew. Rothschild and Salomons certainly led the fight which resulted in the liberation of English Jews and which eight years after their victories brought greater success. Thus, the entire movement revolved around these two men and their ultimate successes and failures. They were representative of this reform movement, just as Jewish emancipation was representative of the British Age of Reform.

Through the removal of all civil or municipal disabilities, Jews took their first step towards political independence. This success, accomplished with relative ease, opened the road to the more difficult final political emancipation. The English had no fear about permitting Jews to live under existing laws, but did fear the consequences of allowing them to legislate such laws. As the anti-Jewish forces made apparent, the Christian character of the nation was safe only so long as non-Christians were excluded from the legislative process. Indeed, similar arguments were used against Christian Roman Catholics, although with certain modifications.
The basic premise of the disabilities centered around the Protestant Christian nature of the country. Thus, it is true that a real concern for the sixteenth century Protestant settlement of religion motivated the arguments proposed by anti-Jewish factions. Prejudice, however, also played an important role. Without imputing false motives, it is difficult, if not impossible for the historian to understand the situation without a study of Victorian sentiment. In many cases, the two may be a part of each other, and it seems especially true in this case as often anti-Jewish opinions were not based on one ground alone. Specifically, at the time of the most important decisions on the issues, many members of the House of Lords believed that religious devotion might easily conflict with national devotion.

The struggle for Jewish reform was slow and discouraging, and, at times, the desired result beyond achievement. When Salomons realized that more than parliamentary methods must be employed, success came more swiftly through the use of political pressures in the election campaigns. Perhaps Roman Catholics had been a threat to national security because of their relatively large numbers. The English Jews, however, were few in number and failed to create irritating political pressure until some years after Catholic
emancipation. But as Turberville so aptly stated, the times and circumstances of this mid-nineteenth century age encouraged, and even more, demanded that the old aristocratic element of society reform or be reformed!\(^1\) In the House of Lords, the Jewish question was only one of many problems facing the nation, and, as with many of the other issues, the Jewish question might have been settled much earlier except for the obstinancy of the Upper House in nearly all such matters.

The prolific arguments advanced between 1830 and 1838, though eloquent, did not significantly influence the final result. With little effect on the outcome, the oft-used propositions only indicated the nature and duration of the struggle and the many problems involved in such a reform. Lucan's Compromise, for example, was not based on a conviction about the rights of the Jews, but on the conviction that national security must be maintained. When the arguments are reviewed in the light of the final decisions it becomes evident that the moral convictions of the anti-Jewish factions never really changed; they were merely suspended in favor of national security.

---

On the momentous day of July 23, 1658, most of the hopes and dreams of conscientious, loyal, Jewish subjects were realized. But as one writer so aptly said:

In England Jews did not gain political equality as a result of a sudden revolution or political change. It came as the crown of a process of integration into English society which had been proceeding for more than a century, delayed only because of the range of the problem and the innate conservatism of the English people.

The long battle for Anglo-Jewish emancipation has to be set in the framework of a complex society. England did not just consist of 'Christians' and 'Jews'. There was in the country an established Church, which possessed monopoly control of the universities, . . . . Those who dissented from it were penalized in varying measure, depending on the social fear which they aroused.²

Jewish emancipation was merely one of the numerous vital issues confronting the English nation in the mid-nineteenth century. It was neither more significant, or trivial, than many other of the problems that plagued the country and, when seen in proper perspective, the Jewish settlement must be looked upon as a part of the vast restructuring of British society in the Age of Reform.

²Parks, A History of the Jewish People, pp. 138-139.
APPENDIX A

THE OATH OF SUPREMACY*

I do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever.

And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm.

APPENDIX B

THE OATH OF ABJURATION*

I do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify, and declare, in my conscience before God and the world, that our Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria is lawful and rightful Queen of this realm, and all other of Her Majesty's dominions and countries thereunto belonging.

And I do solemnly and sincerely declare that I do believe in my conscience that not any of the descendants of the person who pretended to be the Prince of Wales during the life of the late King James II.; and since his decease pretended to be and took upon himself the style and title of King of England by the name of James the Eighth, or the title of King of Great Britain, hath any right or title whatsoever to the Crown of this realm or any other of the dominions thereunto belonging; and I do renounce, refuse and abjure any allegiance or obedience to any of them.

And I do swear that I will bear faith and true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and Her will defend to the utmost of my power against all traitorous conspiracies and attempts whatsoever which shall be made against Her person, crown, or dignity.

And I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to Her Majesty and Her successors all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which I shall know to be against Her or any of them.

And I do faithfully promise to the utmost of my power to support, maintain, and defend the succession of the Crown against the descendants of the said James, and against all other persons whatsoever: which succession, by an Act intituled 'An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject,' is, and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and the heirs of Her body, being Protestants.

And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever; and I do make this recognition, acknowledgment, abjuration, renunciation, and promise heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian.
APPENDIX C

SUBSTITUTION OATH*

I do swear, That I will be faithful and beare
true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and will
defend Her to the utmost of my Power against all Con-
spiracies and attempts whatever which shall be made
against Her Person, Crown, or Dignity, and I will do
my utmost Endeavour to disclose and make known to Her
Majesty, Her Heirs and Successors, all Treasons and
traitorous Conspiracies which may be formed against
Her or them; and I do faithfully promise to maintain,
support, and defend, to the utmost of my Power, the
Succession of the Crown, which Succession by an Act,
intituled 'An Act for the further Limitation of the
Crown and better securing the Rights and Liberties of
the Subject,' is and stands limited to the Princess
Sophia, Electress of Hanover, and the Heirs of Her
Body being Protestants, hereby utterly renouncing and
abjuring any Obedience or Allegiance unto any other
Person claiming or pretending a Right to the Crown of
this Realm; and I do declare, that no Foreign Prince,
Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath or ought to
have any jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Pre-eminence,
or authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, directly or
indirectly, within this Realm.

*Hansard, CXLV (1857), pp. 322-323.
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The Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, substituted for various earlier forms the oath which is now in the following form:

I . . . do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God.

---
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