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Summary

This thesis identifies the German rabbinate in British exile as a distinct refugee sub-group and traces its experiences from the onset of Nazism in Germany in the 1930s to those in Britain, ending in 1956. It argues that the rabbinate rose to unprecedented prominence under the Nazi regime as it was part of the communal leadership structure within German Jewry and maintained this role in the early years in exile. It was found that the end of the war and the vanishing of outside pressures impacted on the German rabbinate changing it into a different, modern, Anglo-Jewish institution, with German roots and influences. With the changed demands of the Anglo-Jewish population on their rabbis and the ageing German rabbis passing on, the heritage was transferred into Anglo-Jewish institutions such as newly founded synagogues and the Leo Baeck College. This had been facilitated through the rigorous training and the powerful experiences of the immigrant rabbis which gave the impact for religious expansion in Britain. Their influence turned the progressive but also the orthodox movement into a powerful force in the Anglo-Jewish landscape today.

On a personal level the study uncovered that despite their prominence, the experiences of the German rabbinate in British exile unfolded along the same lines as that of the general refugee population fleeing Nazism. In their leadership capacity however most rabbis were able to reclaim their position in the midst of the refugees, the remnants of their former communities now in exile. With that they held responsibility and power. Their attempts of transplanting and maintaining the German Jewish heritage in Britain was a desperate and only marginally successful undertaking with only few traces still recognizable today. Their attempts had a dramatic influence on the course and future of Anglo-Jewry.
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Introduction

Literature Review, Methodology, Theoretical Framework

*Worldliness and modernity have decomposed the basis of religious Jews. Whatever the adjustments were, made in particular by the Jews of Germany, having been led by a distinguished rabbinate - and this applies to all rabbinic directions in Germany - they came to an abrupt halt through the Shoah.*

Rabbi Prof. Dr. Julius Carlebach

---

On August 29, 1939, just two days before the beginning of World War II, Kurt Kassell arrived in Britain from Frankfurt/Oder. He left behind not only the life that he had known but also the members of his congregation who had relied on him for their spiritual and emotional support. He was the last German rabbi to arrive in Britain. Just as he had done, around one hundred rabbis left Germany and Austria for Great Britain and other countries in the ten months between the November pogrom in 1938 and the beginning of World War II in September 1939. Their story is subject of this dissertation.

Their own story held particular interest for the rabbis and their descendents. The son of former Hamburg Rabbi Joseph Carlebach, Julius, was particularly interested in this chapter of German Jewish History. In the short introductory quote he aptly describes both the importance and the end of the German rabbinate. His criticism of the adjustments to modernity, which he feels have deconstructed religious life were the very essence of German Jewry. Defining this German Jewry and German Judaism is a difficult undertaking. In German, both words are identical - their meaning is not as clear-cut as it is in English. German Judaism, the expression of religion and belief prevalent in Germany, developed out of a societal need for adjustments and modification in order to suit the lifestyle of German Jewry. This German Jewry was in the 1930s not a cohesive entity. However, it was vastly assimilated and its members had by and large moved away from any form of religious expression. Religion aside, German Jewry was an ethnicity and an identity. It was held together by adherence to common principles, to a moral code, to ethical behaviour and by integrating German values and ambitions into their heritage. This was manifested in the three strands of religious expression - orthodox, liberal and reform. These strands or movements and their individual Jewish attitudes have each been widely investigated. A closer look at the movement's leadership, the rabbinate reveals that here modern Jewish attitudes met religious observance and interpretation. So the bridge between both worlds is the rabbinate and therefore a suitable medium with which to investigate both German Judaism and German Jewry.

Julius Carlebach, former Professor at the University of Sussex, has summarized the importance of research into the rabbinate and his analysis can be considered the mandate under which this study has been created.

We do not only devote ourselves to this topic because it is a worthwhile undertaking, to subject the development of the German rabbinate to a systematic historical investigation, but also, because in particular in the final phase in the twenties and thirties, it had dealt with several central themes, for us today as relevant as they were for former generation (...) questions (...) which at all times belong to the creation and development of Jewish communal life.²

He emphasizes the importance and the influence of the German rabbinate - touching upon issues that are still relevant today. His own attempt to memorialize it was motivated by his tragic family history which is also part of this study. Besides Carlebach, few historians have fully realized and studied its role and importance in modern times. No study of the rabbinate during

² Carlebach, Rabbinat, 9.
the Nazi era has ever been undertaken and no in-depth study on the rabbinate in exile has been conducted. This lack of research may be attributed to the perceived irrelevance of religion in light of the rampant assimilation and secularization of German Jews before the onset of National-Socialism. And it was this assimilation and secularization which was thought of as having been carried into exile.

‘The experiences of exile in Britain tended to accelerate the abandonment of most of the Jews among the refugees of their religion and their sense of a traditional Jewish identity. The process of assimilation already well advanced in their native countries resumed briskly once they became settled. The clearest evidence of this is that a fair proportion of them barely mention religion in their life stories after emigration and some (...) not at all.’

Anthony Grenville’s summary of the role of religion in the lives of refugees questions the entire premise of this study. The conclusion that religion was irrelevant and unimportant begs the question of the importance of the men who personify this religion - and their work. This study documents and explores the relevance of religion and the rabbinate in the lives of refugees in exile in Britain.

As the complexity of rabbinic migration emerged the research into this issue needed to be limited in scope, location and time. Consequently, excluded is the developmental narrative of German Judaism and its rabbinate with its particular characteristic markers differentiating it from other European Jewries. Also excluded are the formative experiences of World War I which influenced the role of the rabbinate in particular with regards to Jewish self-defence against rising anti-Semitism which continued into the Nazi era. This aspect is only marginally referred to.

As rabbinic migration can be traced in all continents with many rabbis transiting through Britain, it had to be limited to those rabbis remaining there. The time-frame was also limited by two ‘natural’ cut-off points. These are the November pogrom of 1938 which was the cause for rabbinic emigration and the death of Rabbi Dr. Leo Baeck in 1956 which marks the passing of a generation and the point in time when twenty-eight other refugee rabbis had also passed on.

This study establishes a previously unexamined refugee sub-group, responsible for the cultural and religious transfer of German Judaism into exile. This is placed within the context of existing research on Jewish refugees in Britain and on the expansive body of research in the field of Holocaust and Exile Studies. It bridges two different contexts through the use and combination of a wide range of diverse sources - personal and public, academic, intellectual and emotional which have created a detailed picture of the rabbinate over the period of eighteen years. Equal attention was initially to be devoted to both the orthodox and the liberal rabbinate but the uneven distribution and scarcity of material skewed the study towards the liberal experience. It has been further complicated by the vastly different types of material that exist for the time in Germany and Britain, making comparison difficult.

---

The refugee-sub group of the German rabbinate had always been part of the entire Jewish community and its leadership. Their work and influence defined a heritage which is still part of Jewish culture and religion in Britain today.
Literature Review

This study touches upon a number of historical aspects that encompass German and British history, Jewish and Holocaust history, post-war and modern social history. The amount of literature devoted to each of these topics is vast and diverse.

The complexity of the Holocaust researched since the 1930’s, has continuously shifted in terms of approach and perspective, as detailed in Dan Michman’s book. Research on refugees began to emerge in the 1980s, with the entire refugee community initially considered as one homogenous group. When the archives in Eastern Europe began to open up in the 1990’s, research of Holocaust study shifted again, focusing on the life of individuals and their experiences. Biographical narrative was no longer merely seen as a collection of stories of survival, but as a piece and building block of the larger whole. In 1994, the University Of Southern California Shoah Foundation Institute for Visual History and Education pioneered the focus on biographies and as a result made the identification of individual sub-groups affected by the Holocaust possible. In Britain, the emergence of the story of the Kindertransport children prompted further research into the complexity of the refugee population. In a micro-historical fashion other refugee stories were separated into a large number of sub-groups. Subsequently examined were Jurists and Dentists, Artists and Historians, Scientists and Political Refugees, Musicians and women in exile. This research also divided the refugee population by country of origin, focusing on Austria, Czechoslovakia and Germany respectively and documenting their individual impact. The main focus from the British perspective has been placed on Austria.

Grouping refugees by profession discounts the experiences of the average refugees who were not members of any professional or elite groups. In that context, Marion Berghahn identified the average, the ‘Continental Refugees’, a ground-breaking work published 1988.

While all this research created a greater awareness of the impact that German and Austrian refugees had on a number of different areas of British life, one group that had remained conspicuously absent was that of the refugee rabbinate. Furthermore, no attempt has yet been made to relate the refugee experiences to religion, its practice, spirituality and pastoral care.

---

5 Michman, Holocaust, 334-396.
8 Marion Berghahn, Continental Britons: German-Jewish Refugees from Nazi Germany (Oxford: Berg, 1988).
Historically, the rabbinate had changed in its role and perception, both internally and within the Jewish world. It was equipped with new tasks and duties in modern times and was able to forge a new leadership role at the start of the 20th century. A historical perspective was documented by Carsten Wilke who examined these obstacles up to the 1870's. He focused on its newly defined role and its struggles with secular Jewish leadership. This foundation for the modern rabbi was essential for the rabbinic leadership role during the Nazi era, which evolved from the ‘Kisseh-Ha-Rabbanut’ into the respected representative of the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ with the rise of the ‘Doktor-Rabbiner’.

With that, the rabbis personified the attributes of ‘Sittlichkeit and Bildung’ and represented middle-class cultured and educated Jews who made up the majority of the congregants. As religion was strongly rooted in the female domain, the experiences of Jewish middle-class women shed new light on its relevance and with it that of the rabbinate, particularly important during the Nazi regime. At that point, Jewish and Holocaust History converge with Gender Studies. This is briefly highlighted to include the experiences of Jewish women and rabbis’ wives in this study. Pioneering the focus on women and the Holocaust were Dalia Ofer and Leonore Weitzmann and Marion Kaplan with their research in 1998.

They describe how women reacted to increasing outside pressure and that through their everyday contact with ordinary Germans, they were more readily aware of the imminent dangers. This is in contrast to their husband’s perception and reflects how they were tied into German society on a different level. Kaplan’s book contributes to an evaluation of rabbinic family dynamics which was an important factor as it ultimately led to the liberation of the rabbis from concentration camp and to the family’s subsequent emigration. These women became the rescuers of their families and the autobiographical accounts of several rabbis’ wives were utilized in this study to narrate the personal and the female aspect of this story.

Documentation about the rabbinate under the Nazi regime is sparse and consists for the most part of testimonies written by those representing it. Rabbis Alexander Altmann and Alfred Jospe both documented the German rabbinate from 1910 -1939 mixing academic discourse with autobiographical accounts. From a distance of many decades the rabbinate under Nazi rule was again examined by historian Jacob Boas. More recently, interest in the refugee rabbinate has increased as a result of articles written about the German rabbinate and its experiences in a number of countries including Israel (Jütte), Australia (Apfel) and the United States (Meyer).

---

10 Throne of the Rabbinate, Science of Judaism and Rabbis with doctoral titles.
11 Decorum and Education.
The leader of German Jewry and the most prominent rabbi, Rabbi Dr. Leo Baeck has been the focus of much research. A first attempt at researching him was undertaken by Friedlander and later by Baker, both of which lack a critical discussion of his role as Jewish leader and with it that of the German rabbinate. Individual autobiographies have contributed to the research on the German rabbinate and began to appear after Baeck’s death. They provided an insight into both the distress and responsibilities of the rabbis in Germany, their experiences in exile and for some of them the return to Germany. The full extent of the rabbinic migration experience can, however, only be contextualized when placing it into the general emigration research. This has been done for the United States. There synagogues played a central role as institutions for social exchange and the rabbinate in exile functioned as an adjunct to German Jewry. Both the community and the rabbinate attempted to re-establish themselves within a new context abroad.

The emigration and the arrival of refugees are put into British context which is an important facet of this research. Anglo-Jewry has been thoroughly and critically examined by a number of authors who have identified Anglo-Jewish self-understanding as being first and foremost British and secondly Jewish. Assimilated Anglo-Jewry had a long-held fear of losing its status within society as a result of continuous Jewish emigration. This sentiment arose with the Eastern European Emigration at the turn of the century and was also present during the Holocaust. Furthermore, the intra-Jewish power struggles between the Board of Deputies and the Chief Rabbinate, a controversial position and an obstacle to Anglo-Jewish cohesion has also been considered. Tracing the Orthodox Chief Rabbinate historically and the men who occupied this position reveal that they either exerted a uniting influence or propagated the rift within Anglo-Jewish society which still continues today. The Reform and Liberal movements had different approaches to Judaism and were part of the religious landscape of Anglo-Jewry into which the refugees entered.

The narration of refugee experiences that began in the 1950s started a discussion about the role of Britain in the wider political events of World War II. An overall but subjective view of the Anglo-Jewish rescue and resettlement efforts appeared in 1956 but was devoid of any criticism of the British public or of government policy. Britain continued to be seen in a favourable light until a more critical perspective was made public in the 1970’s and was contrasted with U.S. policies. It opened the door for more discussion on government policy in Britain and Germany. Richard Bolchover criticized Anglo-Jewry and its reaction to the refugees and to political events. An equally critical analysis which was based on the study of British policy and public opinion was created by Pamela Shatzkes who details the reasons behind the failure to rescue more Jews from continental Europe. This perspective ran counter to the prevailing, positive public self-perception by the British that had been propagated since the end of World War II.

In the 1940s, the worldwide refugee problem was highlighted in an attempt to influence opinion and policy makers. After the war, academic interest in the entire refugee subject began to fade but, with the 50th reunion of the Kindertransport in 1989, this was renewed. Since then by far the greatest attention has been on these ‘Kinder’. The earliest study on this subject was by Mary R. Ford where she investigated the nearly 10,000 children who came to Britain, most of whom were going to be orphaned before 1945. Their history has been recorded in a number of biographical and autobiographical works and, both individually and as a group, their experiences have been the subject of many scientific and literary works. Illustrating the available amount of literature is reflected when entering the term ‘Kindertransport’ into the catalogue of the British Library which yields 234 results. Many of these documents trace the ‘Kinder’ experiences from the time they left Germany, were separated from their homes and parents until their arrival in Britain and their experiences thereafter.

Another well documented rescue effort is that of the ‘Chief Rabbis Religious Emergency Council’, CRREC. Three different books with three different approaches were written between 2004 and 2009. Documenting the massive efforts behind the rescue, these portray the charisma and ‘can-do’ attitude of its figurehead Rabbi Solomon Schonfeld who was the driving force behind this operation. Chanan Tomlin, an Orthodox historian, takes a critical view of the person and the rescue efforts and treads a thin line between objectivity and personal conviction.

33 Exemplary work by Rebekka Göpfert, Der jüdische Kindertransport von Deutschland nach England 1938/39: Geschichte und Erinnerung (Frankfurt: Campus-Verlag, 1999).
This critical view of the CRREC and its work assumes an ulterior motive behind the rescue schemes.34

Other rescue efforts such as that of the ‘Domestic Service Permit’ also underwent academic examination.35 The efforts of the Liberal Movement and their leaders Rabbi Israel Mattuck, Lady Lily Montagu and Sir Claude Montefiore in collecting funds and securing visas for Jews in Germany has not yet been researched. Another gap exists in the research of the Kitchener Camp in Richborough, a cooperative rescue scheme between the Central British Fund and the Reichsvertretung in Berlin. Clare Ungerson, Professor Emeritus of the University of Southampton, currently documents this under-researched topic. Life at this camp was a positive experience for most of the residents as they entered voluntarily. Internment and deportation which followed in 1940, was a completely different matter. The passionate plea against this policy was credited with raising awareness and leading to the eventual release of internees. This is an episode in British history that had until the 1980s remained largely forgotten.36 The policies, circumstances and experiences around internment reflect British attitudes which at the time, failed to differentiate between the individual groups of refugees. Whilst this could be blamed on incorrect or insufficient military intelligence and xenophobia, the inability to make an informed and sensible decision about refugees and internment is a controversial subject in British history.37 Accounts by former internees document a more relaxed perception of internment which is full of humour and absurdity.38 In 1990, the 50th anniversary of internment sparked a new academic discourse with a conference at the University of Southampton in cooperation with the Wiener Library. The conference papers highlight a variety of aspects that question the motivation behind this policy.39 These papers cite historical antecedents and critically examine politicians, civil servants and the British public, all of whom were unable or unwilling to tolerate ‘Enemy Aliens’ both during World War I and World War II. Tony Kushner and David Cesarani conclude that the reason why this chapter in British history was largely forgotten or suppressed is that the gratitude of the refugees and the focus on refugee achievements effectively eliminated any critical discourse. This refugee gratitude resulted in the creation of the ‘Thank you Britain-Fund’ in 1963. Under the chairmanship of the refugee and Nobel-prize laureate Professor Hans Krebs and other prominent refugees it raised £96,000 for the British Academy.40

Only since the Australian film ‘The Dunera Boys’ was first aired on British Television in 1985 has there been a renewed interest in internment and subsequent deportation to Canada and Australia. In 2005 in that context another collection of papers re-examined internment policy as

---

a political tool. It highlighted internee sub-groups in both World Wars, and provided a complete historiography on internment.\(^{41}\) With the examination of women in internment, Maxine Seller took a novel approach and revealed their community-building efforts as well as the educational outfall of internment that left an imprint on the lives of the internees.\(^{42}\) A direct function of ‘Enemy Alien’ status and internment was recruitment into the ‘Pioneer Corps’. Initially the only unit within the British army into which refugees could enlist in was documented by Norman Bentwich in 1950.\(^{43}\) This topic was taken up again by Peter Leighton-Langer, a former member of the ‘Pioneer Corps’.\(^{44}\) In 2006 he collected data and anecdotes from friends, former colleagues and their children and constructed a comprehensive and detailed account of the men and their experiences. He speaks with much pride about his German roots and having fought against the Nazis. This account, which is far more detailed than that of Bentwich, is written with the benefit of sixty years of hindsight. It rekindled public interest and two further works on the ‘Pioneer Corps’ have recently been published.\(^{45}\)

Literature about the war years, whilst covering the war itself and those fighting in it, has produced very few works on the experiences of Jewish refugees and the rabbinate on the home front. In particular, the period between 1940 and 1945 that began with the release from internment has not been covered in academic discourse. From the works on the Kindertransports and children’s training camps some of this information can be extrapolated.\(^{46}\) Additionally rabbinic autobiographical works are sparse. Some of them do mention conditions during the Blitz but they fail to cover most other public and private aspects.\(^{47}\)

The arrival of Rabbi Dr. Leo Baeck in Britain in 1945 re-energized the refugee rabbinate. Recognition for its efforts first appeared in the 1970’s with a modest piece by Gerhard L. Graf, himself a refugee rabbi.\(^{48}\) He paid tribute to his fellow rabbis and briefly elaborated on the efforts of the Leo Baeck College and the Reform Beth Din. A piece published by Jonathan Romain in the ‘AJR Information’ in 1987 details the contribution of orthodox and progressive refugee rabbis to Anglo-Jewry.\(^{49}\) Five years later Werner Mosse compiled a comparison between the Jewish experiences in Germany and Britain. He included articles by the orthodox scholar Carlebach and the Reform rabbi Friedlander who both acknowledged in more detail the influence of the German-speaking rabbinate in Britain.\(^{50}\) Acknowledging individual rabbis began with a book

---
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about Ignaz Maybaum, an article about Italiener and a collection of essays portraying British Reform rabbis, including the refugee rabbis.\textsuperscript{51} The existing literature about the refugee rabbinate was either written by its members or by people closely related to them, such as their children or students. They identified individual rabbis and their role within their peer group. However the influence of this group on cultural and religious transference, its maintenance and expansion was only explored marginally. Within this context, Anthony Godfrey examines the only refugee synagogue, the New Liberal Jewish Congregation. Today it is called 'Belsize Square Synagogue' and is still active. In his book he includes biographical information about the refugee rabbis in its pulpit.\textsuperscript{52} This synagogue's existence is important in the context of refugee self-perception examined through the lens of the refugee publication, the \textit{AJR Information}.\textsuperscript{53} The finding that religion among the refugee population was of little or no relevance is examined closer in this study.\textsuperscript{54}

Individual aspects which were influenced by the German rabbinate in Exile have been touched upon in a wide range of secondary literature. However no comprehensive study with exclusive focus on the rabbinate has been undertaken. This lack of research was remedied with this comprehensive study focusing on the German rabbinate in British exile. It considered the rabbis' private and public lives, their work before, during and after the November Pogrom, and their efforts to transfer culture and religious tradition into British soil. This in-depth research based on a wide range of sources has unveiled a hitherto neglected refugee sub-group which is being introduced with a well-rounded and sensible analysis. This study thus closes an existing gap in research on the Jewish and refugee experience for Britain

\textbf{Methodology}

This study traces the German rabbinate in Britain and introduces two distinct narratives - their experiences in Germany and those in Britain. These two distinctly different experiences were analyzed with the help of a theoretical framework. Looking at the broader context of Jewish leadership, of exile, identity and religion, these experiences could be explained and understood. Furthermore theories on ethnicity, rabbinic authority and pastoral care helped to understand this undertaken cultural transfer to Britain. The impact of the Jewish leadership exerted by rabbis on the refugee community and subsequently on Judaism in Britain was identified, based on a wide range of material from public and private sources that describe the experiences of rabbis. Included was material that narrates their experiences in their own words, adding a very personal and emotional dimension. It also contains a reflection on the social, economic and political world. In light of the Holocaust's annihilating impact on German Jewry,


\textsuperscript{52} Antony Godfrey, \textit{Three Rabbis in a Vicarage: The Story of Belsize Square Synagogue} (Larsen Grove Press, 2005).

\textsuperscript{53} Anthony Grenville, \textit{Jewish Refugees from Germany and Austria in Britain, 1933 - 1970: their Image in AJR Information} (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2010).

documenting these individual experiences has become even more important, as historian Ruth Wisse has stated ‘Individualizing the Holocaust undoes the levelling work of the Nazi regime.’

The overwhelming amount of individual biographical data on the German rabbinate in exile of varying quality and density warranted an overarching prosopographical approach. Prosopography, also known as collective biography or multiple career-line analysis is the ‘(…) investigation of the common background characteristics of a group of actors in history by means of a collective study of their lives.’ This collection of data not only defines a population sub-group but also sets the parameters of their lives and when compiled, compared and contrasted it serves to identify variables, correlations and commonalities. Taken together these further explain behaviour within this sub-group. The collected data represents a contribution to micro-history as it defines the individual spheres, actions and contributions. A thorough analysis has created the overarching context and understanding while drawing the relevant inferences to societal, cultural and religious impact. This approach is particularly useful where the individuals who make up a particular historical sub-group have sketchy biographies, where each individual piece of information contributes to the understanding of the entire population. The focus of this study is on two countries - enabling a cross-cultural comparison with data from two distinctly different cultural contexts. Prosopography and micro-history uncover new angles and connections within the political and social narrative, but relying solely on this approach has clearly had its drawbacks. The analysis could potentially lose focus on the historical context in favour of the individual. It thus necessitated constant cross-referencing with the narrative of the refugee peer-group and shifted the focus to the larger historical, political and social context. These external factors were compared and contrasted with the rabbinic narrative and contribute to the field of Holocaust and refugee history.

While prosopography relies on factual data, life histories are the sum of the biographical data collected about particular individuals. This information is usually recalled by individuals themselves and depicts their beliefs and attitudes through autobiographies, letters, contemporary reports or newspaper descriptions. While this approach helps to explore the subjective dimensions of a life, it also highlights historical connections between a person’s life and a social structure and can provide access to ambiguity, flux and social change. Combining both prosopographical and life histories approaches were the foundation for a balanced examination of the population sub-group studied here. In order to subject the collected data to a meaningful analysis, it was necessary to sub-divide it by a number of factors in an effort to draw inferences from common and differing experiences.

---
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With the help of autobiographical accounts the reconstruction of the lives of German rabbis was undertaken. These are highly subjective and need to be placed into the context of their creation. An individual who experiences persecution, humiliation and displacement, is deprived of freedom and then thrown into unexpected and uncontrollable circumstances, can attempt to regain control over his life by committing memories to paper and writing about them. As a psychological act of dealing with trauma, writing attempts to forge experiences into words, but speech is found lacking. ‘Trauma’, the Greek word for ‘wound’, refers to self-altering and shattering experiences that have been caused by violence. The difficulty of addressing this ‘wound’ becomes apparent in the writing. Research has confirmed that the autobiography, as a particular expression of identity, is automatically censored by the writer i.e. specific elements are included and others are omitted. The autobiographies which were included in this thesis showed a striking common denominator in the absence of certain narratives. Another revealing aspect is the limited number of autobiographies in existence of a very literate and widely published sub-group. This lack of material is most poignantly summarized in an exchange between Rabbi Dr. Werner Van Der Zyl and his daughter, who had asked him why he would not write an autobiography. His reply was that he did not consider his life to have been remarkable.

The autobiographical material that was included in this research was continuously cross-referenced with the experiences of the immediate peer groups, other rabbis and other refugees. These helped to identify previously unrecognized connections and unveiled intricate networks among rabbis, rabbinic families, institutions, organizations, communities, and German Jewry as a whole. This led to the application of network analysis. As a tool for historical study, it is increasingly being applied, but had been created in the 1930s to analyze business processes. It helps to visualize the interactions among various sub-groups and individuals. Networks describe the individuals and their connections. They help to recognize and explain human behaviour and how these influence events and outcomes. Networks are defined as close, regular contact with individuals who share another person’s life. Networks consist of nodes, local clusters and giant clusters, connected in either of two ways. Strong ties exist to local surroundings while weak ties exist to those connections at a greater physical distance or which are further removed socially. These long-distance, weak ties all connect in a giant cluster an essential instrument for disseminating information to the network members.

The relevance of networks for the rabbinate in Germany and in exile and their importance in restarting in Britain are identified in the following chapters.
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This study identified the rabbinate as part of the larger refugee community and attempted to focus on its less famous representatives in order to depict the rabbinate as a function of the exile of the average people. Consequently, some rabbis have purposely been excluded in order to maintain the focus on the ordinary community rabbi. Excluded were Rabbis Fackenheim and Maybaum who are mentioned throughout this study but their importance and their influential works are not considered. Rabbis Alexander Altmann and Eliezer Berkovits have been completely excluded as their fame would have overshadowed the efforts of the other refugee rabbis. All four of them have contributed greatly to the advancement of Jewish Studies, Jewish Theology and Post-Holocaust Theology. The study limited the examination of the refugee congregation, New Liberal Jewish Congregation, today known as ‘Belsize Square’ synagogue as this important institution has already been thoroughly documented elsewhere.  

Uncovering archival sources in particular the personal papers of refugee rabbis, was a main element of this study. In the beginning, it was anticipated that this material would uncover a more personal aspect of the refugee rabbis and provide a view into both the public and the private personae. The archival holdings and the personal papers which could be identified were however largely limited in scope and mostly contained material on family history or material that related to the post-1956 period, which made it not directly relevant to this study. Other material used was rabbinic writings both in Germany and in Britain. Writing, seen as the public expression of a viewpoint and position, is an important criterion for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the rabbinate and its prominence. Within these writings were stark differences, both in terms of quality and quantity between the publications in Germany and those in Britain. German material includes newspaper articles about rabbis and monographs on Jewish ritual, practice, philosophy and history. Newspaper articles published during the Nazi era that were written by a large number of rabbis attempted to provide comfort and support and give a clear picture of the state of the rabbinate and Jewish congregations. Sermons, usually held without manuscript, were very difficult to obtain and a published collection of sermons held on the occasion of the Jewish New Year in 1935 was a remarkable find. Material in Britain is of a different nature as emigration to a new and foreign environment silenced many of the once prolific writers. Few of them were able to publish books again and some published short pieces in congregational newspapers. These articles are in stark contrast to the German publications and make it clear that a different audience demanded a different kind of writing, i.e. short, concise pieces mainly relating Judaism to current events, whilst lengthy tractates on Jewish tradition and history were no longer in demand.
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Theoretical Framework

In order to examine the efficacy and relevance of the German rabbinate both in Germany and in Britain it needs to be placed within the larger context of German Jewry and the Jewish people. A vast range of theories, concepts and frameworks can be applied to further the critical understanding of the basis on which the German rabbinate came to flourish, transfer into a different context and later vanish. Some of these concepts are highlighted here and are applied throughout the study.

Ethnicity, Identity, Exile, and its Impact on Religion

The complicated, multi-layered notion of Jewish identity which has been much addressed throughout the history of the Jewish people has never been authoritatively resolved and no absolute definition has ever been achieved. Amongst a wide number of other factors, identity rests on the definition of ethnicity, i.e. the state of belonging to a social group which shares a national or cultural tradition.\(^71\) This sharing of cultural traditions which includes religion and ritual has a strong psychological and emotional component of belonging which supersedes any societal class segregation and includes members of all strata.\(^72\) While these definitions apply to an ethnic group in a stable environment within a society, ethnicity changes when these circumstances are influenced, modified and even destroyed by outside forces such as government regulation and a policy of exclusion. Within an ethnic group, sub-groups can be formed which develop and vanish with the circumstances.\(^73\) Rampant assimilation saw many Jews integrate into German society and vanish as members of this ethnic minority. Many sub-groups also established themselves and at times these groups worked against each other and against the concept of a common ethnicity. This fact alone made the application of the concept of ethnicity to the perceived homogeneous body of German Jewry complicated, if not impossible. Similarly, refugees from Nazism arriving in Britain also split into a number of ethnic sub-groups - the Jews from Germany, those from Austria, those from Czechoslovakia and those from other countries. This is called ‘Ethno-Genesis’ and connotes the creation of ethnic sub-groups. Refugees therefore cannot be understood as a homogenous entity but the word is rather an umbrella term for all those who fled their homeland for Britain. A reverse trend, which is also part of ‘Ethno-Genesis’ is the disappearance of a particular group by re-entering the existing ethnic group.\(^74\) While initially separate over time this group began to merge and disappear within Anglo-Jewry. Although many refugees still cultivate their former status of refugee today through membership in refugee and social organizations, they have in reality become an intricate part of the host ethnic group and society at large. ‘Ethno-Genesis’ and its reversal is an important concept in this study. The individual identification within the refugee group and in British society at large has important implications for the transfer of culture and

\(^73\) Ibid.
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religious tradition. This study uses ‘Ethno-Genesis’ to additionally identify important factors which gave rise to the importance of the rabbinate. It is of particular importance when analyzing the impact of the rabbinate on Judaism in Britain.

One of the elements that define ethnicity is that of a common religious belief in a supreme being. Whilst not all Jews believe in the basic concepts of their religion, they are however still part of the ethnic group of the Jews. Several approaches to religion which attempt to explain its complexity and importance for human beings serve to further illustrate the foundation on which the rabbinate is based. Without the importance of religion, its rituals and its significance, the rabbinate would be irrelevant. Clifford Geertz, a leading anthropologist, argued that religion provides its believers with the assurance that the world is meaningful and that events can be placed within a greater context, thus giving rhyme and reason to suffering, injustice and evil.

Religion also has a strong psychological aspect, in particular in times of trouble. Anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski introduced a psychological theory into his field, stating that religion and ritual serves to give people confidence and to remove anxiety about the uncertainties of life. Humans, aware of their mortality, seek comfort within the context of religion which is seen as a coping mechanism. Apart from any individual psychological effects religion has a strong sociological factor. Its practice can instil, maintain and enforce common values and cultural norms and form the basis for group cohesion and cooperation, thereby fostering harmonious social relationships between individuals and groups. French sociologist Emile Durkheim went further and stated that religion not only enhances the cohesion of society but makes people sense their inter-dependence and tradition.

A distinctive marker of Jewish ethnic identity is the combination of both ethnicity and religion which is reinforced through institutional networks. These networks provide support for individuals and the group beyond the period of initial immigration and include synagogues with both religious instruction and a social sphere. Other social institutions such as youth groups, philanthropic organizations and an extensive social network also support this. As this study will prove that the social aspect of religion played an important role and contributed to the unprecedented rise in the prominence of the German rabbinate both in Germany and in exile in Britain.

‘Exile’ is interchangeably used with the term ‘Refugee’ but connotes more than just leaving one place and entering another. It is a temporary, an in-between condition, where a refusal or inability to abandon one state is juxtaposed with the rejection or inability to accept another, whether it is a new state, home or the present condition. Thus, exile has a de-stabilizing effect on a person’s self-perception and self-definition because it invalidates all previous parameters.
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of identification, i.e. that of nation, nationality, the physical home, profession and even religious practice. It also entails the loss of material possessions, of heritage, symbols of ancestry and inherited items. All of these aspects are essential for identification and a sense of continuity. Their absence can create an identity crisis and destabilization. Thus interaction with others who share the same experience becomes important because a group can negotiate a new common identity in response.\textsuperscript{82} As such, the ethnic sub-group, the community of exiles, holds on to various elements of the native environment including familiar objects, music, memories and religious expression, thus maintaining the ties to their native land.\textsuperscript{83}

The study moves on to examine the role of the Jewish leadership in this context. The rabbinate was part of the complex structure of Jewish leadership and has distinct duties and power. It relied on intricate relationships between congregation members, its organizations and the community board. These intricate connections and interactions between Jewish leadership and rabbinic authority are important for the understanding of the rabbinic role, in particular during the Nazi era and later in exile. Throughout history, the rabbinic role within the leadership structure and within the community was not fixed but continuously shifted in power, responsibility and importance. This complexity of interaction has been investigated by Elazar and his colleagues.\textsuperscript{84} Their work is based on texts that span fourteen epochs of Jewish history. On this basis they developed a leadership model and identified the concept of Ketarim, the three crowns of Jewish leadership.\textsuperscript{85}

Millennia before one can rightfully invoke terms like ‘democracy’ or ‘empowerment’ to describe leadership styles, Jewish leaders were sensitive to the excesses of power, the dangers of charisma, and the complex inter-relationship between leaders and led. Though they most assuredly would not have described it in terms of a paradigmatic infrastructure, Jewish leaders understood that fealty to Judaism’s theological ‘Weltanschauung’ militated against centralizing power, despite the temptations to do so. Similarly, obedience to God’s law meant that dictatorial leadership, however effective in the short term, was aberrant and had to be avoided.\textsuperscript{86}

Identified were three separate and equally important segments which are called the three crowns or Ketarim of Jewish leadership and make up this model. Keter Torah (Learning), Keter Kehunah (Priesthood), and Keter Malkhut (Kingship) each defines a separate aspect of Jewish life and with it the accumulated power in its realm. Although able to function independently, each is subject to strong interdependence, enduring rivalries and infringement yet forcing close cooperation to assure optimal functioning of the Jewish community. This applies to ancient biblical communities, the Ghettos of medieval Europe, Jewish communities today and also to the Jewish people as a whole. In other words:

\textsuperscript{82} ibid, 12.
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The proper Jewish polity (...) is that which contains fully articulated and functioning institutions in all three Ketarim. The good Jewish polity is that in which, furthermore, the balance between the Ketarim is both buttressed and respected.\(^8\)

Graph 1 shows these three Ketarim and their individual responsibilities in a balanced, optimal state. Historically Keter Malkhut evolved from its initial purpose to the secular, administrative function of the community. In the modern era this governance was executed by prominent and wealthy lay leaders with the assistance of trained professionals. Rabbis were traditionally not part of this construct but where they were involved their roles were explicitly secular. Rabbis entering the Keter Malkhut were accepted

(...) not by virtue of their religious authority but by virtue of either their individual talents or the fact that they happen to speak in the name of a rabbinical association joined with other nonreligious organizations in a secularized organizational framework.\(^8\)

Graph 1 Power Distribution among the Ketarim\(^9\)

Keter Torah which was traditionally embodied by the ‘Kissee-Ha-Rabbanut’ was the legal backbone of the Jewish community.\(^9\) Rabbis interpreted divine law through the study of the scriptures and advised the community leadership in legal matters. This legal aspect diminished with emancipation but Jewish learning out of which the field of Jewish studies emerged was maintained. Today, the academic community has taken on many former aspects of the rabbinate and surpassed it in expertise. For the most part its representatives refrain from becoming involved in communal affairs.

---


(... with the proliferation of academic Jewish studies ... few rabbis could claim the highest level of expertise even in their own domain.91

The last of the Ketarim, Keter Kehunah, the priesthood, is responsible for the divine communication. This includes providing for the spiritual needs of the community through services, rituals and rites. Modelled on the role of the protestant pastor in modern times the task of pastoral care was added and today this is the central part of the rabbinate. Throughout history the rabbinate can be found in all three of the Ketarim, yet it never established a firm hold in any other than Keter Kehunah. This study will show the application of the Ketarim concept as put forward by Cohen and Elazar and places it into a previously unrelated and unexamined context - that of the German rabbis in Germany and in British exile. This concept will be revisited in the concluding chapter.

Rabbinic Authority and Pastoral Care under Duress

The rabbinate had always been a source of authority. Authority is defined as the legitimate use of power which Max Weber differentiated into three kinds. Charismatic Authority is derived from the personal qualities of highly respected or revered, charismatic leaders. Rational-Legal Authority stems from the hierarchical structure of an organization granting office-holder the right to exert influence over others. The third, the Traditional Authority, derives its power from inheritance or social custom.92 Throughout history the rabbinate had held both Traditional and Rational - Legal authority. As interpreters of Jewish law, rabbis held traditional authority and exerted power over the community. Their rulings and interpretations gave them authority which continued through tradition, inheritance, and social custom. In post-emancipation German-speaking countries, the re-defined rabbinate made way for a new ‘Rational - Legal’ authority. This was expressed in the highest educational – and therefore rational - legal qualification - the doctoral title. Whilst rabbinic education was of primary importance, the increased public aspect of the rabbinate increasingly demanded charismatic authority. Today, academic qualifications are superseded by oratory skills and personal charisma. These skills are of particular importance with the added emphasis on pastoral care. This task of the rabbinate became increasingly important and can be traced back to biblical passages where God Himself comforted His people. ‘(...) the words of Isaiah 52:9 “God comforts his people” and 66:13 (...) “so I will comfort you.’93 Rephrasing this statement, Claude Montefiore confirms this position in his writings of 1938.

The loving deeds of which the rabbis lay most stress - comforting the mourners, visiting the sick, clothing the naked, burying the dead, joining in the rejoicing of the bride and bridegroom - were all said to be deeds which, in the biblical story, had been done by G’d Himself. The truest rule or principle of human goodness was the imitation of God.94

Pastoral care is central to a position of religious and spiritual responsibility and addresses the most imminent human need. Rabbis not only have the right to comfort those in need but also the obligation - particularly when faced with persecution, emigration, exile and any disaster situation. These are communal experiences entailing collective trauma and causing widespread disruption to all areas of life - spiritual, emotional, physical and economic. These communal experiences exceed the ability of individuals to cope.\(^{95}\) When people are simultaneously affected they all need spiritual, emotional and physical support. A disaster radically undermines the human being’s fundamental sense of security and strips away control. It also diminishes faith in the existing order and raises questions about the meaning of life and basic beliefs. Disasters cause profound shock and grief and its victims become ‘(...) physically, mentally and / or spiritually overwhelmed.’\(^{96}\) Research into the dynamics of disaster survival suggests that communal reactions go through several phases and a universally applicable pattern is depicted in Graph 2. It illustrates the subsequent steps of disaster recovery and highlights individual and communal reactions. In this study, these phases of disaster recovery will be applied to the experiences and dynamics of the refugee community in Britain and the refugee rabbinate in their midst.

Graph 2 Cycle of Communal Reaction\(^{97}\)
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The importance of the rabbi as leader, pastor and spiritual guide is particularly important in conditions of disaster. He can then provide meaning and purpose, help people relate to themselves, to the world, and to God. He can also help the affected to recover their own spiritual resources and tools, acknowledge their pain and provide religious care through rituals (\textit{Viddui}, the deathbed confession or funerals) and prayers (\textit{Misheberach}, the healing prayers or organizing \textit{Tefilah}, prayer service). Rabbis can also provide religious objects, help secure
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kosher food and also help to answer specific religious questions. In their role as pastoral workers, they help to relieve the suffering while offering hope for the hopeless. Within this context it needs to be taken into consideration that rabbis themselves were affected by disaster. They were victims and survivors yet managed to maintain their pastoral roles and serve the needs of their congregations affected by disaster. A detailed consideration of the reaction to disaster will be undertaken in the concluding chapter.

Religious attitudes of the congregants are the foundation on which rabbinic work is based. These attitudes are important in all interaction between community members and the rabbinate, but particularly so for communal disaster recovery. While their absence in refugees has often been referred to, research suggests a more differentiated view. Religious life in pre-war Germany with its assimilated communities is considered to be non-existent except for superficial expressions of piety on the occasion of the Holy Days. This discounts the fact that religious expression is an intricate part of ethnicity and identity. Religious values are part of one’s upbringing and of a moral and ethical code on which daily life and behaviour is based. This complex value system was traditionally expressed in strict religious observance. Once this diminished and outward expression ceased, adherence to the moral and ethical codes was not automatically discarded. Jewishness within an assimilated society altered and began to express itself in a number of ways such as in the emphasis on ‘mitzvot’ or ‘good deeds’. Similarly, a significant increase in philanthropic activity can be observed that correlates with the rise of Jews within German society, fuelled by increased secularism. David Biale has identified the inter-connectedness between secular life and religion.

Religion is part and parcel of the secular world in all its aspects. Religion is permeated with the secular, just as the secular is permeated with Religion.

In that context, the rabbinate maintained a token function and was also part of the philanthropic activities as will be shown. With mounting outside pressure, Jews returned to the synagogues for a renewed religious connection and for emotional and spiritual support. Further research indicated that religious conviction was found to correlate with personal resilience in extreme situations. Rabbis attempted to place the experiences into a religious context.

The rabbi must not be merely a master of citation, one who has the homiletic skill to draw the proper pithy saying to meet the immediate situation. The rabbi must be the one who, understanding the process and the modes of thought which created Torah in the
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98 Ibid., 446.
99 Ibid.
101 Ibid.
past now creates Torah anew. The rabbi’s task is thus essentially theological. It is the translation of experience and deeds into moments of transcendence.\textsuperscript{104}

In exile Rabbis were part of a larger whole, that of a generation that had suffered and survived. The German rabbinate reflected German Jewry. As German Jewry changed, merged and ceased to exist, so did the German rabbinate. This traditional interconnectedness is highlighted in the following quote.

\textit{Rabbi Yehudah Nesi\textsuperscript{a} and the Rabbis disagreed. One said: According to the leader, so the generation. The other said: According to the generation, so the leader.}\textsuperscript{105}

In light of this relationship and interconnectedness the thesis begins with the examination of the role of the rabbinate in the German-Jewish context and its interaction with those they served.

\textbf{Dissertation Structure}

This study is structured into an introductory part which contains a literature review, methodology section and theoretical framework. Within these sections the aspects on which this research touches are discussed in particular the issues of Jewish identity, network theory and exile. Furthermore the theories around Jewish leadership, rabbinic authority and its role in the relationship to disaster recovery are highlighted. This introductory section is then followed by four chapters depicting the research into the lives and experiences of the German rabbinate. The first of these chapters ‘\textit{Serving and Preaching}’ narrates these experiences in Germany until the November pogrom and emigration. The second chapter ‘\textit{Leaving and Arriving}’ provides information on the Anglo-Jewish context into which the refugee rabbis were going to enter and the rescue schemes which made their emigration to Britain possible. The next chapter ‘\textit{Arriving and Settling}’ details the experiences of the refugee rabbis in Britain and includes their work for the refugee agencies, children of the Kindertransports, their own internment and deportation to burgeoning beginnings and re-emergence of a refugee rabbinate. The last narrative chapter ‘\textit{Ending and Beginning}’ starts with the end of World War II and traces the developments in the post-war years for the individual rabbis as well as the religious movements in Britain. It ends with the year 1956 when Leo Baeck passed away. The concluding chapter then ties the narrative chapters into the introductory chapter and the introduced concepts and answers the question of German-Jewish rabbinic heritage in Anglo-Jewry.


\textsuperscript{105} Arachin17a, quoted from Hal M. Lewis, \textit{From Sanctuary to Boardroom: a Jewish Approach to Leadership} (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 84.
Serving and Preaching until 1938
The Rabbinate in Germany

From September 1935 until October 1938, I experienced the last rays of a setting sun, in whose warmth German Judaism had previously blossomed. (…) By mid-November deep night had broken out in Germany.

Rabbi Dr: Hermann Ostfeld ¹

¹ Zwi Hermon Vom Seelsorger zum Kriminologen: Rabbiner in Göttingen,Reformer des Gefängniswesens und Psychotherapeut in Israel; ein Lebensbericht (Göttingen: Schwartz, 1990), 101.
The introductory quote by the last community rabbi from the town of Göttingen summarizes the rise and fall of German Jewry and, with it, that of the rabbinate. It also summarizes this chapter which narrates the formative experiences of the rabbis until their departure from Germany. The rabbinate underwent significant changes as emancipation led to the dismantling of the traditional rabbinate in the mid 19th century. In its place developed and later flourished a modern and powerful institution. This process of redefining the rabbinic role within German-Jewish society went in phases, marred by internal strife, conflict and power struggles. The result was that the rabbinate rose as a central pillar of Jewish society. It was anchored in a leadership role and created within its ranks an extensive and strong network. As outside pressures and influences had an effect on both the role and the function of the rabbinate its work for their congregations was an important service. The most significant and formative experience was that of World War I which changed rabbinic self-perception and the increasing exposure to rising anti-Semitism catapulted the rabbinate into the forefront of Jewish self-defence. It rose up to counter these attacks with public defence of Judaism which gained increasing fervour with the rise of National-Socialism. This also led to a change in the rabbinate with the older generation making way for a younger and more assertive group of rabbis. With the rise of Nazism in 1933 the Jewish leadership was being dismantled. Accelerated emigration or deportation forced the rabbinate to take up this unprecedented position of leadership within the community. Subsequently the rabbinate gained greater power, influence and authority than ever before and rabbis became a pillar of strength and the last resort for their increasingly desperate members. The last stage of the dissolution of German Jewry was the November pogrom of 1938 followed by deportation of 30,000 Jewish men, among them most of the German rabbis. In the concentration camps rabbis once again assumed their leadership role while they attempted to protect themselves, to support their friends, the members of their community and their co-religionists. It was now apparent that no-one would be spared persecution and, if an opportunity to emigrate should present itself, then this opportunity should be grasped. Finally this chapter will examine the pending decision facing the rabbinate: perish together with German Jewry or grab the life-line that was offered to many and choose to leave. Even when visas and all necessary permits were available, leaving Germany was still a difficult undertaking – both physically and emotionally. Narrating these experiences is not a new approach. Narrating these experiences from the viewpoint of the German rabbinate is. It has thus far received little attention and mainly Rabbi Dr. Leo Baeck had been the focus of research. In this chapter both rabbis and their spouses will provide a very personal insight into their experiences, feelings, failures and successes and the moral dilemma that surrounded their decision to leave.

\[2\] This is further discussed in the literature review.
The Modern Rabbinate

The post-emancipation years saw a fundamental transformation of the German rabbinate. Having been stripped of its former power through legislation the rabbinate gradually re-defined itself. It ascended to achieve unprecedented prominence and importance which peaked during the Nazi era and descended in 1938. Throughout history, the continental rabbi had always been a scholar, teacher and judge who based his rulings on the interpretation of Jewish religious texts and in that capacity served as an advisor to the community and its leadership. The Napoleonic code and Emancipation sought to separate religion and state by regulating all religious leadership and, as a consequence, the rabbinate was stripped of its legal powers. This left the rabbinate dismantled and largely irrelevant, but removed the last obstacle to equal civil rights for Jews. The rabbinate then declined from being a powerful, scholarly profession to a mere administrative function. This enforced surrender of power in the early 19th century sparked an inner-Jewish discourse on the task and position of the rabbi in modern Jewish society. In an attempt to find answers to the questions surrounding the rabbinic role, an essay competition was organised to elicit a comprehensive definition of a new role in the 1840s. But, even after repeated attempts over several years, no conclusive answer to that question could be found. At about the same time, renewed academic interest in Judaism led to the creation of the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ or the science of Judaism. Its goal was to provide a new direction in Jewish discourse, to create a new self-understanding and, ultimately, to modernize Judaism. This new academic engagement and scientific discourse was a fitting subject-matter for the rabbinate. Not only did it provide an intellectual challenge but the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ became the validation by which the rabbinate entered modernity and modern Jewish society. This examination of Judaism within a historical context, coupled with a religious and theological approach led to the creation of the first rabbinical seminary in Breslau in 1854. (From the time of its inception until its dissolution in 1938, a total of 728 students were instructed and 249 rabbis were ordained.) At this institution, a new generation of rabbis and teachers was trained in the theological and historical aspects of Judaism. With the same goal, two further institutions opened in Berlin: the ‘Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums’ representing Liberal Judaism and the ‘Hildesheimer Seminary’ for the training of modern, Orthodox rabbis. These institutions were also the foundation for an ever widening rabbinic network throughout the generations who attended them. With this background of education and esteem the rabbinate managed to reclaim its position of prominence and to increase ‘its inner religious strength and its outward importance.’

The rabbinate was just one of the professional choices for young, Jewish men and, as part of the occupational landscape in Germany, information about the rabbinate, its role and responsibilities was published by the German Employment Agency. One of these pamphlets

---

was written by Rabbi Dr. Malwin Warschauer in 1929. He belonged to this new generation of rabbis educated in the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’. Born in 1871 in Upper Silesia as the son of a timber merchant, he was a frail man, who had graduated from the ‘Hochschule’ in Berlin. He later became its director, preceding Leo Baeck in that position. As community rabbi in Berlin, he rose to great prominence at the Neue Synagoge where he served until 1938. In this pamphlet he authored for the Employment Agency, Warschauer outlines the educational requirements and professional challenges surrounding the path into the pulpit. In order to become a rabbi, students were obliged to study at one of the seminaries while simultaneously obtaining a university education in a related discipline, mainly in History, Philosophy, Semitic languages or Archaeology. All of these provided the tools for future academic examination of Judaism. The instructions at the seminaries also included Greek, Latin, Homiletics, Pedagogy, Pastoral Care and Social Work. Over time, these standards for rabbinic education were continuously being raised both by the rabbinate itself and by future employers, the communities. Hiring the rabbis they demanded a doctoral title as pre-requisite for employment. This reflected the aspirations the community and its membership.  

Many young men who chose the rabbinate as a profession continued the rabbinic family tradition. With that they came to inherit their father’s networks which they expanded with their

---

8 Malwin Warschauer ‘Der Jüdische Theologe’ in Merkblätter für Berufsberatung der Deutschen Zentralstelle für Berufsberatung der Akademiker (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn), 1929.
9 Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, ca. 1930. (Call Number: F 2359) and Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar Breslau, (Call Number: F 87984), both courtesy of LBI.
own connections and ties. Other rabbis like Warschauer who came from a variety of different backgrounds also became interested in this line of work. They were attracted to this profession for different reasons - personal devotion, academic interest, charitable and pastoral inclination or 'a calling'. Rabbinic work demanded a personal commitment to the Jewish faith, the Jewish people, the community and its individual members.

He must not only teach Judaism and provide leadership to the religious institutions of Judaism, he must personally reflect the values and the ways of the faith that he wishes to instil in others.\(^1\)

---

Academic ability, life experience, piety and social consciousness all merged together in this profession, combining 'heart and mind' and, in the word of Rabbi Warschauer, transforming it into 'a hard, truly holy function.'

On that basis, rabbis became an integral part of their congregations and with it part of the developments that affected German Jews. World War I had created a new set of circumstances and had drawn Jewish men into the fighting forces. This not only changed German Jewry but also the complexity of the rabbinate itself. More than thirty German rabbis joined the forces as Field Rabbis. Young rabbinic students also assisted the Jewish military chaplaincy and provided religious services and pastoral care. After World War I many of the soldiers would become rabbis themselves.

The experiences of the war forged close relationships and a tight network among the Field Rabbis as a sub-set to the existing rabbinic network. They cooperated and created Field Rabbi Conferences where they shared their experiences and exchanged ideas on how to deal with the plethora of problems and difficulties they were facing. These ranged from the organization of services, the supply of kosher food to the troops, war graves, anti-Semitism, venereal disease and its own relationship with rabbinic and Jewish organizations back home. These conferences strengthened the personal networks among the rabbis and created new ties.

---


Warschauer “Theologe”.


The experiences of war, contact with the vastly different Eastern European Jews and anti-Semitism in the ranks had a profound impact. All of the rabbis and in particular the Field Rabbis, who had experienced it first-hand, became involved in the public defence of Judaism, which was a natural continuation of their public function. Those rabbis who had served on the Home Front devoted their time and efforts to the families of the soldiers and provided care and comfort for them. As part of their wide network rabbis also became involved in organizations aimed at supporting the soldiers such as the ‘Reichsbund Jüdischer Frontsoldaten’, ‘Jüdischer Friedensbund’ and ‘Reichsverband für jüdische Kriegsgefangenenfürsorge’. This further increased their reach, importance and influence. This rising sense of self-awareness led to the rabbinate diverging from its traditional role. Their experiences and the events of the early 20th century made rabbis no longer the ‘obedient servants of the community’, but turned them into ‘the religious leaders of the Jewish people’.18

Before the war, rabbinic work had included a vast number of activities and causes outside of the pulpit with particular focus on charity and education. Especially charitable organizations benefited from rabbinic involvement as they helped with fund raising and increasing public awareness of the charitable causes. Their increasing engagement in these charities involved them in many different aspects of social work, which had become professionalized in the early 20th century. The care of the needy, a pressing problem in the aftermath of World War I, gave rise to organizations such as the ‘Zentrale Wohlfahrtsstelle’, the ‘Wohlfahrtslotterie’ and the ‘Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Bekämpfung der Tuberkulose unter Juden’.19 Many rabbis served on the boards of these charities and also headed up regional offices. One of these charities, the ‘Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Bekämpfung der Tuberkulose unter Juden’ attempted to halt the spread of tuberculosis among the Jewish population, focusing mainly on Eastern Europe. Founded in 1919 by Bertha Pappenheim in Frankfurt, this organization in particular attracted

19 The working group for the fight against tuberculosis among Jews.
rabbinic involvement.\textsuperscript{20} Table 1 is an example of how many of the rabbis were involved in this charitable cause. Twenty-six rabbis served on the board of this organisation and at times even included both fathers and sons. This organization, like many others, united the rabbis throughout the whole of Germany and its work also bridged all denominations and Jewish factions, worked together for this cause.\textsuperscript{21} In the context of network theory, it can be stated that these social organizations constituted ‘giant clusters’ of which the rabbis became a part. They acted as the ‘local cluster’ and had strong ties to these ‘giant clusters’. This further bolstered rabbinic power, influence and leadership.

Table 1 Rabbinic Membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Bekämpfung der Tuberkulose unter Juden*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altmann, Adolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt, Naftali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baeck, Leo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahn, Leo Jehuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlebach, Ephraim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David, Moritz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschelbacher, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschelbacher, Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliner, Julius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann, Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horovitz, Jakob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Benno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Ernst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Additionally, this table reveals a vast and intricate rabbinic network which had developed as a result of the new rabbinic tradition. Since the mid 19\textsuperscript{th} century any rabbis had become part of this network and had passed the traditions and network on to a new generation of rabbis, their sons. They then expanded it with their own connections made at university, the rabbinic seminaries and work. In addition, the entirety of the German rabbinate was closely interconnected at many different levels via personal connections, professional associations and also family relationships as marriages between rabbinic families were a common occurrence.\textsuperscript{22} These networks were further strengthened by the plethora of organizations in which rabbis were involved and included the three rabbinic organizations. The ‘Allgemeiner Deutscher Rabbinerverband’, for example, was the umbrella organization for the entire German rabbinate and was the central point of contact for all rabbis of every denomination. In addition, Orthodox


\textsuperscript{21} Orthodox rabbis Jakob Horovits, Leopold Lukas, Ephraim Carlebach are listed.

\textsuperscript{22} Natalie Baek nee Hamburger was the daughter of a rabbi. Natalie Charlotte Salzberger was the descendent of the author of the Shulchan Aruch.
and Liberal rabbis had their own organizations which served as the denominational forum for exchange. These organizations were the ‘Vereinigung Liberaler Rabbiner’ and the ‘Vereinigung gesetzestreuer Rabbiner’, all of which were ‘giant clusters’ within the German-Jewish network.\textsuperscript{23} 

Over and beyond the rabbinic affiliation, the ‘Reichvertretung der deutschen Juden’, ‘Reichsbund jüdischer Frontsoldaten’ and many other organizations further deepened the exchange and networking activities amongst rabbis. Even though these network connections extended beyond the German border to include movements such as the ‘World Union for Progressive Judaism’ and the ‘World Agudath Israel’, the information hub and centre of the network was located in Berlin.

Beyond their work for rabbinic organizations, rabbinic work had increasingly begun to include a focus on pastoral care encompassing charitable and social work. But rabbis were also involved in the organizations that funded them. In that respect, the Lodges of the ‘B’nai B’rith’ order, one of the most prominent and respected charitable organizations, co-opted all community rabbis as members.\textsuperscript{24} This organization was also a platform for intellectual exchange and as such, the local chapters of the lodges facilitated networking within the congregational elite. The rabbis participated in this exchange by regularly holding talks and serving as members of the board. But rabbis also assisted with this organization’s charitable work which collected and distributed funds to a number of welfare and social causes.

More detail into the wide range of charitable, social and educational involvement of the German rabbinate is provided in Table 2. The listed organizations are sub-divided into categories of Charitable and Social Work, World War I Veterans Work, Teachers’ Organizations, and Rabbinic Organizations. While this does not constitute an exhaustive list, it gives an overview of the largest, most influential and popular organizations, the ‘giant clusters’. It also reflects the intricate relationships within the rabbinate and how its members functioned as public representatives of Judaism in Germany at the centre of German-Jewish society.

Summarizing, it can be said that from its post-emancipation beginnings, in a reduced and often merely administrative function, the rabbinate had re-emerged as a powerful leadership force. A former Berlin rabbi aptly describes this new complex, public position and the demands on rabbis and the modern rabbinate. As such, the rabbis functioned as a node in the network of German Jewry and devoted themselves to its service.

\textit{He is a citizen of several worlds and not of one; his mind is open toward the world and his soul and mind become a battle ground of competing and conflicting ideas, some of them touching the very foundation of his beliefs. He is a person of culture. He has a mature appreciation of the creative in its many forms. He recognizes the masters and he respects them - even if he does not share their beliefs. The voices that ring down from the past and the voices of his contemporary restless world reach him and speak to him.\textsuperscript{25}}

\textsuperscript{23} Kathrin Nele Jansen and Michael Brocke, eds. \textit{Biographisches Handbuch der Rabbiner Teil 2, Die Rabbiner im Deutschen Reich 1871 - 1945} (München : Saur, 2009).

\textsuperscript{24} Georg Salzberger \textit{Leben und Lehre} (Frankfurt: Kramer, 1982), 60.

Outside Pressure and Inner Strength

Jews were an integral part of the German national and social system and were well represented in academia, the sciences, the arts and in many professions. An estimated 525,000 Jews were living in Germany at the onset of Nazism, of which about 300,000 did not practice their faith and were not affiliated with the Jewish community. Although this was the official statistic, it was estimated that 300,000 Jews had been missed out of this count and a document issued by the Ministry of Interior in 1935 identified an additional 750,000 mixed-race ‘Jewish Germans’. This raised the total estimate to around 1.5 million.26 As a result of the enactment of the ‘Rassegesetzte’ of 1935 many people were re-classified as ‘Jews’ of varying degrees. They had previously considered themselves to be Christian or ‘non-affiliated’ because their grandparents, parents or they themselves had severed ties to the Jewish faith. Now they were considered as “Mischlinge ersten Grade”, “zweiten Grades”, “Volljude”, “Halbjude” or “Vierteljude”.27 These laws brought about a forced re-affiliation with Jewish roots, a re-examination and re-definition of identity and ethnicity. Through these labels a forced ‘Ethno-Genesis’ took place and created a number of ethnic sub-groups within the general Jewish population, such as the ‘Non-Aryan Christians’. Many of these previously non-affiliated Jews became part of the Jewish community, the Jewish faith and the Jewish race. Increasing outside pressure and the newly ignited process of self-re-definition generated a new interest in and demand for Jewish publications. These aimed at counteracting the propaganda and attempted to instil pride in Judaism’s long tradition. Many books were published that explained Judaism, its practice, history and the historical relevance of the Jewish people. Between 1933 and 1939, around 30 publishing houses brought out between 1,000 and 1,200 books and pamphlets on Jewish topics with a total circulation of around three million copies.28 It was not only the established publishing houses that were involved but new ones were also created specifically with the purpose to counteract rising anti-Semitism with their publications and to satisfy the

---

27 Crossbreed first degree, second degree, full Jews, half Jews, quarter Jews.
public demand for Jewish literature. Many of these new books and pamphlets on Judaism were written by rabbis who were used to explaining the relevance of tradition in the modern era in their weekly sermons. All of these books attempted to provide answers to the pressing questions of identity, purpose and historical context and represented yet another attempt to encourage a positive self-image, pride and active participation in the Jewish faith. Through the Nuremberg laws, the individual sense of identity had increasingly been shattered and these writings offered a link to a ‘new’ or rather ‘old’ identity. For decades, synagogues had largely remained empty but were now experiencing an unprecedented increase in attendances. They were full to overflowing hours before the services had even started. People did not start attending synagogue as a result of a sudden increase in personal piety, but rather out of a need for social interaction among their peers within a protected environment that these houses of worship provided. Religion was an expression of belonging to an ethnicity and was also a vehicle for social cohesion and communal bonding, which was of particular importance during the Nazi era. Religion and ritual, as Malinowsky and Geetz pointed out give human beings confidence and remove uncertainties about life. As Jews began to be increasingly excluded from public life, the Jewish communities became the centre of Jewish life and the synagogues were the only available venue for Jewish public gatherings. The synagogue became more important and occupied a central role in Jewish life with a new and significant symbolism. Rabbi Nussbaum, one of the prominent young rabbis in Berlin, reflected upon the increasing importance of the synagogue. He observes how the synagogues were increasingly becoming a public gathering place where Jews could find a certain level of support in an otherwise hostile environment. He also notes that information difficult to obtain elsewhere was disseminated there.

Our services were overcrowded. Often we had standing room only, with children and teenagers sitting on the steps leading to the pulpit, and it was up to us, the few rabbis still there at that time, to give these bewildered masses of Jews at least a small measure of hope and encouragement, of direction and self-respect and, quite often, some factual information which could no longer be conveyed by any other media of communication.

In 1938 in Düsseldorf, Eschelbacher observes a similar situation. The son of a prominent rabbi, he had initially trained as a lawyer but turned to the rabbinate in 1906. He succeeded Leo Baeck in the Düsseldorf pulpit and rose to prominence in the community. In his memoirs he also remarked on the changing role of the synagogue in Jewish life which was increasingly becoming one of a social exchange.

33 Max Eschelbacher, Der zehnte November 1938 (Essen: Klartext, 1998), 67.
(...) this community was in a state of shock, and as always in times of terror, turned to the synagogue where alone Jews could find a semblance of sanity and stability. No longer just a place to worship a distant god, the temple became the intimate haven, an extraterritorial asylum, even if only for the spirit.  

But these re-energized congregations that were now coming together in the grand houses of worship posed a new challenge for rabbis. The increased numbers and changed makeup of their audiences altered the demands placed on them. Heinrich Lemle, the Frankfurt youth rabbi considered these changes to be a great opportunity both for Judaism and the rabbis.

It was a great chance of the synagogue to once again become house of the community, the place of learning and source of strength. It was incumbent upon the rabbi to work in this spirit and in the service of the synagogue.

Emil Fackenheim, originally from Halle was a rabbinic student at the 'Hochschule' in Berlin in 1938 where he was the student of many prominent rabbis. In his memoirs he reflects on the role of the rabbinate which he felt rose in prominence under these circumstances.

Jews would flock to synagogues on Shabbat to hear sermons as events of the week, given not only by well-established rabbis but also by young ones, now rising to meteoric fame: Joachim Prinz, Max Nussbaum, and Manfred Swarsensky.

Fig. 5
Rabbis Dr. Max Nussbaum and Dr. Eschelbacher with his family 1935.

36 Emil L. Fackenheim, An Epitaph for German Judaism: from Halle to Jerusalem (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007), 44.
The sermons were the central part of the service and were its main attraction. Under Nazi rule, the importance of the sermon increased and it gained new momentum. As Jews flocked to services to hear the rabbis speak, these sermons were to provide answers as worshippers sought comfort and encouragement. Traditionally, sermons communicated the meaning of the weekly Torah portion and they also served as an educational tool to bridge religion and growing secularization. The sermon was the opportunity for the rabbi to publicly delineate the traditional teachings and to show their relevance, even in an assimilated world. The oppressive circumstances of segregation, persecution, anti-Semitism, violence and hate now were to be explained and rabbis placed them within a historical context.

As was the case everywhere in Germany, the services of Dortmund rabbi Ernst Appel were also filled to overflowing in the years of the Nazi regime. The importance of his sermons to the local audience and to the rabbi himself was remarked upon by his wife Martha. She was aware that the community needed to hear an uplifting message and states that, ‘The entire community would participate in the service, to draw new hope and courage.’ Nussbaum confirms Appell’s observation and further states that the rabbi’s efforts relating to the sermons were largely intended to lift the spirits of the audience and to counter hateful Nazi propaganda.

(…) it was a source of deep satisfaction to me that sometimes a sermon seemed capable of giving a sense of perspective and a measure of élan vital to those who were on the brink of being engulfed by the night of despair and hopelessness. It was not enough for a sermon to be ‘uplifting’ in the usual sense, which would have meant to escape into the lofty realm of the spirit and make your audience forget reality. On the contrary: a people that was constantly told (…) that it was lower than the scum of the earth, had to be reassured from the pulpit that it was not only not bad, but good, better, the best, in order to keep up its self-respect and its sense of values.

---

As Nussbaum writes, the persecution and abuses had a massive impact on peoples’ self-awareness and questioned belonging and identity. As a means of counteracting the destabilizing impact of these events, the public sphere of the pulpit provided the appropriate platform. The historian Jakob Boaz acknowledges the importance of the communal gatherings in the synagogue and other community initiatives:

(...) But the threat posed by (the verbal abuse) was immediately perceived and was the impetus behind community-wide efforts to combat it. - from the rabbi administering “collective therapy” from the pulpit to cabaret artists (...) from the stage (...). 41

![Rabbi Dr. Max Dienemann and Preacher Max Abraham.](Fig. 7)

Thus, the sermon increasingly gained importance and relevance. Traditionally, it had remained neutral and avoided any critical references to political events or circumstances. In fact, rabbis were explicitly forbidden to politicize the pulpit. When Rabbi Warschauer, who was an ardent Zionist, took on the position as community rabbi in Berlin in 1900, he had to sign an agreement with the community where he promised to abstain from making any reference to his Zionist ideology either in or out of the pulpit. 43 Reference to Zionist ideology was seen as undermining German-Jewish identity and patriotic sentiments thus countering assimilation. 44 Expressing a political opinion, apart from Zionism had been tolerated but the challenging circumstances changed this. During the Nazi era, rabbis had to refrain from making any reference to the political situation and they were forbidden to criticize Nazi policy or officials. To insure adherence, representatives of the Gestapo were present at all of the services where they took notes of everything that was said, effectively acting as censors. Expressing any kind of personal opinion or voicing criticism from the pulpit under these circumstances would have severe consequences, as Max Dienemann of the Offenbach community experienced. He had served the community since 1918 and had overtly criticized the city’s police chief in one of his sermons. He was subsequently arrested and sent to the Osthofen concentration camp.

took place as early as 1934. In Spandau near Berlin, Max Abraham was an outspoken critic of the regime and was sent to Buchenwald for his expression of opinion in the same year as Dienemann. He was a Jewish preacher, a rabbinic candidate, not yet been ordained. After his release, from concentration camp he attempted to send a warning to others by publishing his experiences in a book.

As any critical expression made in the pulpit could result in arrest and deportation, rabbis began to disguise their messages within the religious context of their speeches. A shared common heritage with their audience made a common cultural and linguistic understanding of these messages possible. These hidden messages effectively eluded the comprehension of the uninitiated official minders. Rabbis were certain that their congregations would ‘relate to the allegories and understand the deeper meaning behind the sermon’. The difficulty in creating these sermons was in formulating the messages to their audiences in such a way that their Jewish audiences would understand them. Martha Appel, the wife of the Dortmund rabbi, continuously supported her husband in creating and editing these sermons. She describes the agonizing task of trying to convey the intended message whilst at the same time circumventing censorship.

\[\text{He had to find words to describe our current situation not directly, but would unambiguously transmit to his audience what he wanted to tell them.}\]

All rabbis had to avoid any inflammatory remarks or direct references as these could not only endanger themselves and the community officials. Conscious of not providing the Gestapo with an excuse to shut down services or arrest board members, sermons were continuously examined and re-examined as Martha Appel continues.

\[\text{(...) my husband and I attentively checked his sermons. Word for word we read them out loud and pondered if this or that sentence would rouse the disapproval of the Gestapo officer present in all services.}\]

With regret she talks about the messages that her husband wanted to convey to his audience but was forced to omit.

\[\text{There was so much, my husband would have liked to say to his community on these Holy Days, what he could not. (...) My husband subjected himself (to this difficult task) in particular because he did not want to give the Nazis with his sermons the smallest pretext for banning his services and to arrest the community board.}\]

The sermons that emerged after intense self-censorship were from a theological or rhetorical point of view probably not very remarkable. Nussbaum confirms this in self-critical observation but adds that sermons were

\[\text{(...) full of innuendoes and rendered in a kind of spiritual code language - they were highly meaningful to the Jewish audiences (...).}\]

48 Appel, “No Title”, 238.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
The stigmatization of Jews was rampant and was expressed in various ways such as street signs and propaganda films such as ‘Der Ewige Jude’. In this climate of hatred, rabbis attempted to convey their messages of support and hope. Georg Salzberger, who had been the community rabbi of Frankfurt since 1910, also attempted to counteract this propaganda in his sermon. He relays the story of his sermon for the High Holy Days in 1938 and speaks of how he attempted to turn the negative stigmatization of Jews in a positive light. His topic was the meaning of the name ‘Israel’, the compulsory first name that every man had to bear, which had a further destabilizing effect on the individual sense of identity which Salzberger tried to counteract.

At the end of the Day of Atonement (1938) I preached about the name ‘Israel’ which every Jewish man had to add to his civic name in his passport and all official submissions. I spoke with pride of this name, which means ‘fighter for God’ and many of my listeners shed tears as if they sensed what the next weeks would bring over them.

Another vehicle for concealing a message of defiance was the Book of Isaiah, which was constantly referenced. Many sermons drew a parallel between the prophet and the current suffering of the Jewish people. (This interesting concept and the many sermons around the comparison between persecution, destruction and the annihilation of the Jewish people have undergone in-depth examination and theological interpretation elsewhere, for example in the book by Steven T. Katz).

---
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By dispensing support and hope to their congregants, the rabbis had not only risen to prominence within the Jewish community, but themselves felt that they had been elevated to an important leadership position. Nussbaum reflects on this time in his life and admits that:

*Never at any other period in my professional life did I feel so strongly that my ministry or even a single sermon could be, and had to be, of such vital, practical value as it had to be then, for one of the most important arenas in our fight for survival was the synagogue, the spiritual rallying point for the shocked and bewildered Jewish community.*

Working in the pulpit and delivering sermons with hidden messages were acts of defiance and resistance and thus a dangerous undertaking. Yet all of this was part of the changing role of the rabbinate during the Nazi Era.

**Shifting Rabbinic Duties**

A shift in rabbinic work began with the ‘Machtergreifung’ in 1933 with changed duties and new public roles. Already in February of 1933 ritual slaughter was outlawed and subsequently kosher supervision was no longer required. In particular in rural communities, this duty had been an important part of the rabbinate. Changes also occurred in the educational responsibility community rabbis held. The majority of Jewish children attended German schools where they, in accordance with the state school curriculum, received their religious instruction through their local rabbis. In 1937 this school instruction which included Jewish religious and Hebrew lessons was abolished through Nazi legislation. Subsequently, rabbis were no longer required or permitted to teach in the public school system. At the same time, their representative positions on the local school boards were also rescinded. In their role as public school teachers rabbis had not only been members of the teaching staff but also of organizations such as the ‘Deutscher Reichsverband Jüdischer Religionslehrer’. With the expulsion of Jewish students from the German school system, all Jews were excluded from teaching and rabbis were removed from the school commissions such as the ‘Preussische Volksschulverwaltung’. This exclusion had begun as early as 1934. At the same time, the board membership at municipal welfare organizations and inter-denominational charities also ceased. This elimination of duties and responsibilities changed the focus of rabbinic work and curtailed the extensive rabbinic network which also included secular and inter-denominational work. With the exclusion of pupils from the school system, the future of the younger generation of German Jews was significantly impeded. Not only were children unable to complete their education but with the exclusion from university were severely limited in their occupational choices. For the young Jews this was a difficult situation to which they were finding it increasingly difficult to adjust to. Their plans and hopes for their future lives - and those of their parents - could no longer be realized and impacted the sense of identity. Universities were inaccessible and many professions were
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closed off completely. Under such circumstances, the younger generation sought the security of the community in order to help them find their place in life. With their exclusion from society, they became the focus of the community. Here they received training as part of the ‘Umschulung’ scheme which provided an opportunity to learn a trade and was seen as a successful foundation for a future life abroad. This focus also increasingly involved the rabbinate. With the goal of a life abroad, it was deemed important that sufficient theoretical and practical religious knowledge be instilled in these young people. It was to provide them with psychological and emotional stability for the remaining time in Germany and later abroad. Rabbis organized religious classes for these young people and their efforts re-invigorated the institution of the ‘Youth Rabbinate’. This part of the rabbinate originated in the late 19th century in an attempt to create a closer bond between young people and the Jewish faith. At that time, some rabbis had objected to this development as they believed that it represented a rift within the profession and would split the community along a generational divide. Under the Nazi regime, this division in the rabbinate became necessary because of the increasingly heavy demands on the rabbis additionally focusing on the younger generation with its divergent responsibilities. These youth rabbis, like all other rabbis, attempted to counter the increasing outside pressures, the exclusion and the continuous messages of hate. They saw their role as helping to instil a sense of pride in their young charges. Youth rabbis, who were chosen because they were similar in age to their students, were additionally able to create a bond of trust with them. At the same time, their rabbinic authority gained them the respect of the parents. Many times youth rabbis acted as intermediaries between parents and children and attempted to calm fears about the future while providing advice about career choices, emigration and adolescent problems. All of these aspects had exacerbated the already difficult home situation of many of them. The young rabbis attempted to alleviate these pressures and saw their roles as an assistance to and the extension of the parental duties.

Our youth had a destiny, had experienced the rule of god in their lives. (...) where friction in the debate about the teachings and the law arose, the youth rabbi was asked for advice. In long personal talks between two many times could help be provided.

The two youth rabbis Lemle of Frankfurt and Van Der Zyl of Berlin were thus teachers and confidants and their duties went beyond religious instruction. They held special youth services and also accompanied the young people on outings and trips. Lemle remembers his role and particular responsibility.

My task was in particular to guide the education of the youth towards the younger generation finding their way to self-consciousness, towards a change in professions,

Ulrich Steuer, „Der Jugendrabbiner“ *Der Morgen* 2, 1936, 63.
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towards integration into community and history, and in many cases in preparation for Palestine.\footnote{Lemle, “No Title”, 2.}

Their work counteracted the destabilizing effects that Nazi propaganda had on self-perception and attempted to strengthen the young people’s identity by affirming a positive connotation of ethnicity. As mentioned before, the general occupational choices had become rare and thus the appeal of the rabbinate as a profession increased. Through their interaction with the youth rabbis the rabbinate was also seen as a meaningful vocation. This was a career with attributes that could no longer be found amongst the remaining occupational choices available to Jews. Rabbis had economic stability as they were employed by the financially solid Jewish communities. Another aspect was the prospect of a public and a leadership role. Thus, in the 1930’s young men flocked to attend the ‘Hochschule’ and their education was embarked upon with a sense of urgency. In the many Jewish communities throughout Germany these future rabbis were needed to provide religious authority and human support.\footnote{Karpf, Ernst. “Anlernwerkstätte Und „Berufsumschichtung“.” Frankfurt 1933-1945. September 3, 2009. (accessed August 6, 2014). http://www.ffmhist.de/ffm33-45/bitmap/jm_anlernwerkstatt01_01_k.jpg and http://www.ffmhist.de/ffm33-45/bitmap/jm_anlernwerkstatt01_04_k.jpg.} At the ‘Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums’ in Berlin the students were made aware of this special task and responsibility that their positions would involve in the future. They were thus outfitted with the necessary tools to acquire the respect of all segments of their future congregations, not just of the Liberal members which this institution traditionally served. The ‘Hochschule’ prided itself in issuing a modern rabbinic diploma to the rabbis it ordained. But in light of the new role as leader for both the liberal and the orthodox segments of their

\footnote{Hermon, Seelsorger, 74.}
communities this modern diploma was changed back to a traditional ‘Smicha’, or rabbinic ordination document. With it a new authority was endowed upon the students which included judging on Halachic issues. This new responsibility led to a certain hesitation amongst the students. They felt that the skills stated on their diploma and Smicha exceeded their real talents. But at that particular time, the rabbinic leadership role demanded more strength, courage and human greatness than a young, newly graduated rabbi actually possessed.

The young rabbinic candidates who had not yet been ordained were trained in these attributes. During their enrolment at the ‘Hochschule’ students were actively involved with aid and rescue organizations whilst others were directly assisting the needy. This social work effectively established the young rabbinic students within the network. All of them were aware that communities desperately needed them in these difficult times and were eagerly waiting for them.

As a direct result of the increasingly restrictive laws and regulations, many of the traditional public and prestigious duties of the rabbinate had ceased. These had been a major part of the importance and the self-perception of the older generation of rabbis. Eschelbacher, a representative of this generation recognizes his own decline in importance after 1938 with a sense of resignation. He feels that his position was being dismantled, it had eroded and his self-perception, his identity was suffering.

For a long time already I did not have to travel much and since the pogrom not at all. Talks had become sparse. As long as they took place anywhere in Germany, I received invitations in abundance. (...) But now there were no more talks. For years there were no more students at the secondary schools. Subsequently I did not have to hold anymore lessons there. (...) That leaves a rabbi only with giving what he can, which is more Hebrew than religious lessons. At the end, I only gave four hours weekly (...) Stripped of its former duties such as inter-denominational work and high-school teaching, the rabbinate now shifted its focus inwards - toward the community and helping their congregants. Nazi legislation had continuously undermined Jewish life and had dismantled Jewish charitable organizations. Jews could no longer turn to the state for financial support, education or employment assistance. Vital organizations such as the ‘Jüdischer Frauenbund’ and the ‘B’nai B’rith’ which had supported impoverished Jews were dissolved, their property was confiscated and their assets liquidated. The Jewish communities needed to accommodate these circumstances and changed from being a religious congregation with a strong social emphasis into a charitable organization providing support for its increasingly impoverished membership. To accommodate these arising needs, a number of organizational bodies were established and included charitable organisations, employment and training agencies, emigration advice bodies and school committees. Within this newly created organizational structure, rabbis maintained...
their role of advisor, guide and supporter with main emphasis on pastoral care. They were and remained part of this changing network within German Jewry while maintaining their rabbinic network. Within this context, Rabbi Manfred Swarsensky, one of the young rabbis who had risen to fame in Berlin, estimated that already by 1936, these social and charitable duties made up around three-quarters of the rabbinic work load.\(^7\)

The shift in duties ignited by increased pressure through Nazi legislation and exclusion in turn accelerated the rise in prominence of the rabbinate. This led to increased public attention on this institution and throughout the 1930s and much was written about it. Many articles about rabbinic work appeared, written either by journalists or the rabbis themselves, which were published in Jewish newspapers such as the ‘Israelitisches Familienblatt’, ‘Der Morgen’ or ‘Gemeindeblatt der Israelitischen Gemeinde Frankfurt am Main’.\(^7\) These articles acknowledged that rabbinic work had shifted from an academic and religious context to a predominately pastoral and social role. Its function, leadership role and rise in importance ignited also a public exchange that focused on the assessment of all these changes. This public exchange started in the spring of 1938 at the Berlin ‘Lehrhaus’ with a discussion where Rabbis Swarsensky and Maybaum publicly debated their views on the shifting tasks and responsibilities of their positions.\(^8\)
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Rabbis Dr. Ignaz Maybaum and Dr. Manfred Swarsensky.\(^8\)

Rabbis experienced a change in their roles and professions. With it, they provided hope and encouragement from the pulpit and took on personal responsibility for their congregants. The rabbinate had increased its relevance and renewed its prominence in the inner-Jewish context. At the same time, within German society the rabbinate’s outward importance had waned. This also meant that the rabbinate itself was not immune to persecution.

---

\(^7\) Ibid., 57.


\(^8\) Public Discussion held at Berlin Lehrhaus between Rabbi Dr. Ignaz Maybaum and Rabbi Dr. Manfred Swarsensky on the tasks and duties of the rabbinate.

Concentration Camp

As representatives of the Jewish communities, officials and rabbis were inextricably drawn into the unfolding events. The anti-Jewish regulations together with the increasing harassment of the Jewish population perpetrated by the government agents had become more radical and brutal. The April boycott of Jewish businesses in 1933 was only the prelude. By 1935, anti-Semitic aggression had increased prior to the passing of the ‘Rassegesetze’ during that same year. It culminated in further violence during the summer of 1938.\textsuperscript{82} In June of that year, the first arrests and deportations took place in what was later called the ‘Juni Aktion’. The official, bureaucratic term was ‘\textit{Aktion Arbeitsscheu Reich}’ and was designed to target men who were allegedly shirking work. This regulation initially affected an estimated 1,500 to 2,600 men, many of whom were Jews. Included were men with previous convictions, mentally handicapped men, Sinti and Roma as well as the homeless - all of whom were deemed anti-Social elements, so-called ‘\textit{Asoziale}’.\textsuperscript{83} They were arrested and deported to concentration camps but were eligible for release if they could prove that they were willing and able to emigrate.\textsuperscript{84} This was the precursor of similar actions that were to follow. Assaults geared towards the elimination of Jews from the Reich increased in their intensity and brutality.\textsuperscript{85}

Four months after the ‘Juni-Aktion’, in October 1938, legal wrangling between Germany and Poland over citizenship issues escalated and rendered all Polish citizens on German territory ‘stateless’.\textsuperscript{86} This eventually culminated in the ‘\textit{Polen-Aktion}'. Executed on a much larger scale, this initiative attempted to deport all Polish subjects - without any advance notice. The number of Polish Jews deported is estimated to be between 17,000 and 18,000 with the first train of deportees arriving at the border on October 27, 1938. Ordered to leave German territory, the deportees were refused entry into Poland and were subsequently stranded in ‘no man’s land’ between these two countries. Some still in their nightgowns had been taken from their homes at night and children were often times deported right out of school with nothing but their schoolbooks.\textsuperscript{87} A number of professors from the ‘\textit{Hochschule}’ in Berlin were also affected.\textsuperscript{88}

Two of their students, Emil Fackenheim and Karl Rautenberg, had heard of the impending deportation of their professor Moses Sister who was a Polish citizen. In order to help him, they rushed to his home and packed a suitcase with clothes and met him at the train station.\textsuperscript{89}

The ‘\textit{Reichsvertretung}’ also tried to provide for these deportees and contacted Rabbi Kurt Kassell, the community Rabbi in Frankfurt/Oder. He can be considered the ‘\textit{local cluster}’ in the network. This small town located near the Polish border was in close proximity to ‘no man’s

\textsuperscript{83} For more details on the Juni-Aktion see Christian Faludi.
\textsuperscript{84} Wolfgang Benz, \textit{Flucht aus Deutschland, zum Exil im 20. Jahrhundert} (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch-Verlag, 2001), 55.
\textsuperscript{85} Faludi, ‘Juni-Aktion’ 1938, 9.
\textsuperscript{87} Eschelbacher, \textit{November}, 35.
\textsuperscript{88} For biographical sketch of Dr. Erwin Zimet see Jansen and Brocke, \textit{Handbuch}, 2009, Entry 2696. For more information on Dr. Abraham Joshua Heschel see Susannah Heschel, ed. Abraham Joshua Heschel: \textit{Essential Writings} (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2011).
\textsuperscript{89} Fackenheim, \textit{Epitaph}, 53.
land’ so those who had been stranded there could be easily reached. A young rabbi of 26, Kassell travelled to the town of Beuthen where the border crossing to Poland was located. He attempted to gain access to the deportees but was unsuccessful. His request to leave German territory in order to assist was refused and he was subsequently arrested by the Gestapo. After a lengthy interrogation, he received a severe warning and was ordered to return to Frankfurt/Oder. He had been unable to help.90

The ‘Juni-Aktion’ was followed by the ‘Polen-Aktion’ which was followed by the November pogrom shortly after. This was the turning point in the persecution of German Jews and the increased intensity of persecution could be felt. Berlin Rabbi Warschauer noted that just before the November pogrom a strong sense of impending doom could be felt. He admits however that no one could have foreseen the disaster that was to follow.91

In Paris, vom Rath, a diplomatic envoy, was assassinated by Hershel Grynspan in an act of revenge for the deportation of Grynspan’s family during the ‘Polen Aktion’. The assassination in turn provided the perfect pretext for the ‘spontaneous eruption of the people’s wrath’ - the deliberate destruction of German synagogues and businesses that was later given the trivial misnomer of ‘Reichskristallnacht’.92 As a result of this event, more than 100 Jews were killed, 7,500 Jewish businesses were plundered and destroyed, 101 synagogues were ransacked and burnt and a further 75 were severely damaged.93 All of this destruction took place with the support of the general population. Large crowds of bystanders witnessed the arson and destruction with laughter, applause and encouragement.94 In his book ‘Kristallnacht’ historian Alan Steinweiss disputes the contention that the vast majority of the German population disapproved of the November pogrom, a view that is supported by the accounts of the rabbis and this study.95 These also confirm that the November pogrom was not just restricted to the destruction of businesses and synagogues. The homes of prominent community representatives including those of the rabbis’ were also invaded, ransacked, plundered and vandalized by the Gestapo who also terrorized the families. The destruction of the synagogues as the symbol of ancestry impacted the individual’s identification process and the ransacking of the homes destroyed with it inherited items, personal and material possessions which were all important means of personal identification.96

In Frankfurt, the Gestapo were waiting for Rabbi Salzberger to return home. He had attempted to avoid arrest by hiding with relatives nearby. In the mean time, in order to amuse them, the Gestapo forced his daughters to throw all the books belonging to his extensive and
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valuable library out into the street, much to the dismay of their terrified and intimidated mother.\textsuperscript{97} In Düsseldorf, a similar picture emerged. There the Gestapo had unleashed the same destructive forces.\textsuperscript{98} After being arrested, Max Eschelbacher was led past his home only to witness the destruction that lay before him. His typewriter, files and correspondence had all been piled up in the street.

(…) my books and files, also my precious private correspondence of forty years, all was thrown through the double windows into the street and created a high pile there. I had seen its beginning in the night On Thursday, the people took papers and books, but during the course of the morning others came and lit the whole thing. It burned for many hours. I am glad because of it. Better burnt than in strangers' hands.\textsuperscript{99}

In Essen, the homes of the two community rabbis, Hahn and Auerbach, were also ransacked. The Gestapo gave both families ten minutes to pack their belongings into a small suitcase and then proceeded to set fire to the house.\textsuperscript{100} In Offenbach, Mally Dienemann, the wife of community rabbi Max Dienemann was left to face the Gestapo on her own. Her husband had been absent for the day. Her neighbour courageously intervened and sheltered her whilst her home was being raided.\textsuperscript{101} Many rabbis were also physically abused. Eschelbacher's Düsseldorf colleague Siegfried Klein and his wife who had two small children were physically assaulted by the visiting Gestapo officers and thrown down the stairs.\textsuperscript{102} Rabbi Fuchs of Chemnitz was so severely beaten that he had to be admitted to the police hospital and Rabbi Bohrer of Gailingen was beaten to death during the same night.\textsuperscript{103}

In the days following the November pogrom, around 30,000 Jews from all walks of life were arrested and transported to Dachau, Sachsenhausen and Buchenwald concentration camps or held at police stations.\textsuperscript{104} During the time leading up to these deportations, the Jewish communities had been forced to comply with Nazi regulations by creating lists of community members. These included their current addresses and other personal information. These lists had to be updated on a weekly basis and were then delivered to the Gestapo offices.\textsuperscript{105} In larger congregations such as Berlin, these administrative tasks were still being handled by staff whilst in the smaller congregations this was part of the duties of the rabbi who was also the main point of contact for the Gestapo. After the November pogrom these lists were used to identify the Jews who were to be arrested. Rabbi Kassell realized too late that he had unwittingly supported the deportations.
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Then ordered the interrogating officer (...) that I provide him with a list of all Jews in the administrative district. The purpose of this list proved itself through the events of the ‘Kristallnacht’ as grave.\(^{106}\)
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Prisoners in Sachsenhausen Concentration Camp.\(^ {107}\)

After being arrested himself, he was once again confronted with the list that he had created - on the desk of the arresting Gestapo officer.

*Actually, at an interrogation at the Gestapo after the November pogrom, I saw my list lay on the desk of the (officer).*\(^ {108}\)

Kassel was not the only rabbi to be arrested. With few exceptions the entire German rabbinate was arrested. Spared were Vogelstein of Breslau and Warschauer of Berlin who had both been away for the day.\(^ {109}\) Others were spared deportation because of their age, but this regulation regarding the cut-off age for deportation differed widely throughout Germany. In Offenbach and Magdeburg, rabbis Dienemann, 63, and Wilde, 61, were both deported despite their advanced age. In Düsseldorf, an age limit prevented Eschelbacher’s deportation who was 58 years old at the time. Instead of being deported, he was arrested and sent to the local prison.\(^ {110}\) There, he maintained his rabbinic role and ministered to his fellow prisoners, his former congregants. He conducted daily services, prayed Kaddish and held Shiurim with his cellmates, keen to provide support and encouragement.\(^ {111}\)

*I did much to help my comrades through this time. (…) It was most important for me that no one should die in prison.*\(^ {112}\)


\(^{107}\) Prisoners in the concentration camp at Sachsenhausen, Germany, 19. December, 1938; Heinrich Hoffman Collection, 242-HLB-3609-25, National Archives and Records Administration ARC 540175.

\(^{108}\) Ibid, 6.


\(^{110}\) Eschelbacher, November, 51.

\(^{111}\) Mourning Prayer and Study Sessions.

\(^{112}\) Eschelbacher, November, 43 - 44.
The men who had been arrested and incarcerated in police stations were eventually transferred to collection points such as the local synagogue from where further transport to larger assembly places took place. In Frankfurt this collection point was the ‘Festhalle’ the local festival venue. There, the Gestapo severely abused the arrested men – both physically and mentally regardless of the victim’s position, status or age.

All the arrested men were questioned, harassed, humiliated and threatened and eventually put onto trains bound for the concentration camps. Salzberger also endured this maltreatment and soon came to understand that any resistance or appeals for humanity would be futile. Asked by the SS-man in charge if he had anything to complain about, he answered with a resounding ‘no’.114

At that moment, my sense told me, if you report to this man, what happened to you and others, your life is not safe anymore.115

After arrival at the concentration camp, prisoners endured an initial roll call and were asked to state their professions. Regardless of whether they answered this question or remained silent, they would be given a beating.116

We were asked what we had been and every answer or silence was answered with a blow by the rifle butt, so that finally nearly all were bleeding. Particularly badly abused was rabbi Ochs from Gleiwitz.117

Thus, rabbis became the focus of rage, hate and abuse by the SS. As religious leaders and spiritual guides, they were perceived to be the personification and tangible symbol of Judaism. In prison they were exposed, vulnerable and unprotected so they were singled out for
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particularly harsh, painful and humiliating treatment.\textsuperscript{118} Forced to endure ridicule and physical abuse, they behaved with great serenity.\textsuperscript{119} Their steadfast endurance inadvertently made them a role model by virtue of their behaviour and attitude and served as a guiding example to others. Whilst verbal abuse was simply hurtful, the physical abuse was dangerous and even deadly. Detailed accounts of torture and abuse in concentration camp are well documented. The statements made by fellow inmates below confirm the special attention that rabbis received.

\textit{At the arrival at Dachau, rabbis were treated particularly badly. The rabbis Dr. Baerwald and Dr. Finkelscherer from Munich were terribly beaten. But worst of all was suffered the orthodox rabbi Dr. Ehrentreu (Munich), who had a black beard. Each hair was torn out individually.\textsuperscript{120}}

\textit{A rabbi Cohn was particularly badly treated and constantly insulted and taunted.\textsuperscript{121}}

\textit{Among the arrested were mostly rabbis, who, when they mentioned their profession, were treated particularly harshly.\textsuperscript{122}}

\textit{In Sachsenhausen, a rabbi from Bremen was ordered by an SS-man to recite a Jewish saying in Hebrew and then to translate it. When he replied 'He does not sleep or slumber the god of Israel', he was beaten and forced to hold a sermon on the Talmud.\textsuperscript{123}}

Despite the abuse, rabbis attempted to maintain some form of religious life under these atrocious conditions. Holding services, which was a central part of their work, was forbidden in all the concentration camps except for Buchenwald.\textsuperscript{124} But Dienemann, who was incarcerated there, refused to hold any services. He said that ‘At the place of disgrace, one is not allowed to name the name of god’.\textsuperscript{125} As services also had an important social function, communal prayer established a sense of identity and belonging and strengthened both the individual and his resilience. By deciding not to hold any such services, Dienemann effectively removed this important social activity but, acutely aware of his leadership role and his duty to provide support, he found other ways of establishing community cohesion and creating a sense of belonging. Mally Dienemann recalls her husband’s experiences. This quote indicates that in concentration camp, an ethnic sub-group formed, that of the former Offenbacher community members with their former rabbi as leader in its midst.

\textit{According to his wish, all of the arrested from Offenbach called each other by their first name, and with this brotherly ‘you’ they became a community of unhappy individuals, who could carry their plight a bit lighter in the feeling of brotherliness.\textsuperscript{126}}
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People addressing each other by their first names, which is a sign of great closeness between individuals, was an unusual occurrence in German society. This familiar form of address enabled hierarchical levelling and created a sense of community. It was based on the awareness of a common fate and mutual support and thus tied the individuals together. In prison, at the assembly points and also in the concentration camp, a strong sense of community grew among the arrested. Helping each other to survive was everyone’s aim and the general mood among the prisoners was perceived to be an ‘excellent one’. This strong sense of communal responsibility and camaraderie contributed to individual survival. The rabbis did not only provide comfort but also received the support of their colleagues, acquaintances and friends, former students and community members. Mally Dienemann comments on her husband's fate.

For my husband it was lucky that he could sleep next to his friend, Dr. Guggenheim, and that so many young members of his community were with him in the camp. They took on what they could, massaged his back after hour-long standing.

In their memoirs, rabbis continuously refer to the experience of helping and of being helped. They stood at the centre of all that remained of their former communities and in concentration camp, the stronger prisoners attempted to protect and encourage the weaker ones, helping each other to survive. This mutual care forged a support system and strengthened interpersonal bonds, in particular among those men who had known each other previously. Rabbi Wilde of Magdeburg describes how he cared for one of his former congregants whilst at Buchenwald.

129 Dienemann, Aufzeichnungen, 32.
(...) Mr. A. a man of my congregation had also gone mad. (...) “Yes, yes, Mr. A. (...) come, here is room for you next to me - he was a very small man - lie down, we can have a rest of two or three hours: how shall we otherwise endure to be shot!” (...) He lay silent next to me till the morning. I saw him some weeks later, he was sane again.130

Besides the mutual support, the hope for a speedy release also upheld morale. Fackenheim, who was also incarcerated in Buchenwald, confirms this sentiment. ‘Of course, we had gallows humour. Jokes were a morale builder, but true morale existed only in one hope, nonexistent for some: release.’131 Wilde confirms that hope of release made life in the concentration camp more bearable. ‘We had only one topic of conversation at Buchenwald: When would we be released.’132 Upon his release, he summarized what kept him alive.

Three things helped me: The comradeship with many people, the attachment of pupils of mine and of members of my congregation and the will to fulfil the word of an English Christian Clergyman: The Jew has always survived, to stand at the grave of his persecutor.133

The number of rabbis who eventually immigrated to Britain were deported after the November pogrom are detailed in Table 3. With Berlin as the largest of the Jewish communities, most of its rabbis were deported to either Sachsenhausen in the Province of Brandenburg or Buchenwald near the town of Weimar, both in proximity to Berlin. Rabbis from towns and cities in the western part of Germany were imprisoned at Dachau in Bavaria, whilst several others remained in police custody. The table does not list all of the deported German rabbis. However, the names on the list illustrate who was held at which concentration camp and that rabbis met and cooperated there. The interpersonal connections making up the rabbinic network are highlighted here.

Table 3 Deportation of Rabbis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rabbis in Concentration Camp</th>
<th>Dachau</th>
<th>Sachsenhausen</th>
<th>Buchenwald</th>
<th>Police Custody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bamberger, Moses</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Moritz</td>
<td>Ansbach, Jonas</td>
<td>Eschelbach, Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohn, Julius</td>
<td>Fackenheim, Emil**</td>
<td>Baneth, Ludwig</td>
<td>Van der Zyl, Werner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunner, Josef Hirsch</td>
<td>Holzer, Paul</td>
<td>Bienheim, Erich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrentreu, Jonah Ernst</td>
<td>Jospe, Alfred*</td>
<td>Dienenm, Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Ernst</td>
<td>Loewenstamm, Arthur</td>
<td>Lemle, Heinrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koehler, Max</td>
<td>Rautenberg, Karl**</td>
<td>Ochs, Samuel Moses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzberger, Georg</td>
<td>Rosenthal, Karl*</td>
<td>Pfingst, Gustav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawady, Konrad**</td>
<td>Wilde, Georg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schreiber, Hermann</td>
<td>Swarsensky, Manfred*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepp, Leo*</td>
<td>Weiss, Theodor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* to United States or other destination

**rabbinic students

Table Source: Michael Brooks (ed.), Biographisches Handbuch der Rabbiner, Volume 2, Die Rabbiner im Deutschen Reich 1871-1945 (München: Saur, 2009)
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Release

While their husbands faced an uncertain fate in the concentration camps, the rabbis’ wives were left to fend for themselves. Despite their dire situation, women had to carry on with their daily lives and provide for their families and at the same time, attempted to get their husbands released. This new situation was a major challenge for many women as it forced them to play an active role within the family structure. Taking on this responsibility was an unusual position for women to hold. However, compared to other women, the wives of rabbis were traditionally more active alongside their husbands. A rabbi’s wife had to actively support her husband’s public work and was involved in community initiatives and in a wide range of social and charitable causes. For other women who were rooted in the domestic sphere this proved more of a challenge. In their husband’s absence all women had to now take charge as head of the household and had to organize visas and affidavits, guarantees and passages. The woman’s role in the family and society had previously been pre-determined by stereotypes, social roles, preconceived ideas on women’s competence and a male orientated culture. In distress these women had to leave their traditional roles, take on unfamiliar responsibilities and become the head of the households. This interesting aspect on the changing role of women during the Nazi regime has recently gained much attention. This topic at the intersection of Holocaust and Jewish studies and Gender studies uncovered new insights. Ofer and Weitzmann and Marion Kaplan pioneered this approach and identified these changing roles forced upon women by the changing circumstances under Nazi rule.

After the November pogrom, some wives broke all family conventions by taking over the decision making when it became clear that their husband’s reluctance to flee would result in even worse horrors.

Apart from Marion Kaplan, this interaction and the consequences for the Jewish families are not widely researched and this aspect is only marginally part of this study. The diaries of rabbi’s wives provide some insight into this issue with one such source being the diary of Martha Appel. In it she confirms the general reluctance to flee and her record details a discussion among friends where the wives and husbands clearly took opposing sides on this issue. Women were more ready to leave Germany and to start afresh elsewhere, whereas their husbands were reluctant to do so. They were more attached to Germany, to their jobs and their obligations towards their country than their spouses. However the deportation of their husbands and other men in their social circle brought urgency to the issue of emigration as danger was imminent.

---
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After their husbands had gone, many wives were informed of their husband’s whereabouts in letters. This prompted them to immediately begin working towards obtaining their release. Whilst release was arbitrary, it could be accelerated by supplying paperwork attesting to an impending emigration. The prospect of getting their husbands released from concentration camp prompted many women to actively make use of their husbands’ extensive networks. They sought contact with other women whose husbands had also been deported and began to make contact with organizations and people of influence both in Germany and abroad. These contacts eventually supplied the necessary documents. In Magdeburg, Mrs. Wilde made good use of her husband’s network and was able to establish contact with the Chief Rabbi’s office in London. She sent a telegram asking for the necessary papers. Wilde later remembers that the Chief Rabbi’s office complied with her request.

*When I was in concentration camp, my wife sent a telegram to the Chief Rabbi in London Dr. Hertz. He acted immediately and saved our lives.*

Rabbi Van Der Zyl of Berlin had travelled to Hannover in an attempt to free his brother who was in prison there. Unable to help, he was also arrested. As soon as his wife found out about his arrest, she re-activated her husband’s contacts in England.

*I immediately contacted the Honourable Lily Montagu in London (...). As a representative of the World Union for Progressive Judaism (...) Miss Montagu knew him. (...) if Miss Montagu could procure a visa stating (he) would be able to find work in England (...) it was possible he would be released.*

Lady Lily Montagu of the Liberal Movement provided the necessary paperwork for Van Der Zyl. She also became involved in the release of youth rabbi Lemle of Frankfurt, who was incarcerated at Buchenwald. (Lady Lily Montagu and her involvement with the refugees are discussed in detail in the next chapter). Other approaches for obtaining release were sought by Georg Salzberger’s wife Nannylotte. She also activated her husband’s network and had managed to arrange a rabbinic position for her husband in the United States. This was an important pre-requisite for a much coveted ‘*non-quota visa*’. These types of visas bypassed the restrictive fixed quotas and protracted visa allocation process for Jewish emigration. With this ‘*non-quote-visa*’ the Salzberger family was effectively able to bypass any waiting list. With the promise of a position in the USA, it was then possible for her to secure a transit visa to Britain. In his memoirs, Salzberger acknowledges the efforts of his wife in securing his release and in rescuing the family.

*From the moment that we (...) had said our good-byes (...) she worked continuously to gain my release. Back then one could obtain release from concentration camp by submitting papers for impending emigration. She called relatives in Switzerland, sent cables to London and the United States to other relatives, and my former students and friends, to arrange for our emigration.*
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Emigration became a matter of the utmost urgency. Several rabbis whose grown-up children were already living abroad had been able to secure permits already before the November pogrom but most had not made use of them. Anticipating worsening conditions in Germany, Warschauer’s children continuously urged him to leave and ‘energetically’ pursued his permit for England. Nearly a month before the November pogrom, Seligmann had obtained a permit for England but because he did not make use of it, it was rendered invalid and the document had expired. His daughter who was in England approached Lily Montagu who as a close personal friend of her father and managed to get her parent’s permit renewed. Once the papers attesting to impending emigration were obtained, these had to be forwarded to the German authorities in an attempt to secure the prisoner’s release. This did not always produce instant results and women were eagerly awaiting the return of their husbands. Mrs Salzberger remembers this anxious period of waiting.

*From the other women at the (English) consulate, whose husbands had been arrested earlier, I had heard that within a week of submitting the application for release, the men would return. The week ended (…) my husband had not returned. I was desperate (…)*[^148]

While the women were busy organizing the paperwork to emigrate from Germany, their husbands, who were still in concentration camps, were hoping for an early release. The guards played on these hopes by announcing that their release was imminent and then dashing all hopes. Eventually imprisonment did come to an end and their names were called. However, in a final act of humiliation, the prisoners were sent for a medical examination where the visible signs of physical abuse would be inspected. Wilde remembers this consultation:

---

[^144]: Photograph of Rabbi Dr. Caesar Seligmann, ca. 1940, (Call No. F. 95) and Rabbi Dr. Malwin Warschauer Malwin Warschauer, 1935; Malwin Warschauer Collection; AR 794; Box No. 1; Folder No. 5; both courtesy of LBI.
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At first I didn't understand the reason why, but then I saw: The doctor looked only for traces of ill-treatment. Men with fresh wounds would not be released.\textsuperscript{149}

Wilde's own injuries were almost completely healed but other prisoners with recent or visible wounds had to undergo treatment and remained imprisoned. Rabbi Ochs who had been severely abused remained and was treated for his injuries. \textit{With (...) Rabbi Dr. Ochs, a sunlamp was used to accelerate scar removal}.

\textsuperscript{150} Before their final release, the prisoners had their confiscated clothing and personal property returned to them. Salzberger noted that his property had been stolen and he was missing his gold watch and a fountain pen.\textsuperscript{151} Once they were in civilian clothes and were ready for departure, all prisoners were summoned and given a last admonition before their release. At Buchenwald, the SS-Oberscharführer addressed the prisoners:

\textit{Now we are letting you go to your home, to prepare for your emigration. But if you say a single word about the concentration camp, we will take you back and you will never get out again. Don't imagine that if you are living abroad, you can speak as you like: we have our people everywhere and they will make you silent – forever.}\textsuperscript{152}

This speech was a stern warning and, combined with their experiences of the recent weeks, it was clear that emigration was now a matter of the utmost urgency. Upon their return to their home towns, the released prisoners were obliged to report regularly to the local Gestapo office. Here, they were asked once again about their emigration plans and the date of departure and had to sign a form stating that ‘voluntary’ emigration would take place within six weeks to two months, in Wilde’s case before April 15, 1939.\textsuperscript{153}

In the meantime, a great deal had changed at home in the wake of the November pogrom. Over the previous years, Jews from the smaller rural communities had moved to the urban centres seeking anonymity and hoping for less anti-Semitism. This migration within Germany led to a consolidation of the remaining communities which subsequently blurred the lines between the liberal and orthodox sections of the community. Rabbis now had to assume responsibility for the entire community. There had never been a unified representation of German Jewry and, historically, the Jewish communities were decentralized organizations which represented diverse attitudes and ideas, goals and perspectives so they lacked homogeneity and unity. The mounting outside pressures began to forge all the different factions such as Eastern European Jews, Zionists, cultured representatives of German Jewish society, orthodox and reform Jews into one cohesive entity. The shared \textit{‘Jewish fate’} reduced the gulf between orthodox, liberal and unaffiliated Jews.\textsuperscript{154} It also blurred the differentiation between social classes.\textsuperscript{155} All the different factions that had been divided by ideological differences for a hundred years now came together again into one single community and all the separatist
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orthodox communities began to rejoin the ‘Einheitsgemeinde’. In cities such as Cologne, this happened already in 1936 and the same union was forged in Frankfurt after the November pogrom.156 The senior Frankfurt rabbi, Seligmann, remembers this reunification which took place in the kitchen of his ransacked home.

And, miracle, in our old kitchen met harmoniously with the board and officials of the main community, the board and officials of the separatist Samson-Raphael-Hirsch community. What a century of well-being of German Judaism had not accomplished, the unification of German Jewry, a command Hitler's or his organs had accomplished.157

The centuries-old animosity between the two communities in Frankfurt had finally come to an end. Forced by outside pressure to cooperate, they came together into one unified community. The destroyed synagogues could no longer be used for services so temporary synagogues were set up in the community centres. These makeshift synagogues also brought with them a different kind of service as people began to return to the old traditions and simpler form of worship.

Out of necessity it (service) was again the way it had been for generations in small rural communities. No more talk of organ and choir. All by itself simple communal singing re-established itself. Our robes had been burned. So we officiated in long Tallis (prayer shawl). The pulpit had disappeared, the room was small. So the sermon ended and in its place entered a casual and personal explanation of the writings in simple form. The German language disappeared from the service.158

All of the changes that entered religious expression of Judaism in Germany were obliterated by the destruction wreaked on German Jews. All of the proud outward signs of ‘Sittlichkeit und Bildung’ had disappeared.

Moral Dilemma

The November pogrom and the threat of further incarceration removed any moral reservations that existed about emigrating. Only very few people resigned themselves to their fate and clung to the illusion that this ‘horror would eventually come to an end’.159 This is observed by the Jewish teacher Weinberg, who was unable to leave Germany in time.

As for the Jews left in post-Crystal Night Germany there was nobody anymore who had any hesitation about leaving. Never mind tearing up old roots or striking new ones; it was a mad scramble. But emigration was available for only a few; the rest were caught.160

The Jewish organizations and communities supported and encouraged in particular young people to emigrate. As a result, more than half of those Jews who left Germany were under the age of forty.161 In the efforts around the organization of their emigration, rabbis became an important point of contact. They were not only consulted for pastoral and spiritual care, but increasingly in an administrative capacity. In order to apply for a visa, most consulates required a character reference written by members of the clergy as supporting documentation. As a
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result, visa applicants lined up at the rabbis’ offices, including that of Leo Baeck. Subsequently rabbis had to extend their working hours in order to accommodate them as Nussbaum remembers.  

My study used to look like a travel office in those years. (…) my visiting hours (…) were largely taken up by throngs of people in need of (…) a letter of recommendation. Sometimes there were so many that the living room would not hold them, they spilled over into the hall, on the stairs, or even all the way down the street to the corner, waiting for their interview after which I would give them the required reference.  

Rabbis issued these references even if they realized that a person's emigration plans would not be successful. Nussbaum reflects on the process and concludes that these references were  

(…) a formality at best and often a futile effort because in many cases the rumour was false and there were no visas, or so few that only those applicants waiting virtually on the doorsteps of the consulate had a chance.  

Whilst these references may have been futile, the mere act of writing them provided support and gave rabbis a sense of being actively involved in a rescue mission. This provided them with a raison d’être.  

Never before or since have had I felt that so many lives have touched mine as in those years, during these afternoons that stretched into the evenings and even into the nights.  

Deciding to emigrate created an inner conflict and so the decision of whether to stay or to leave became a moral dilemma. The question of emigration and whether or not it was necessary was a difficult decision to make for any individual. It was not easy to leave aging parents and family members behind and this aspect alone actually thwarted many peoples’ emigration plans. The decision to emigrate was made even more difficult by the uncertainty of a future life abroad. This was additionally complicated by the ambivalent position of Jewish organizations and of the rabbinate itself. Ultimately, there was a choice of two options: stay in Germany and endure an unknown fate or immigrate to a foreign country and endure an unknown fate there. The inevitable loss of one’s financial and social status abroad further complicated this decision and halted many emigration attempts. All of the difficulties that the refugees had to deal with led to a disturbing development. In 1935 around 10,000 Jews actually returned to Germany from exile. The graph below illustrates the migration figures for the years 1933 until 1938. It shows how emigration correlates to the circumstances in Germany and falls to its lowest figure in 1935. In that year anti-Jewish agitation lessened in the run-up to the Olympic Games in Berlin the following year. Another dip occurred in 1937 followed by a sharp increase in 1938 in the wake of the ‘Aktionen’ previously covered.

---
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As people tried to make the difficult decision of whether or not to emigrate, rabbis once again played a central role in the information dissemination process. Peoples’ personal networks had begun to falter as many had moved away from their home communities in order to seek refuge in the larger urban centres. There they expected to find less anti-Semitism. Whilst this move to the cities was a protective measure, it also led to increased isolation and made it more difficult to obtain essential information. The process of informed decision-making became increasingly more difficult. Within the communities, this trend was attempted to counteract by providing relevant information from the pulpit. In Frankfurt for example rabbis exchanged their views on emigration in a number of subsequent sermons, in an attempt to assist the congregants in the decision-making process.

*Once there extended a pulpit discussion for many weeks between us colleagues, then rabbis of the Frankfurt communities, on the necessity or non-necessity of emigration.*  

Despite the difficult political situation and the bleak outlook for the future, it is interesting to note that rabbinic emigration did not increase before the November pogrom. The rabbis felt a strong sense of duty and moral reservations forced most of them to remain in their positions and postpone their departure. Leaving, or deserting the community went against their self-perception. The notion of ‘Pflichtgefühl’ or loyalty, their calling and their respectable reputation made this decision increasingly difficult.

---
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Fig. 15
Interior of Frankfurt Synagogue.  


Fig. 16
Rabbis Dr. Fritz Pinkuss and Dr. Hermann Ostfeld / Zwi Hermon.

Rabbi Fritz Pinkuss, community rabbi in Heidelberg since 1930, realized the seriousness of the situation early on. He subsequently became actively involved in helping those members of his congregation who were willing to leave. He also felt an acute need to emigrate himself but was torn between saving himself and taking care of his congregation. His memoirs reflect a concern for his reputation. He resents the idea of being seen as a rabbi who had deserted his community. However, he did eventually leave Heidelberg in 1936.

> There were many reasons which did not permit me to leave the country immediately (...) the other was a moral reason. I rejected the notion of entering into History of German Judaism as a rabbi, who deserted his community. Regardless, I waited for the day to arrive, when I had helped all who wanted to listen to me, at least those in my district.\(^{172}\)

Leaving the congregation behind to face an uncertain future became an increasingly difficult dilemma. Rabbis were aware that upon their own emigration their positions would remain vacant and their communities would subsequently be left without a spiritual or pastoral leader. Recently ordained Rabbi Ostfeld holding his first position in Göttingen notes upon the consequences his emigration would have.

> My impending departure was also (...) a warning. Around this time no one thought anymore that a new rabbi would be appointed. It was clear the communities were in dissolution.\(^{173}\)

The rabbis felt that they had a responsibility and Warschauer observes in his memoirs that, as senior rabbi, he felt he had a particular duty to both his congregation and his fellow rabbis, particularly the younger ones. His responsibility he felt was to

> (...) guide them through the storm. I have to be an example to my younger colleagues. A captain never leaves his sinking ship.\(^{174}\)

These exact words were also echoed by Baeck and Salzberger and many others and justified remaining in Germany rather than trying to emigrate oneself.

Making the decision to emigrate was easier for those rabbis without an active role in the communities. Unlike their younger colleagues, the retired rabbis were no longer caught up in careers and taking care of the communities and their own young families. Additionally their personal and professional responsibilities had been reduced. They faced a different moral dilemma and the circumstances surrounding their departure were no less complicated. Warschauer and Seligmann, who had already retired had their adult children abroad. They were now concerned about the financial aspects of migration and how their pensions would be paid abroad once they left Germany. Warschauer was made to retire in February 1938 to make way for the younger rabbis. The community had agreed to provide him with an annual pension of 24,000 RM.\(^{175}\) In Frankfurt, Seligmann faced strong opposition when he announced his plans to emigrate. One community representative tried to convince him to remain and even threatened

---


to withdraw the pension which had been agreed upon. Realizing the dire circumstances and the uncertainty of the situation, Seligmann could not be convinced to remain.

_Who will give you the guarantee that the community will persevere and will be able to continue paying my pension?_  

Although it was a relief to retire abroad close to the grown-up children it was still very difficult to leave the leadership position and its associated responsibilities of pastoral and spiritual care as Warschauer observes with mixed feelings. With his departure and that of other rabbis another part of the network of particular importance in time of distress was effectively eliminated.

_I do not leave gladly, not with light or even happy heart; it is hard for me to part from office, community and home, even harder to leave you behind, without my help. But I believe to be doing my duty. I owe it to my children to extricate myself from danger._

Even after their experiences in the concentration camps, rabbis were still inclined to remain with their communities and did not want to desert their positions. Van Der Zyl, who had been released from prison continued his work and insisted on staying with his community. His colleague Brasch who also remained in Berlin with the community describes very clearly the rabbinic dilemma and foresees the only alternative to emigration.

_Was it not my duty, as a rabbi, today on to the very end, to extend spiritual help and give support to those who needed it desperately - till I became a victim myself?_

When the much-coveted visa eventually arrived, Brasch notes how it brought both relief and distress.

_It was my lifeline. And yet I did not grasp it happily. What would happen to my beloved parents who (...) I would leave behind (...)?_

---

<Fig. 17>

Rabbis Dr. Rudolph Brasch and Dr. Werner Van Der Zyl.

---
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As rabbis communicated their impending departure to the congregation this was accompanied with great apprehension and a sense of anxiety. Rabbi Ostfeld remembers the lack of criticism and all the good wishes he received upon announcing his emigration. He particularly remembers the absence of disappointment or resentment amongst his congregation. They showed him great benevolence and love and were genuinely saddened by his departure.\textsuperscript{182} However, the general public reaction was mixed.

It did not go unnoticed that it was easier for rabbis than for the general population to leave Germany. Many rabbis had been able to obtain special emigration status and in many cases received ‘non-quota’ visas. These were available if a rabbi could obtain a position abroad for which no qualified local person could be found. These visas circumvented the waiting lists all other Jews were subject to. The congregants who received the news of the rabbi’s departure were not always able to share their rabbi’s sense of relief. Weinberg, a Jewish teacher and rabbinic student, states: ‘(...) rabbis, who made use of their special standing outside the immigration quota, filled us with sadness and indignation.’\textsuperscript{183} He was unable to obtain a visa and was eventually deported to Bergen-Belsen.

In addition to covert criticism accusations against rabbis who had ‘deserted’ their communities started to increase. It was perceived that the rabbi’s duty was with his community and in this case any concern for the rabbi’s personal safety was discounted. An anonymous eye-witness statement confirms this. ‘The released Rabbi Dr. Schönberger did, instead of caring for his community, go to Luxemburg.’\textsuperscript{184} Leo Baeck also scolded those rabbis who had sought refuge. He considered them to have disappeared without any urgency to do so. ‘Failed has unfortunately a large number of rabbis, in particular the formerly steadfast ones. Some simply disappeared without need.’\textsuperscript{185} Yet Baeck did praise those rabbis who remained with their communities even after their release from concentration camp. They effectively upheld and maintained the decreasing network.

\textit{But some did prove themselves, among the younger I mention in particular Swarsensky, of the older, Dienemann, who after difficult weeks returned to his place and when his community ceased to exist, left upright.}\textsuperscript{186}

Many of the rabbis who sought to leave Germany turned to Leo Baeck, the head of German Jewry for advice, guidance and answers to their personal and professional dilemma. He was not only their former teacher but also a colleague and friend. While not actively encouraging emigration, he did not discourage anyone.

\textit{Towards the end of the 1930s began also his students and staff to leave and Baeck did nothing to prevent them from doing so. He thanked them for their help and wished them all the best.}\textsuperscript{187}

Baeck, who was a strong advocate of youth emigration, also supported the younger rabbis in their plans to leave. He was their counsellor and advisor; he provided not only encouragement
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but also pragmatic assistance. Baeck used his extensive network abroad and in Germany to support these plans. This has been expressed by Leonard Baker in his biography on Baeck and in the memoirs and recollections of refugee rabbis. As such, he actively helped many rabbis to obtain new positions abroad and was particularly successful in Britain. In 1938, he assisted Brasch to obtain a position at the Liberal Jewish Synagogue in London and recommended Van Der Zyl for the position of rabbi at the Kitchener Transit camp. Baeck also arranged for Van Der Zyl to accompany a children’s transport in order for him to get to England.

Baeck also helped in the decision-making process and absolved rabbis of any guilt associated with their own decisions. He relieved them of their duties and responsibilities and urged them to go abroad. Brasch recalls his last conversation with Baeck. ‘You must accept the call (…) It will enable you to be of much greater service - from the outside!’ Pinkuss called Baeck before his departure to Brazil and remembers their conversation.

> On the eve of my departure, I spoke to Leo Baeck and told him: ‘I cannot resign myself to the divestiture of German Jewry, and I want to create something new, I want to rebuild. I dream, that I will succeed to find something new somewhere.’ He replied: ‘You will certainly succeed, Fritz. If I were your age, then I would have the courage and would do the same, but I have to remain with my people.’

For Baeck leaving Germany was not an option. He had made up his mind to stay as he felt that his primary responsibility was to his position, not only as a rabbi and head of the ‘Reichsvertretung’, but as representative of the entire community of Jews in Germany. Even after receiving repeated offers of positions in England and the US, he still refused to leave. Several rabbis recall similar conversations with him. His response to Rabbi Edgar in London to an offer of a visa was: ‘It is impossible. I will be the last Jew out of Germany.’ To Swarsensky he said: ‘(…) as long as there is a single Jew left alive in Germany, my place is here with them.’ Pinkuss remembers Baeck saying ‘I have to stay with my people’. Joseph Carlebach of Hamburg felt the same sense of responsibility; he too had been offered positions abroad as well as a guarantee for the UK. He declined these and remained in Germany but was able to put several of his children on a Kindertransport.

The moral dilemma of leaving was not resolved with the departure from Germany. Rabbi Ostfeld describes how he was continuously confronted with remorse and guilt.

> Leaving people behind who had trusted me and needed me in order to continue their lives, people who I loved, who had taken me into their families and had acted brotherly and sisterly towards me, (…) Why had I not stayed with my community and my synagogue and perished with her?
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He continues how even after years in exile, sadness, shame and reproach about his decision to emigrate still weighed heavily on his conscience.

Deep sadness stayed with me. The incomprehensible has through the years not become any more comprehensible. The shame over saving my own life and abandoning my community, the Jews in Göttingen who trusted me and who were endlessly good to me, is inextinguishable.  

Leaving

The decision to leave Germany had not been an easy one to make. But the process of emigration and going into exile was arduous. Exile, as has previously been mentioned, is the exit from one location without having another one to go to. It is an in-between state and a suspension between two places. What had been home for centuries was no longer a stable, welcoming environment. At the same time, the place of exile was for most an unknown place full of uncertainty. Once the decision to leave had been made, the emigrants entered this in-between state, and this condition was exacerbated by the difficult and complicated process of physically getting there.

For all Jews, regardless of their position, prominence or prosperity, the process of leaving Germany was more or less identical. Emigration depended primarily on the ability to obtain a passport. This was the main document required to leave Germany and to enter another country. Many essential documents had to accompany a passport application and included a wide range of certificates and reports. These documents needed to be issued by the emigration and the customs offices, the tax office and the police. A vast number of government offices needed to be visited where these documents could be requested. This was a complicated, elaborate, difficult and arduous process, as Mrs. Dienemann remembers. It was a process drawn-out over months involving the various government offices in Offenbach.

(...) the many papers one needed for emigration. And while the Gestapo was in a hurry, the tax office had so much time and so many questions and without the certificate from the finance- and taxation office, one would not receive the certificate of non-objection, and without the certificate of non-objection, one did not receive a passport and without a passport the luggage could not be inspected.

In neighbouring Frankfurt, the Seligmann family was attempting to obtain their necessary papers. Rabbi Seligmann observed how this process was made more difficult by uncooperative and abusive clerks and officials in the various German offices. They and all other applicants had to endure 'the psychological abuse at the offices manned by Nazis.' This process was made more protracted and complicated if real estate was involved. Rabbi Salzberger owned a house in Frankfurt and for him and his family the passport application process was made even more complicated and difficult as different offices pursued their own financial interests in this property and disputed among themselves the house's future ownership. The Salzberger's home on
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Eschersheimer Landstrasse became the subject of bitter rivalry between the Gestapo who wanted the house for themselves and the tax office who objected to this. The rivalry between these offices continued at the expense of processing the applicants' documents speedily.\footnote{Salzberger, Leben, 125-126.} This dispute was never actually resolved and extended the emigration process for the Salzberger family by three months.

Further complicating the emigration process was the issue of moving or dissolving an extensive household. Moving a household abroad was marred by bureaucracy. Special approvals and export certificates were required for all household items. These needed to be applied for with extensive packing lists, which served as the basis for the permits. Many rabbis owned extensive libraries. Whilst many of their books had been destroyed in the November pogrom, they wanted to take the remnants abroad. For this each individual book had to be noted on the packing list. Salzberger was very proud of his library which included many books that he had inherited from his father who had also been a rabbi. But the futility of the endeavour of trying to include the library as part of the removal items became clear upon departure. All that remained of Salzberger’s former library and of the books he had salvaged were simply confiscated.

\begin{quote}
Of my ca. 3,000 books, among them many valuable, inherited folios, I was only left with eight, and these only of religious nature.\footnote{Salzberger, Leben, 127.}
\end{quote}

The process of exporting any property was complicated as every item required an export certificate. Thus, many Jews wanting to leave Germany were forced to sell what was deemed non-essential property. Finding buyers for these items of property proved difficult as placing advertisements in newspapers for household clearance was not allowed and no general public interested could be generated. Subsequently, these items were sold for a fraction of the real value. With bitterness, Eschelbacher recalls the situation surrounding the sale of his property:

\begin{quote}
For many months newspapers could not accept advertisements by Jews. A Jew, who wanted to sell his house or furniture, could because of it not place an advertisement. There would have been demand for his possessions, but it had been forcefully suppressed. There was nothing left to do than to spread word of mouth or offer the possessions to a second-hand dealer. He paid a ridiculous price.\footnote{Eschelbacher, November, 73.}
\end{quote}

Each item sold represented one step further away from Germany, away from one’s home and into an unknown exile. Seligmann and his wife also let go of their possessions, with each one symbolically representing a link with Germany. ‘Negotiations with the furniture remover, sale of all superfluous, which was hard to let go, filled the last two to three months of our stay in Germany’.\footnote{Seligmann, Erinnerungen, 191-192.} The voluntary or involuntary loss of material possessions is one of the steps of entering exile and constitutes yet another threat to self-perception and with it an individual’s identity.\footnote{Levine, Class, 12-13.}

Once all the documents and necessary permits had been obtained, the arrangements for the removal of the remaining personal property were made. All the necessary papers and permits
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had to be presented before the transport, also called the ‘Lift’ was sent off for Britain or for another destination. The containers transporting the property were once again inspected by customs, sealed and the move was then paid for. This property was then left in Germany in good faith while the owners prepared for their voyage into exile. On this trip, emigrants were only allowed to take 10 Reichsmark and bare essentials which usually included some items of clothing, underwear and daily utensils, all of which had to fit into one suitcase.\textsuperscript{207} The property was left with the removers in Germany with the hope and expectation to be reunited with their property once in England. In his memoirs, Salzberger accusingly talks about their removers: After the family had left Germany he too expected his property to arrive and writes ‘everything else should have been forwarded to us by the remover Delliehausen’.\textsuperscript{208} He continues to recall with bitterness the whole process of property removal and how he tried to obtain information about his belongings. His sense of helplessness and powerlessness is clear but no answers were forthcoming.

\textit{All other possessions including concert grand piano, rugs and paintings, which after official inspection were packed into two large boxes and deposited with the remover, was probably after our de-naturalization been auctioned off, no one could or would tell us where and when.}\textsuperscript{209}

The advertisement in Fig. 18 announces a three-day auction of Jewish property in Frankfurt. The items to be sold ranged from Empire, Baroque and Chippendale furniture and a Steinway grand piano to a garden hose and a washbasin. The two photographs show a public auction held in Lörrach soon after the Jews of this town had been deported. These images illustrate the popularity of these public auctions of Jewish property.\textsuperscript{210}

The entire process of arranging emigration and finally leaving Germany took around three months. Eschelbacher reflects on this time and summarizes the humiliating process that he had to go through.

\textit{We were legally and illegally robbed by the officials and cleaned out, and by private people we were cheated and robbed. There was nothing one could do against it; it was the general fate of all Jews in Germany.}\textsuperscript{211}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Seligmann, \textit{Erinnerungen}, 192.
\item Ibid.
\item Salzberger, \textit{Leben}, 127.
\item Götz Aly and Frank Bajohr have extensively researched this process of ‘Arisierung’ and brought these auctions into the public eye. Franziska Becker, \textit{Gewalt und Gedächtnis: Erinnerungen an die nationalsozialistische Verfolgung einer jüdischen Landgemeinde} (Göttingen: Schmerse, 1994).
\item Eschelbacher, \textit{November}, 77.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
On the journey into exile, either by train or plane the last obstacles had to be overcome. Most trains passed through the border town of Emmerich where the final inspection by the SS took place. Here passports were checked and luggage was searched. Dienemann’s passport did not contain the obligatory ‘J’ for ‘Jew’ and they were forced to break their journey for one night in order to obtain the appropriate stamp at the local police station. After that night, nothing remained of the 10 Reichsmark they had been allowed to take with them as they had to pay for their accommodation. When they finally resumed their journey the next day and crossed into Holland, the contrast between both countries became obvious to them.

The Dutch border came, our bitterness over everything that had been perpetrated against us, was much greater than the feeling of happiness to have exited the country of torment and shame (…) when we (in Holland) once again heard a polite please and thank you, that one did not heard in Germany anymore, then awoke in us a sudden and intense feeling of gratitude and happiness. A prayer of thanks rose to the heavens for our release and a petition prayer for all who were still in Germany.

Eschelbacher and his wife also travelled by train and left Germany on the evening of January 29, 1939. He describes this experience as having been devoid of any feeling of relief or anticipation of the future. His feelings were simply those of hopelessness, mixed with anxiety and sadness.
We had been told that whoever crosses the border initially feels only a sense of unutterable relief. We did not feel that way (...) We could not sense anything but the certainty of having lost our home and everything that we had loved, that there was no return and nothing in front of us but a dark future.\textsuperscript{215}

Salzberger describes feeling overwhelmed on his departure by the awareness that he and his family had been rescued and that this feeling drowned out all other feelings.\textsuperscript{216} Warschauer, who left with his wife, reflected on their departure and realized that his rescue from Germany had ultimately strengthened his belief in God.

\textit{Looking back at the tragic events, that led us out of pressure, adversity, and danger into a new, certainly not an easy existence, I can now after more than a year only repeat what I had at that time always articulated. I thank God who led us this way, whose rescuing hand I never in my life felt as distinctly as in these days of fate.}\textsuperscript{217}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Passport stamped with 'J' for Jew and Advertisement for Travel via Emmerich.\textsuperscript{218}}
\end{figure}
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This chapter has shown the changing nature of the rabbinate in Germany up until the eve of departure into exile in 1938. Using individual narratives it explored this development from 1840 arguing that since emancipation the rabbinate had been able to reinvent itself. Stripped of its former powers, it found new meaning in the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ where rabbinic education together with academic endeavours and doctoral degrees from German universities resulted in a new interpretation of this old profession. World War I marked a turning point in the self-perception of the rabbinate. With its countless Jewish casualties the war also ignited a resurgence of anti-Semitism which in turn impacted on Jewish attitudes. A self-confident, assertive yet consolidative Jewish population was increasingly being represented by an equally assertive rabbinate whose members rose to the position of leader and defender. Rabbis provided support and cared for their communities. Further disaster befell German Jewry with the ‘Machtergreifung’ in 1933. The community reacted by coming together and welcoming into its midst people who had not previously been associated with the Jewish community but who were now considered Jews by law.

With the exclusion of Jews from German society and the banning of Jewish participation in official events, the synagogues became a venue for social, cultural and intellectual activities. The synagogues served as a safe haven where it was possible to gain reprieve from persecution. Within this context, the nature of services changed as attendances increased. The sermon, once merely regarded as an educational device to impart an ancient religious message, now became the main part of the service. Its focus was to provide comfort, support and advice and to strengthen the community. Thus, the pulpit provided the platform for exchanging views on emigration and the role of the rabbinate itself with its new tasks and responsibilities. Outside the pulpit, rabbis were called on for council on individual circumstances where rabbis acted as advisors and mediated family conflicts, in particular, when the bleak outlook for the future created inter-generational conflict. However, the increasing importance of the synagogue and of the rabbinate did not signify an increase in religious attitudes or observance. The increased attendance rather attested to the need for Jews who shared a common destiny to come together as a community.

The re-definition of just who was regarded as Jewish affected many people who now belonged to a new ethnicity. The re-entry and subsequent attachment to a Jewish context led to much reflection and intellectual exchanges about identity. Rabbis helped this process along with their publications which were a vehicle for a new association with the historical and religious context of the Jewish people.\(^{219}\) With the rabbinate in its midst, the institutional networks of the Jewish community also contributed to the stabilization of the individual’s identity. From the pulpit, the rabbis raised awareness of the cultural traditions, rituals and religion and also assisted with the emotional and psychological needs connected with belonging - needs that came to the fore during the exclusion and segregation of Jews from the general population and

---

their subsequent persecution. Religion and its expression provided an assurance that events could be understood within a historical context and so help to explain the suffering and injustice. Community cohesion, a fundamental coping mechanism, was an automatic reaction forged through identical experiences of persecution and suffering. This community cohesion was preserved even in prison, at assembly points and in concentration camps, where bonding through common suffering among individual community members and their rabbis contributed to mutual survival.

In the concentration camps, groups of people with the same background formed a bond and gravitated towards each other. Many eye witness accounts confirm how the local community rabbis were at the centre of these groups. These accounts attest to the positive aspects of community building. But they also reveal that individual authors were strongly censored. Rabbis played down their own experiences of humiliation and suffering or simply did not refer to them at all. They focused on the experiences of others instead. Their own torment is only briefly referred to; only in the context of being able to outwit the perpetrators and inadvertently become the hero of their own story. Cross-referencing these experiences with other eye witness accounts provided a different view of the experiences of rabbis in the concentration camps and depicted their suffering. These accounts also confirm that rabbis had been singled out for harsh treatment by the Gestapo and the SS. The previously established inter-personal networks were of paramount importance for survival in the camp and subsequent rescue. The inner workings of these rabbinic networks were looked at in detail throughout this chapter. The network theory laid out in the introductory chapter where ‘nodes’ and ‘clusters’ define the dissemination of information were traced. Applying this theory indicates that each of the German Jewish organizations can be considered a ‘giant cluster’ to which all the rabbis as individual ‘nodes’ are connected. The rabbinic organization of the ‘Allgemeiner Deutscher Rabbinerverband’, for example, was the umbrella organization for the entire German rabbinate and can be considered to be its central connector. The members of this organisation were rabbis of all denominations whereas each orthodox or liberal denomination had its own organization, which in turn was another cluster. Beyond these entirely rabbinic affiliations, its members also participated in a broad range of social and charitable organizations which also served as ‘giant clusters’ and further connected the network. A flood of information was disseminated through these channels. Further observation of the rabbinic network shows that the centre for information distribution, not only for the rabbinate but also for German Jewry, was located in Berlin with organizations such as the Reichsvertretung as ‘giant clusters’. This elaborate rabbinic network maintained distant weak links to congregations, institutions as well as friends and acquaintances abroad. These links were utilized and ultimately saved lives.

The question of whether to stay or leave and the moral dilemma it entailed was particularly difficult for rabbis. Deeply anchored in their leadership role within the Jewish community, rabbis provided pastoral care under constant conditions of duress. But they were increasingly being

caught up in the events and their consequences. Despite their own personal distress involving ransacked homes and incarceration, they still attempted to shift the focus away from themselves onto those who were less fortunate and in need of assistance. Rabbis were aware of the consequences of remaining in Germany and made conscious decisions to leave or to remain. Little mention is being made in autobiographies of the moral dilemma and the emotional effect of emigration such as guilt and reproach. It appears sublime in these writing as a justification for emigration. While many explicitly mention the permission that Baeck himself gave them to emigrate, others justified their emigration with their retirement. Those rabbis who were retired and had adult children abroad or rabbis with small children were more inclined to leave. Those who stayed behind were part of an ever deconstructing network of organizations and individuals who remained. They increasingly lost their leadership roles as this was gradually taken over by the German government, the Gestapo and the SS. Administrative tasks remained with the skeleton staff of the communities and the ‘Reichsvertretung’. The remaining rabbis continued to provide pastoral care to those people in need – right until the end. Eighty of them were deported and killed.
Leaving and Arriving 1938 - 1939

Exit into the Unknown

The struggle for a visa to a foreign country, any country, regardless what kind or how far away it was ("how far from what?" we used to ask as a joke), became the main preoccupation of every single Jew and of our Jewish organizations.

Rabbi Dr. Max Nussbaum

---

In the introductory quote Max Nussbaum describes the desperate struggle for visas regardless of destination. He also confirms that the November Pogrom and the subsequent deportations had eliminated previously held reservations about leaving Germany. It was clear that Jews in Germany had no future and emigration needed to be urgently pursued. Getting out to anywhere in the world was the straw by which many sought to save themselves. This chapter narrates the background around the rescue of rabbis. Jewish organizations in Germany and in Britain, either jointly or independent of each other organized a wide range of rescue efforts with many targeting individual professional groups or population sub-groups. The initial plans had included rescuing more than 100,000 Jews from the continent. Through their personal connections to Britain, many rabbis were able to secure their visas. Others were fortunate to be considered by a number of rescue schemes which provided the coveted guarantees. In order to understand the creation of these rescue schemes as a function of the British mentality, the position and attitudes of the Anglo-Jewish community is briefly highlighted. This homogenous, assimilated yet outwardly orthodox community was non-observant and since the 19th century movements had sprung up to again make religion a central part of Jewish life. The leaders of these movements are introduced in this chapter as they and their movements assisted the rabbinic migration. In that context the inter-connectedness of the network between Anglo-Jewry and the political establishment is highlighted which made these rescues possible. This vastly different social, political and cultural landscape was in sharp contrast with that of Germany yet close personal and professional contacts between the leadership of both Jewish communities existed. Despite best efforts the many rescue schemes were unable to help all applicants. Consideration for a guarantee for Britain could only be given after the organizations undertook a thorough screening of the candidate. These organizations also applied a number of selection criteria with overall priority given to applicants who would eventually become self-sufficient. This criterion largely discounted the aged and retired applicants seeking refuge. Those with the ‘wrong’ religious affiliation effectively outside of a particular network were equally at a disadvantage in this process with grave consequences for those not considered. An exclusive focus on the successes of the rescue schemes would have distorted the picture and the failures of rabbis applying for life-saving visas are also recounted in this chapter.

---

Anglo-Jewry

Since the re-admission of Jews to Britain in 1656 Anglo-Jewry had been mainly made up of Sephardi Jews, the descendents of the first immigrants mainly from Spain, Portugal and Italy who had fled persecution in these countries in the middle of the 17th century. Their common background had crafted them into a homogenous religious and social group. Throughout history, their merchant knowledge significantly contributed to the rise of the British Empire with Jewish merchants and bankers and were subsequently raised into nobility. This unprecedented rise into the uppermost ranks of society awarded Anglo-Jewry the highest social status within European Jewry. In no other country had Jews achieved equal success, status and most importantly equality. While Jews were legally still considered ‘Aliens’ until the 1820s they practically enjoyed the same rights, privileges and freedom as all British subjects. While in the rest of Europe Jews struggled for equality and emancipation trying to find and claim their rightful place in society, in Britain Anglo-Jewry fought for the removal of the last barrier, that of holding public office. This was achieved in 1847 with the ‘Jewish Disabilities Act’. In the mid-19th century, Anglo-Jewry was considered the ‘freest, most secure, best tolerated and politically most influential community in Europe’ while it had become ‘the wealthiest and the most comprehensively organized community’.

Anglo-Jewry enjoyed rights and privileges which combined with the absence of outside pressure and persecution decreased the importance of religion and its observance. Already in 1851, this lack of religiosity was cause for concern and a census concluded that only 24% of Jews were attending synagogue. A continuously accelerating and self-perpetuating movement was set in motion. With this de-emphasizing of religion, knowledge of Jewish literature and customs faded, leading to diminished religious observance and empty synagogues. This in turn caused more loss of Jewish knowledge. ‘Assimilation’ had created a very ‘relaxed’ observance of religious laws and ritual and increased ‘indifference to religion’.

While Jews in British society considered themselves ‘orthodox’, they were devoid of strict adherence to tradition. Religious observance had made way for ‘passionate Englishness’. Increasingly sideling religion and embracing this Englishness created a compromise marked with ‘unreflective pragmatism’ and ‘anti-intellectualism’. In order to accommodate an assimilated lifestyle and in contradiction to the term ‘orthodoxy’ a bending of Jewish religious law began. At the same time, alternative movements to prevalent orthodoxy began to emerge, seeking to accommodate religious expression in a modern way which was seen as more befitting the new role in society. This was the mission behind the creation of British Reform and Liberal Judaism both of which had a long-lasting, profound impact on British society.
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Reform Judaism had developed in Germany where emancipation had ignited significant change. New legal requirements of the post-emancipation period in the beginning of the 19th century paired with the inner-Jewish desire for modernity created a modern Jewish denomination. Theological considerations and the desire for ‘decorum’ sparked the creation of Reform Judaism. It attempted to make Judaism and the Jews acceptable to society and thus facilitate their integration. Similar consideration sparked the creation of the British Reform movement. In the mid 19th century the Anglo-Jewish desire for reform was weaker, external and internal pressures similar to those in Germany did not exist. Just as in Germany, Judaism was to be made more suitable to the newly achieved societal status. The traditional form of services was deemed incompatible with ‘passionate Englishness’. The lack of ‘decorum’ and its subsequent modifications became a point of contention among worshippers at the three London synagogues. This resulted in the founding of West London Synagogue (WLS) in 1840, located in the fashionable district of Marylebone, WI, residence of the moneyed elite. Orthodoxy countered these reform efforts by implementing similar changes thus making ideological defection to WLS unnecessary. The split within Anglo-Jewry caused intense but short-lived internal upheaval as the Reform Movement expanded beyond London to Manchester in 1857 and Bradford in 1873. Unlike in Germany the British Reform efforts never ignited a mass movement. In fact, reform efforts of WLS stagnated and eventually halted complete. This prompted the writer Israel Zangwill to observe in 1897 that it had become a ‘body which has stood still for the last 50 years, admiring its past self’.

Revitalization of WLS and with it of the Reform movement began with the arrival of Rabbi Dr. Harold Reinhart from the United States in 1926. A graduate of Hebrew Union College and a mentee of Reform Rabbi Steven Wise, Reinhart was recommended as a man ‘of great integrity, devotion and great oratory skills’. He modelled WLS along the lines of American Reform synagogues, which are not only places of worship but for social interactions and gatherings. There Jewishness was sought to be strengthened through interaction with members of the peer group. Providing a measure of identification apart from religious service increased the sense of belonging to an ethnicity rather than a religious group and group cohesion was fostered through communal activities. Reinhart’s aim was to go further and he attempted to re-ignite the individual’s identification with religion. His weekly sermons aimed at renewing interest in the principles of Judaism, its theology and philosophy. He related ethical principles to individual and community conduct. Disseminating these ideas and ideals to the membership was the intention behind the establishment of the synagogue newsletter, the ‘Synagogue Review’, which was founded in 1926. There his sermons, along with articles on events and community announcements were published. This newsletter would become an important resource for the
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Reform movement and the refugee rabbis. Reinhart’s charismatic leadership and his enthusiastic efforts had a positive impact on membership which significantly increased thus strengthening WLS as a community, making it once again an important institution within Anglo-Jewry.

Around thirty years before Reinhart’s arrival at WLS, its stagnant reforms and the lack of progressive forms of worship sparked another attempt at reforming Anglo-Jewish religious observance with Lady Lily Montagu as its central figure. She was the daughter of a wealthy London banker who had been raised into nobility. As a young woman, she was involved in work with the Eastern Europe Jewish refugee women who entered Britain at the turn of the 20th century. Together with other upper class Jewish women she organized the West Central Girl’s Club in an effort to provide young Jewish immigrant girls with an opportunity of learning a trade. The club furthermore provided an environment where these women could socialize in a safe, Jewish setting. Lily Montagu, having come from an orthodox home wanted to additionally instil Jewish values and the Jewish tradition into her young charges and sought a modern, appealing way to do so. At this club on Friday evenings, she held religious services in a progressive way by replacing Hebrew prayers with English ones and by adding poetry. Her efforts became increasingly popular among the general population and when Sir Claude Montefiore joined her
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efforts they founded the Jewish Religious Union (JRU). Montefiore of similar orthodox and aristocratic background as Lily Montagu had been a student of the ‘Hochschule’ in Berlin. Inspired by the German Reform movement which had a solid theological foundation, he worked to base the Liberal Movement onto a similar foundation. His close connection to Solomon Schechter, the founder of the Conservative Movement in the United States also influenced this work. By 1910 Rabbi Israel Mattuck was hired by the JRU as its rabbi. Like Reinhart, he was from the United States and he too influenced the movement modelling it along the lines of American Reform into a more progressive, radical direction. The JRU became a great success among the general population and by 1928 had founded four synagogues and counted around 2,000 members. The JRU would later become British Liberal Judaism.

At the turn of the 20th century, the progressive movement had become a world-wide phenomenon with many progressive synagogues and communities springing up everywhere. German rabbi Caesar Seligmann of Frankfurt realized in 1913 that a unifying body, an umbrella organization could strengthen the movement’s influence and impact. Seligmann was a progressive thinker and the foremost leader of German Reform Judaism. He had been the initiator of the efforts around a unified prayer book, the ‘Einheitsgebetbuch’, which aimed at standardizing prayer services throughout the German synagogues. Taking the unification of the progressive movement one step further, he was supported by Rabbi Steven Wise in New York and Claude Montefiore in London in creating this body, but the First World War spoiled its official creation. After the war, this idea was taken up again in 1926 and in London a first preparatory conference for the founding of the World Union for Progressive Judaism (WUPJ)
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was organized. Its declared aim was to encourage exchange among the worldwide progressive leadership and support expansion of progressive Jewish religious organizations worldwide. Around one-hundred representatives of communities from the United States, Britain, Germany, Czechoslovakia, France, Romania, Sweden and even India attended.\textsuperscript{22} Two years later in 1928 the official founding conference took place in Berlin.\textsuperscript{23} More conferences followed in London in 1930 and 1934 and in Amsterdam in 1937, the last pre-war conference. On that occasion, Leo Baeck was elected to succeed Claude Montefiore as president.

The creation of the WUPJ facilitated networking among the worldwide congregations, their leaders and rabbis and led to a lively exchange among the members. Many German rabbis were delegates and representatives, among them Van Der Zyl, Italiener, Seligmann and Salzberger. Throughout the 1930s they were continuously being invited to travel to England to hold talks and services there.\textsuperscript{25} This professional exchange had not only created friendly contacts among rabbis in Germany and England, but close friendships between rabbis such as Seligmann and Montefiore and Lily Montagu and Leo Baeck.\textsuperscript{26} The WUPJ played a prominent role during the Nazi era, supporting and financing refugee communities within the worldwide
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network. It also helped to place refugee rabbis with these fledgling communities in the vast progressive network.

The efforts around the development of the German Reform movement had created an orthodox counter movement, the ‘Torah im Derech Eretz’ movement. Its aim was full engagement with Western culture, while at the same time adhering in a traditional way to Jewish law and traditions. This concept was first introduced by Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch in an attempt to compromise between orthodox observance while accommodating emancipation and modernity. He and his followers strongly opposed the ‘Einheitsgemeinde’, the unifying community structure in Germany. In the middle of the 19th century this was dominated by followers of the Reform movement. This had caused great conflict in Frankfurt and ended in an unprecedented split of the ‘Einheitsgemeinde’, the legal construct under which all German Jewish communities were organized. This also marked the beginning of a movement that spread throughout Europe. Only a few years after the split, in 1892, a similar orthodox separatist community formed in London by dissenting English, German and Eastern European Jews. Their intent was to strengthen the practice of traditional Judaism and founded a synagogue. Similar to the conflict around its founding in Frankfurt the ensuing fight in London with the progressive representatives opposing it was ‘just as bitter’. This first synagogue was later renamed ‘Adath Yisroel Synagogue’ as an outward sign of affiliation with the ‘Agudah

Israel (AI), the ‘Union of Israel’ movement. Founded in 1912 this organization aimed at uniting Eastern and Western European orthodoxy represented within three groups - Western European orthodox followers of Samson Raphael Hirsch’s ‘Torah im Derech Eretz’, the followers of the Lithuanian orthodox Yeshivot, and the Polish Chassidim mostly following the Gerrer Rebbe. As a unified body this organization sought to expand religious communal institutions and to strengthen orthodox religious influence, placing particular emphasis on furthering Jewish education. Through its own network, the AI provided an ideological and political alternative to rising religious or secular Zionism and became a powerful political organization. In London, Victor Schonfeld was the rabbi at the ‘Adath Yisroel’ synagogue and under his leadership the laxity in Anglo-Jewish observance was being addressed. Countering the lack of religious knowledge and the absence of Kashrut he was instrumental in the creation of the ‘Kashrut commission’ and the ‘Jewish Secondary School Movement’, both created in 1926. This influential rabbinic position was passed on to his son, Solomon Schonfeld, who later became son-in-law to Chief Rabbi Hertz. By 1934, the AI movement in Britain had grown to a membership of approximately 5,000 families and 54 synagogues; these were united within the organization of the ‘Union of Hebrew Congregations’ in 1943.

Fig. 24
Rabbi Solomon Schonfeld and Chief Rabbi Joseph Hermann Hertz.
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From its homogenous beginnings with Jews of similar backgrounds, ideas and ideologies, Anglo-Jewry changed into a diverse structure with many representative bodies. Overall five movements, three orthodox and two progressive turned Anglo-Jewry into a multi-facetted community marred by disunity, competition and conflict, representing divergent goals and the differing means of achieving them. This divergence is reflected in a vast number of rescue efforts, at times primarily motivated by ideology. The significantly different Jewish community structure in Britain with its many organizations and directions were the map on which the refugees had to orientate themselves, attempt to find their position and re-establish a 'home'.

Rescue Efforts

Jewish refugees from Germany began arriving in Britain soon after the ‘Machtergreifung’ in January 1933. The boycott of Jewish business in April 1933 and the ‘Act for the Restoration of Professional Civil Service’ followed as the first exclusionary measures against Jews and political opponents. While exact figures are difficult to obtain it is estimated that around 360,000 Jews left continental Europe before the war. Of them 80,000 emigrated to Britain and many of them eventually settled there permanently as the routes for onward migration were closed during the war.\[^{35}\]

Initially what can be considered ‘rescue’ of Jews from Germany and Austria was merely tolerated immigration into Britain. But as the political climate changed and awareness of the conditions in Germany rose, the need for assistance to the refugees created a support network within Britain and facilitated targeted rescue operations. The involvement of British Jews, the general population and the refugees already in Britain gained momentum as intensity of persecution grew. With the rising need for emigration grew an awareness of the situation and this initiated a large number of rescue efforts in both Britain and Germany. Some of these focused particularly on certain population sub-groups. The most prominent was the effort around the ‘Kindertransports’, the evacuation of children out of Germany which began after the November pogrom and continued until the outbreak of World War II. Another scheme was the assistance for scientists and academics through the ‘Society for the Protection of Science and Learning’.\[^{36}\] Many similar organizations and their leaders were instrumental in the creation and realization of these rescues and played a significant part in saving rabbis and their families.

With the rise of persecution against the Jews in Germany, the previously mentioned expansion efforts of the Liberal Movement were subordinated to rescue and aid efforts for German Jews. Beginning soon after the November pogrom, Rabbi Mattuck, Lily Montagu and Claude Montefiore established a special ‘Fund for German Jews’ in December 1938, with the declared purpose of financing guarantees.\[^{37}\] A guarantee was the obligation by a British guarantor to resume all financial responsibility incurred in Britain. This obligation was

manifested with a deposit of around £100. This financial guarantee was the basis for a visa. The goal of the fund was to raise money in order to provide these guarantees and then support the visa application of potential refugees into Britain. Donations and applications for guarantees arrived at the administrative offices of the Liberal Movement. Rabbi Leslie Edgar was the head of this fund and was in charge of screening these applications. He was assisted by a committee of volunteers. Rabbi Edgar was born in Britain to German-Jewish immigrant parents and was educated at Christ's College in Cambridge. He had studied philosophy and rabbinics at the University of London and began working at LJS in 1931. He later married the daughter of Israel Mattuck, his mentor and the senior rabbi there.  

This committee sought to choose suitable candidates and interviewed friends and relatives of the applicants who were already in Britain. Particular focus was put on the professional backgrounds as the future possibility for self-sufficiency was an important criterion. No applicant should have to become a burden on the guarantor or society. Selected were individuals of a certain age range and professional class, who were presumed to integrate into and become integral part of British society. In advertising for donations in the Liberal Jewish Monthly Newsletter, the fund raising effort was billed as supporting refugees who would not become a burden on the guarantors or the county:

(...) the overwhelming majority - possibly even all - of the refugee would in time, and some in a very short time, become self-supporting (...).

39 Four of 88 children arriving in Southampton aboard the US Liner Manhattan in March 1939, BBC News
Too many applications could not be matched with guarantees and Edgar had to oversee a selection process, which he considered an ‘appalling calculation’ and ‘a most anxious and distressing task’.\(^\text{41}\) Not being able to supply all applicants with guarantees and subsequently life-saving visas was painful for him.

The fact that not all who applied could be guaranteed weighed heavy on my conscience. (…) there were so many more whom we would have wished to help than was possible for us.\(^\text{42}\)

Aware of the impact this selection process had, he reflected on how his work on the committee put him into a position of influencing a life and death decision.

It was terrible not to be able to help them all and I had many a sleepless night trying to decide what was best to do in the appalling circumstance of such tragic choices.\(^\text{43}\)

The application process was a complex procedure. All of the collected information along with the application forms was documented in individual case files. Once suitable candidates were identified, this file was then forwarded to the Central Jewish Committee, which in turn forwarded the paperwork on to the Home Office where the visa application was processed. The meticulous screening and preparation undertaken by Edgar’s committee and the quality of the documentation of the chosen candidates was so reliable, that these applications were not subjected to further scrutiny and at the Home Office these were ‘rapidly processed’.\(^\text{44}\) By January 1939 only one month into the fundraising effort more than £4,000 had been collected.\(^\text{45}\) By May fundraising had already secured 135 guarantees. Overall, the number of guarantees and subsequently for visas rose to about 150.\(^\text{46}\) Among those benefiting from the fund or Lily Montagu herself were rabbis Seligman, Kokotek, Van Der Zyl, and Lemle. The circumstances of rescuing one unnamed rabbi were remembered by Rabbi Edgar in his memoirs. The fund was able to provide him and his wife with a guarantee. His wife was pregnant at the time, which turned out to become a fortuitous circumstance. It necessitated the speedy processing of the application because a child born on British soil would automatically receive British citizenship and thus secure the stay of the parents. Edgar intervened personally at the Home Office on behalf of this couple and managed to speed up the process. The baby was born British.\(^\text{47}\)

The Liberal Movement, much smaller in membership and financial ability than the other Jewish denominations, was constrained. Its fundraising efforts were a great success but raised only limited funds and the small scale and volume was only sufficient to consider a limited number of applications. Among the vast applicants the committee chose those candidates who according to their criteria were considered best suited for integration into British society. These

\(^{41}\) Ibid.
\(^{42}\) Ibid.
\(^{43}\) Ibid., 18.
\(^{44}\) Ibid.
\(^{45}\) “With our Congregation,” LJM, January 1939, 79.
\(^{47}\) Edgar, Some Memories, 18.
Liberal rescue efforts focused on the liberal element of continental Jewry, and in a counter move, the CRREC came into existence.\(^\text{48}\)

In the beginning in 1933 with the onset of Nazism orthodox Jews in Germany and Austria contacted the Central Executive of the ‘Agudah Israel’ (AI) in London asking for assistance with a number of issues. This office subsequently became the focus for a wide range of aid requests, ranging from kosher food supply to emigration assistance. The increasing need for emigration assistance triggered the creation of a sub-committee within the AI, the Emigration Advisory Office (EAO), which was exclusively dealing with these emigration requests. Requested were applications for affidavits and visas, work in domestic service and apprenticeships. The EAO was also contacted for assistance in locating relatives in Britain and abroad who would possibly provide visas, affidavits or guarantees. The amount of aid requests exhausted the AI’s personnel and financial resources and the head of the EAO sought support from the Chief Rabbi for the idea of creating a fund that would financially support this work. The Chief Rabbi and his son-in-law Schonfeld supported this idea. After consulting with Viscount Samuel, who also lent his support to this venture, the Chief Rabbis Religious Emergency Fund (CRREF) was established.\(^\text{49}\) The declared purpose of the fund was initially to focus on ‘religious reconstruction’ which consisted of providing and funding religious facilities and personnel throughout Britain.\(^\text{50}\) Its financial support came through voluntary contributions and subscriptions combined with donation appeals through orthodox congregations. With sufficient financial support, the EAO was able to handle the increase of aid requests after the November pogrom. While its initial focus was on ‘reconstruction’ within Britain, the November pogrom and the increase in aid requests forced a shift in purpose to the ‘rescue’ of Jews from Germany and other countries. The CRREF limited itself to fundraising in support of these activities, but with increasing demand soon shifted its work to arranging rescue efforts. The subsequent name change to the more general designation of ‘Chief Rabbis Religious Emergency Council’ (CRREC) reflected the incorporation of the many schemes and shifting purposes. While this organization changed directions and aims its main focus continued to be the ‘reconstruction’ of Orthodoxy in the broadest sense. This goal was to be achieved with a variety of initiatives such as an educational scheme, or the rescue of religious personnel from the continent, in particular rabbis, prayer leaders, kosher butchers and teachers of religion. They were not only vulnerable as representatives of Judaism, but were also carriers of knowledge that would contribute to these initial ‘reconstruction’ efforts.\(^\text{51}\)

Similar to the efforts of the Liberal Movement and other rescue schemes, the Council attempted to obtain transit visas. In a first step the CRREC determined which rabbis from Germany would be eligible for visas according to their selection criteria and created a list which is depicted in Table 4. Primary consideration was given to orthodox rabbis who had previously

---

\(^{48}\) Jeremy Schonfeld (son of Rabbi Solomon Schonfeld) in discussion with the author, November, 2012.

\(^{49}\) Shatzkes, Holocaust, 37.

\(^{50}\) Tomlin, Protest, 103.

\(^{51}\) HL MS 183 Papers of Rabbi Solomon Schonfeld, c.1900-88, 289 1/1, Interim Report (undated).
applied for visas abroad, and were awaiting their travel permits. Those close to or part of the orthodox network were primarily being considered. As visas to the US and most other destinations were being allocated according to a quota, the wait for these could be extensive and take years. The list contained forty-two names of rabbis from all over Germany with their current city of residence. With this list Schonfeld who represented the Chief Rabbi and the CRREC approached the Undersecretary of State Sir Ernest Holderness at the Home Office to request transit visas for these rabbis to grant them refuge until their onward visas were due. These transit visas had a validity of six months. For refugees from the continent other visas were more difficult or impossible to obtain. Right after the November pogrom British policy regarding the issuing of these visas had been relaxed and many requests were being granted. As clergy was highly respected in British society obtaining permissions for religious personnel was easier than for many other professional groups. By granting these transit visas, the Home office agreed to assist the ‘stricken Rabbis of Germany and Austria’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Auerbach</td>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Halberstadt</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Königshöfer</td>
<td>Em.</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Auerbach</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Recklinghausen</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kohn</td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Ansbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bamberger</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Löwenstamm</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baumgarten</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Wien</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mannes</td>
<td>Sal.</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bohrer</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Gailingen</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Merzbach</td>
<td>Jul.</td>
<td>Darmstadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Breuer Josef</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>27 Munk</td>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Köln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Breuer Moses</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>28 Munk</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burstyn Israel</td>
<td>Wien</td>
<td>29 Munk</td>
<td>Saul</td>
<td>Burgpreppach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cahn Leo Fulda</td>
<td>30 Ochs</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Carlebach Jos</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>31 Peritz</td>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Marburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cohen Benno</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>32 Posen</td>
<td>Elieser</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dünner Jos. Königsberg</td>
<td>33 Rogosnitzky</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ehrentreu Ernst München</td>
<td>34 Schorsch</td>
<td>Emil</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ephraim Max Kissingen</td>
<td>35 Spitzer</td>
<td>Alex.</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hoffmann Moses Breslau</td>
<td>36 Schneider</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Holzer Paul Bamberg</td>
<td>37 Weiß</td>
<td>Theodor</td>
<td>Altona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Horowitz Jos. Frankfurt</td>
<td>38 Weisse</td>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jacob Benno</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>39 Wilde</td>
<td>Georg</td>
<td>Magdeburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jakobowits Julius Berlin</td>
<td>40 Gibermann</td>
<td>Abr.</td>
<td>Köln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kober Alfred Köln</td>
<td>41 Katten</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Köhler Max Schweinfurt</td>
<td>42 Trepp</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Oldenburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*exactly reproduced from the original list: MS 183 Paper of Rabbi Schonfeld

Some of the rabbis on the list had been able to independently obtain release from concentration camp and managed to leave Germany. For them, the CRREC added replacements to the list and re-submitted it to the Home Office. Rabbi Horowitz of Frankfurt had

---
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managed his own escape and his name was replaced with Isidor Broch from Berlin. Rabbi Bruno Italiener from Hamburg took the place of Rabbi Bohrer who had been killed in concentration camp.\footnote{Ibid.}

Schonfeld who represented the CRREC submitted the above list to the Home Secretary Sir Ernest Holderness. An accompanying letter justified the choice of candidates by stating that \textit{The list included all Rabbis known to be arrested, and covered all sections from the Liberal to the ultra-orthodox.}\footnote{HL MS 183 289 1/1, Interim Report (undated).}

The CREEC statement which hinted at a well-balanced selection of candidates does not withstand closer scrutiny. Looking at the names in Table 4 it becomes apparent that the candidates were not a random cross-section of the German and Austrian rabbinate in danger. The names reveal a bias and two common factors among the candidates become apparent - similar educational background and religious affiliation. Most were members of the AI organization. Those who were not had their religious education in common. Only graduates of Yeshivot, the Hildesheimer seminary or the Breslau Seminary were included. The six rabbis who graduated from Breslau and were not affiliated with the AI were Loewenstamm, Katten, Wilde, Kober, Schorsch and Jacob as well as the replacement Bruno Italiener.\footnote{Loewenstamm, Katten and Wilde would become prominent rabbis in Britain; Kober, and the sons of Schorsch and Jacob would become influential within the Reform movement in the US.} This list additionally reveals an intricate network and the strong ties among the rabbis. It further highlights the distant weak ties between the AI and the CRREC to the German rabbinate.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Fig. 26}
Those rabbis who were granted the visas had to follow a number of subsequent steps in order to turn the promise of a transit visa into travel permit. Initially, the CRREC sent a form letter to the rabbis’ wives informing them that the family had been granted a permit by the Home Office for a temporary sojourn in Britain. This was the central document necessary to obtain the release of their husbands from arrest or concentration camp. The letter provided further instructions on how to proceed. For entry into the United Kingdom, the wife was to present this document to the local British consulate, which in the mean time had been informed through the Consul General in Berlin about this visa. This form letter, while stating that visas for the entire family had been made available contained a conditional acceptance. Only the rabbi himself was permitted to travel to Britain immediately. The letter further stated that the CRREC was unable to finance all of the rabbis immigrating into Britain and to provide for the ensuing maintenance of the entire family. The wives were informed that they were only permitted travel to Britain with their children once the CRREC had given explicit permission to do so. In order to facilitate these family travel permits, the same letter asked to provide information on relatives and friends in Britain willing to contribute or take over the cost of maintenance for the family once in Britain. Attached to the letter was the questionnaire asking for details about these persons.

The CRREC was initially established to serve the overarching purpose of ‘religious renewal’ and aimed at increasing orthodox influence. With that, educational and religious efforts were undertaken in England and their effectiveness would be boosted with the appropriate qualified facilitators. In its communication with the CRREC in 1938 and 1939, the Home Office repeatedly emphasized the need for the refugee rabbis to be placed in employment and that further visas would be dependent on the successful placement of rabbis. This was an attempt to channel the influx of religious personnel. In order to comply with this condition placed on further visas by the Home Office the CRREC created an employment agency, the ‘Vacancies Committee’. Its responsibility was placing the rescued candidates with institutions and organizations not only in Britain and the Commonwealth but also in the United States. There a ‘Rabbis Refugee Committee of the U.S.A.’ had been established and worked at facilitating rabbinic placement there.

In Amsterdam which was still located outside the Nazi sphere the Jewish Central Information Office (JCIO) had been able to collect significant amounts of uncensored information on the state of Jews in Germany. From London the JCIO received detailed information about the efforts and successes of the CRREC and was forwarded the list of rabbis who had been granted visas. In an attempt to propagate this effort, the JCIO used its assembled information to
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create its own list detailing the state of the rabbinate in Germany after the November pogrom. The JCIO effectively acted as a giant cluster for the dissemination of pertinent information throughout the network of German Jewry. Their four page list was intended for dissemination of information hoping to facilitate attempts for further rescue elsewhere. In its cover letter the JCIO cited the achievement of the CRREC as precedent and referred to the list of rabbis rescued through the fund as List 4. In the cover letter, the JCIO expressed the hope that officials in other countries could be made aware of Britain’s efforts.

We are presenting these lists, mainly list 4 as an example for appropriate offices in numerous countries to facilitate efforts along the lines of the beautiful successes reached thanks to the position of Chief Rabbi Dr. Hertz.

![Fig. 27](image)
The Jewish Central Information Agency in Amsterdam.

The achievements of the CRREC documented in List 4 as proof of successful rescue was seen as an encouraging sign that further rescue attempts of rabbis could be undertaken elsewhere.

It is constantly proven that something in any country can be accomplished if a success in another country can be documented. In this sense, list 4 can be used in a confidential manner at government or other offices in countries where the acceptance of rabbis is being prepared.

This letter and the attached lists provide a comprehensive picture on the state of the German rabbinate in November and December 1938. Its first section contains the names of twenty-eight rabbis which according to the JCIO sources had been arrested. This number is significantly understated and can be attributed to the conditions in Germany after the November pogrom.

---
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which was hindering the flow of information to Amsterdam. The second list identifies 184 rabbis and their communities, a most striking representation of not only the state of the rabbinate but also that of German Jewry.\textsuperscript{68} This list was summarized by duchies and shows the importance of Berlin as the centre of German Jewry. It is depicted in Table 5. The Berlin Jewish Community employed thirty-seven rabbis at the time of the November pogrom. The second largest accumulation of Jews in Germany was in the duchies Kurhessen & Hessen-Nassau with its cities of Frankfurt, Mainz and Wiesbaden where altogether thirty-four rabbis were employed.\textsuperscript{69} In the eastern provinces of East- and West-Prussia, Brandenburg and Grenzmark, Silesia many communities had been dissolved. Members and their rabbis had migrated to the larger cities, a trend also observed in the once thriving rural communities of Badenia and Wuerttemberg.

### Table 5 Rabbis in Germany\textsuperscript{70}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Rabbis</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East- and Westprussia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandenburg &amp; Grenzmark</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg, Pommerania &amp; Hanseatic Towns</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silesia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxony and Thuringia</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhineland &amp; Westphalia</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurhessen &amp; Hessen-Nassau</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badenia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuerttemberg</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6 Rescue by CRREC/AI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rescued Rabbis</th>
<th>Britain</th>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JCIO forwarded this compilation of lists to organizations and institutions worldwide in an effort to support other attempts of finding refuge for rabbis. With the same intention, the CRREC in London communicated its successes to the European offices of the AI Movement in Holland, Belgium, France and Switzerland.\textsuperscript{71} This is detailed in Table 6. Both the JCIO and the CRREC encouraged the communication of these successes to officials and government representatives as an example to be replicated. The powerful and well-connected network between both German and British members of the AI made this rescue effectively possible. As a result, the governments of Holland, France and Belgium did support further rescue schemes of rabbis from Germany. Subsequently, Holland admitted forty-three rabbis, France twenty-eight and Belgium seven.\textsuperscript{72} This additional rescue of seventy-eight rabbis increased the overall count to 125. The invasion of the Low Countries and France in 1940 however invalidated these rescues.

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{69} Constituting the State of Hesse today.
\textsuperscript{71} HL MS 183 289 1 F2, CRREC Letter to “Landesorganisationen der Aguda in Holland, Belgien, Frankreich und Schweiz”, undated.
\textsuperscript{72} HL MS 183 289 1/1, Interim Report (undated).
Release from concentration camp could be achieved with the presentation of papers proving impending emigration and under the stipulation of leaving Germany usually within six weeks. Exceeding this time period would have lead to further deportation and indefinite incarceration. This time frame was however insufficient for obtaining an immigrant visa overseas. Awareness of the lag time between having to leave Germany and having a place to leave to, of this vacuum within the emigration process brought forth a creative approach and an attempt to bridge the waiting period for the onward visa. With transit visas generally easier obtained temporary refuge was arranged in neighbouring countries Belgium and Switzerland where holiday camps were converted into transit camps. Similarly, in Britain, the Kitchener Camp in Richborough, Kent was created. The ‘Reichsvertretung’ together with the ‘Central British Fund for German Jewry’ had been able to obtain permission to use a camp as temporary transit shelter for refugees. This was another example of the close cooperation between the giant clusters of the network spanning Germany and Britain and effectively rescuing many lives. These organizations were also able to obtain funding of £20,000 for reconstruction of the camp and the maintenance of the refugees. During World War I, this facility had served as training-camp and embarkation port for the troops en route to continental battlefields. Afterwards it had remained unused for more than twenty years. The camp’s derelict state while on one hand a liability, proved to be an asset. Reconstructing the camp to an inhabitable state was the ideal setting for training, teaching and learning a new trade. Among the many trades were those of electrician, painter and carpenter. The camp opened in February 1939 for initially 3,500 men and had a potential capacity of up to 5,000. Of the available places 2,000 had been assigned to the Jewish community in Germany, 1,000 to the Austrian Community and 500 were for smaller groups of refugees from Italy, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and for ‘non-Aryan’ Christians. After arriving in Britain accompanying a Kindertransport Rabbi Van Der Zyl was assigned as ‘rabbi, supervisor, guard and leader’ to the Kitchener Camp and Karl Rautenberg a former student of Hochschule in Berlin assisted him. (See also Chapter 3).

76 A research project is under way by Professor Clare Unger of the University of Southampton, documenting this camps history and role in the rescue efforts.
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81 Bentwich, Refuge, 102.
Where organizations were unable to assist with guarantees, children, relatives and friends attempted to facilitate emigration into Britain. Many adult children of rabbis had previously made their way to Britain or overseas, and had since their own emigration been able to sufficiently

establish themselves. They were able to make arrangements for their relatives to follow them into exile with the help of their newly established local networks. James Walters-Warschauer, a successful business man had moved his business to Britain and had established a leather company in Woking, Surrey. During his time in Britain, he was actively involved in refugee assistance and was assigned chairman of the Mayor of Guildford’s Refugee Committee, where he organized guarantees and visas for refugees. One of them was for his father and stepmother still in Berlin where Rabbi Warschauer had been in hiding in the Jewish hospital awaiting the travel permit for England arranged by his son. Erica Reid and her husband had been able to come to Britain on a business visa a few years before the November pogrom. She was able to secure a visa for her father Rabbi Loewenstamm from Spandau by applying directly to the CRREC. Ilse Seglow, daughter of Caesar Seligmann had also settled in Britain prior to the November pogrom. She trained in mental health at LSE which afforded her a British Social Work qualification. Together with her younger sister Lotte she was able to renew her parent’s permit by contacting Lily Montagu, a close personal friend of her father. Rabbi Salzberger obtained his transit visa through intervention of former student, friend and business man Harry Meyer who had the visa personally delivered to Mrs. Salzberger in Frankfurt by his lawyer. The guarantee for Rabbi Kassell came from the West London Synagogue and Rabbi Reinhart. All of these guarantees became possible through the individual connections made up of strong local and weak distant ties which linked into the vast network in Germany and in Britain.

Unsuccessful Rescue Efforts

Successful rescue attempts were facilitated by many political, cultural and religious organizations and institutions. The countless unsuccessful requests for assistance and unsuccessful rescue attempts were in most cases ‘death sentences’. As had been pointed out before, consideration for visas depended on continuously passing selection processes. Their ethical aspects are not subject of this work but awareness of the successive steps within the chain of selection is important. This selection process effectively reduced or even eliminated individuals from the network.

In Germany selection processes were continuously applied to the Jewish population. Before 1939 selection for deportation to concentration camp was according to profession and prominence, selection for release according to emigration prospect and behaviour in camp. Selection for passport and the necessary permits was according to the benevolence of the authorities. Equally difficult was the selection process for emigration. Criteria for consideration were personal connections, as examples of children who could rescue their parents showed.
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Furthermore the ‘right’ profession and future prospect of self-maintenance were considered. In the case of applications with the CRREC the ‘right’ religious leanings, educational background and age were also crucial. Being a rabbi did not automatically increase the chances of rescue. Rabbis and other religious personnel willing to leave Germany attempted to secure their emigration by appealing to organizations and institutions that made visas available. Considering the unsuccessful appeals for visas make the moral dilemma of the selection process apparent and show that even organizations targeting religious personnel had limited ability and even the CRREC was unable to consider all applications. To illustrate this dilemma, several unsuccessful rescues are detailed below.

Having a child abroad increased the chances of rescue but did not automatically secure a visa. One example was Dr. Martin Salomonski, rabbi at the Neue Synagoge in Berlin, who had four daughters in Argentina, the US, Britain and Switzerland. In 1942 he was deported to Theresienstadt and killed in Auschwitz in 1944. Another example is Rabbi Dr. Berthold Oppenheim from the Czechoslovakian town of Olomouc. He was born in 1867 and had been the Chief Rabbi of Moravia before his retirement in 1939. Correspondence with the CRREC confirmed that he had been suggested as replacement head teacher at the orthodox Jewish seminary, the Lady Montefiore College in Ramsgate. His request for a guarantee was however eventually refused as he was already retired and, so it was feared, would never become self-supporting. Rabbi Reinhart of the Reform movement had been forwarded Dr. Oppenheim’s request and attempted to intervene on his behalf with the CRREC. He asked for support and a guarantee, but the fund administrator replied that the potentially significant future financial burden had to be considered.

(...) but I am afraid that this is the case in which we are quite powerless to sign a guarantee for this man. It would mean, as you know, undertaking to maintain him for the rest of his life, and I am sorry to say that the fund is not now in a position to undertake any such further responsibility after having signed guarantees for 200 people.

Oppenheim’s appeal was forwarded to other organizations. While the CRREC found itself unable to support Oppenheim’s request the Liberal Movement’s committee with rabbis Mattuck and Edgar were giving it consideration but they too saw themselves unable to provide this guarantee. Unable to obtain emigration papers elsewhere, Rabbi Dr. Berthold Oppenheim and his wife were deported to Treblinka in 1942. Another unsuccessful rescue attempt was that Chief Cantor Samuel Lampel of Leipzig and his wife Rosa. They attempted to leave Germany and also approached the CRREC, begging for assistance. As Lampel had not received any reply, he contacted the Board of Deputies on August 24, 1939 and wrote:

Dear Sirs,

Please accept my kindest thanks for your letter dated August 21. I learned from it that you forwarded my letter and attachment to the Chief Rabbis Religious Emergency Fund. I had written to this organization more than eight months ago and again recently. Mr. Secretary Pels wrote initially after ¾ of a year and again to my renewed cry for help meaningless answers. (…) I beg you, dear gentlemen, for your help and intervention because it seems that from here and from me this cry for help completely fades away. (…) Do not let me ask in vain and do not refuse your help for me.98

Why his initial request to the CRREC which had been forwarded right after the November Pogrom was never answered is unclear. It is clear however that the CRREC gave priority to visa requests from orthodox rabbis and orthodox religious personnel. Cantor Lampel was employed at the ‘Temple’, the ‘Liberale Gemeinesynagoge Gottschedstraße’ in Leipzig, a liberal synagogue. It is likely that his religious conviction closed the escape route through the CRREC for him. World War II began only a week after sending the above letter and this made leaving Germany virtually impossible. He remained with the community in Leipzig and became its acting rabbi.99 The two community rabbis Gustav Cohn and Siegfried Ochs had been able to leave Leipzig in 1938. Ochs was able to obtain a visa through the CRREC and immigrated to Britain. Gustav Cohn fled to Amsterdam, from where he was later deported to Auschwitz.100 Cantor Lampel together with his wife was deported to Auschwitz on July 13, 1942.101
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Several rabbis had been granted visas but were either unwilling or for a number of reasons unable to make use of them. Some were unable to obtain visas for their family to accompany them or to follow and for others these did not arrive in time to save them.

Rabbi Markus Mordechai Bohrer, orthodox rabbi of Gailingen, one of the largest Jewish communities in the south of Germany was arrested on November 10, 1938. Before his deportation to Dachau, he was severely mistreated and was assumed to have been bludgeoned to death.\(^{104}\) He was deported to Dachau and died there on December 30, 1938, without having been able to make use of the visa provided by the CRREC. His widow managed to obtain a permit for Palestine and emigrated with her seven children.\(^{105}\)

As has been previously mentioned visas were initially only issued for the rabbis. Additional visas for wives and other family members needed to be applied for upon the rabbis’ arrival in Britain. In many cases these attempts were successful, in others they failed. Rabbi Dr. Karl Rosenthal, one of the three rabbis at the Reform Temple in Berlin had been able to obtain a visa for Britain where he registered to continue his studies at Oxford.\(^{106}\) He was however unable to secure additional guarantees for his wife and younger son. Both were deported and their son was killed. His wife Trude survived concentration camp and was reunited with her husband in the US in 1946.\(^{107}\)

The fact that a visa could not be extended to family members also posed a serious problem for Rabbi Dr. Naftali Apt from the East Prussian town of Allenstein. He had obtained a visa for himself and his wife through the CRREC.\(^{108}\) His recently widowed daughter, pregnant at the time, could not be considered in this visa and Apt decided to stay with her in Germany.\(^{109}\) On 24\(^{th}\) June, 1942 he and his family with the rest of the Allenstein community were deported to an
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extermination site near Minsk.\textsuperscript{110} These two examples show that even if the network provided for the individuals, its ties were not strong enough to include close relatives.

Voluntarily remaining in Germany was the option some rabbis chose, among them most famously Leo Baeck. A number of organizations and institutions had offered positions and visas but Baeck continuously refused. He was deported to Theresienstadt in 1943 only surviving through an incident of mistaken identity.\textsuperscript{111} For Rabbi Dr. Josef Carlebach of Hamburg and his family a visa had been made available through the CRREC but he decided to remain with his community. He and his wife sent several of their children on a Kindertransport to the UK. His son Julius later became Professor at the University of Sussex and was founding member of the ‘Hochschule für Jüdische Studien’ in Heidelberg. Joseph Carlebach, his wife and four children were deported to Ghetto Riga in 1942, where only one son, Shlomo survived.

Another rabbi on the initial list of the CRREC to be granted visas was Rabbi Benno Cohen of Hamburg. After his release from concentration camp Sachsenhausen, he immigrated to the Netherlands but did not continue his journey to Britain. This emigration was only a temporary reprieve and he was deported to Auschwitz in 1943, never making use of his visa.\textsuperscript{113}

For these men, their families and countless others rescue was not possible due to the lack of guarantees and visas. While visas were difficult to impossible to obtain, a significant discrepancy between the number of visas issued and the number of refugees arriving in Britain existed. Significantly more visas had been issued than were being made use of. This discrepancy became the issue of concern and was subject of a debate in the House of Commons early 1938.\textsuperscript{114} The facts were disturbing. Between 1933 and November 1938 a total of 17,000 refugees entered Britain of which 6,000 were holders of transit visas. Between March
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1938 and March 1939 79,271 visas had been issued but only 14,000 refugees arrived within these twelve months. In the six months directly after the November pogrom, between January and June 1939, a further 13,000 visas had been issued as a result of relaxed visa regulations. Of this significant amount of additional visas only 5,500 were made use of. In May 1939, this issue and the discrepancy were analyzed in a report by the Foreign Office. Since the debate a year earlier providing answers to the questions of why the staggering amount of around 57,000 visas remained unused was attempted.\textsuperscript{115} This report cites as a main reason the difficulties imposed on German Jews by the Nazi authorities. Bureaucratic obstacles had to be overcome in order to leave Germany. Many permits and certificates needed to be obtained in order to be issued the necessary exit permit and a passport. This was humiliating, costly and time-consuming.\textsuperscript{116} Once successfully completed, further obstacles needed to be overcome such as the dissolution of households which as has been pointed out did not provide the émigrés with significant financial proceeds. Another obstacle was the travel to Britain itself. It proved difficult with harassment along the way and was costly. Furthermore financial maintenance in Britain was uncertain and poverty a realistic future. Additionally complicating emigration was the emotional attachment to family and friends who were to be left behind. Another influencing factor on the emigration decision was the evaluation and misinterpretation of the current political climate and its future developments. Research identified that many Jews did underestimated the political situation and had a faulty assessment of the future developments within Germany and Europe.\textsuperscript{117} A discrepancy in perception also existed between men and women as women were more readily willing to leave Germany and start anew elsewhere. Their husbands who were more closely tied into societal structure and professional lives displayed greater reluctance and this discrepancy is reflected in the memoirs of Rabbi Appel’s wife Martha and the research of Marion Kaplan.\textsuperscript{118} Many potential émigrés remained in Germany and postponed any emigration decision to a future date. Other visa holders sought refuge in neighbouring Holland, Belgium and France and never continued their onward journey to Britain. This resulted in deportation once Germany occupied these countries.

Marion Kaplan speaks about those who were left behind and points out that Nazism and its ultimate consequences were un-imaginable to contemporary observers. The perception of the political situation was not the primary obstacle to emigration. Rather ‘the bureaucratic gauntlet and Nazi plunder, creating the spectre of abject poverty abroad, discouraged many (…)’.\textsuperscript{119} While much focus has been placed on the lack of available visas Kurt Grossmann highlighted the unused visas in his work in 1969 and Pamela Shatzkes researched this discrepancy in 2002 in her book ‘Holocaust and Rescue’.\textsuperscript{120} Exacerbating the situation for the refugees were the changed circumstances and political situation in 1939. With Britain’s entry into war the Home
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Office had immediately invalidated all unused visas and authorizations. Refugees now considered ‘Enemy Aliens’ could be refused admission unless visas had been previously been re-approved by the Home Office.\footnote{Louise London, \textit{Whitehall and the Jews} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 173.}

The vastly different structure and history of Anglo- and German Jewry is fundamental for understanding the divergent context into which the refugees entered. With their arrival beginning in 1933 a large number of rescue and aid organizations were created, which cooperated with authorities in Britain, Germany and the United States and channelled refugees out of Germany into safety - among them most famously the \textit{Kindertransports}. Another effort was the Kitchener transit camp in Richborough, which provided rescue for 4,500 refugees. All of these initiatives were largely un-connected and un-related to each other as each focused on a different target group, symptomatic of divergent goals and orientation within Anglo-Jewry. The orthodox efforts specifically targeted religious personnel, while other efforts focused on those who would eventually become self-sufficient. In all cases of rescue, the available visas were allocated to the appropriate individuals through a selection process as applications exceeded the number of available visas. This resulted in a significant number of rejections and unsuccessful rescue attempts, which were ultimately death sentences.

Even with access to the extensive rabbinic network many rabbis and other religious personnel were unable to obtain these coveted visas. These long-standing networks between Anglo and Continental Jewry and its rabbinate had emerged decades before the onset of Nazism. Fostering the exchange of ideas and the popularity of the respective movements led to the creation of more formal networks through organizations such as the WUPJ and the AI. Cooperation among these organizations and the individuals, between the giant cluster and the individual nodes additionally strengthened mutual respect and personal connections. This exceeded professional networking and led to friendships. These networks became central to the rescue efforts. Observing their internal workings it becomes apparent that for the rabbis in Germany, their local environment, their local clusters only provided limited information and this environment was generally unable to further emigration efforts. Rabbis with connections to informational hubs or giant clusters located either in Berlin or abroad were at an advantage. These weak ties to rabbinic organizations, the Reichsvertretung, WUPJ, AI, provided information not available to the general population and eventually led to rescue. Distant connections to Britain through family, friends or acquaintances further helped with information and subsequently rescue. An important factor for the dissemination of information was the JCIO in Amsterdam and the regional offices of the AI as giant clusters which further increased networking and information exchange and in turn lead to more rescue efforts. Those individuals further removed from the central clusters of the network or completely outside of it, those with fewer weak ties, were more likely to be disadvantaged in information dissemination and were not able to obtain the necessary lifesaving papers, as the study showed. Some rabbis had
obtained visas but did not make use of them. Their ties to family and their communities or their hope for temporary reprieve in neighbouring countries voided their rescue. Around 184 rabbis lived in Germany after November 10, 1938. Of these, eighty were killed and all others managed to escape to safety.
Arriving and Settling 1938 - 1945
Establishing Normalcy in Britain

So I am in admiration and love for my new hospitable country of refuge and of inseparable clinging and spiritual connectedness with my old homeland torn back and forth and cannot find inner peace and reconciliation.

Rabbi Dr: Caesar Seligmann

---
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This chapter will detail how the mostly destitute refugee rabbis who arrived in Britain relied heavily on support and maintenance for every aspect of their lives. After their escape, they had to try to re-establish themselves with the help of old and newly established networks. The Anglo-Jewish and the refugee organizations supported the refugees in many ways such as with social clubs, financial and professional assistance, spiritual and pastoral care, youth work and by offering religious continuity. The three religious movements and their employment assistance programs attempted to provide the refugee rabbis with work either in Britain or abroad. The goal was to give them the opportunity to earn a living and to support their families by engaging in meaningful work. The intention was to ease the transition from being a destitute refugee to becoming a productive member of society. These efforts were hindered by the limited availability of rabbinic positions and the lack of the necessary financial means to create and fund new positions. As it was not easy for refugee rabbis to find positions, they became involved in a wide range of other activities such as learning, teaching and pastoral care. As part of this process, they were able to re-establish their once intricate rabbinic network. With the large number of continental refugees in Britain, the continuation of religious services held in the familiar, continental way was a natural continuation of this rabbinic work and was a vehicle for re-establishing and stabilizing refugee identity in a new context. On a temporary basis refugee rabbis could serve in the many synagogues throughout Britain.

The outbreak of World War II hampered further settlement efforts and hindered the establishment of a state of normality in the lives of the refugees. The classification of refugee rabbis as ‘Enemy Aliens’ and internment with deportation to Canada and Australia resulted in additional hardship. For the rabbis who remained in Britain, the Blitz, evacuation and uncertainty hindered their attempts to return to some kind of routine. The war and the call to arms drew many refugees and refugee rabbis into the ranks. For the rabbis on the home front new opportunities arose. Evacuees and the influx of Jewish military personnel into the allied forces created new congregations which sprang up all over Britain. Overall, all three movements regarded the influx of an unprecedented number of qualified and rigorously trained religious personnel as an asset that would provide the basis on which to expand and further strengthen their influence on Anglo-Jewry for the future.
Support and Maintenance

Those refugees who were able to obtain visas and travel to Britain chose two different modes of transport - aeroplane or train. Some of the new arrivals were met by family and friends who also accompanied them during their first weeks in Britain. Refugee rabbis Seligmann, Warschauer and Salzberger, who had decided to fly to England, arrived at Croydon Aerodrome. Salzberger and his family were met by friends and former students from Frankfurt. Refugees who had travelled by train arrived at either London Victoria or Liverpool Street Station, which was the final destination for most of the Kindertransport trains. Their accommodation was arranged by contacts in Britain. The Salzberger family was housed with their friends and stayed there until they were able to support themselves. Some refugee rabbis had family who took them in. Loewenstamm lived with his daughter and Warschauer lived with his son in Woking, Surrey. Although his daughters were living in Britain, Seligmann was unable to find a permanent home. He and his wife were forced to move to fourteen different places over a two year period.

Refugees with no family relations or friends became the responsibility of the hospitality committees at many synagogues who arranged for their accommodation. The hospitality committee at the WLS had been established as early as 1933, when the first refugees arrived,
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and it continuously called on its membership to open their homes and their hearts to the newly-arrived refugees. Generous accommodation was arranged in addition to Friday night dinners with English families. In an attempt to overcome any xenophobia or prejudice and to increase the number of offers of hospitality, the committee provided detailed information about the background of the potential guests.

(...) the larger numbers of the refugees are of the professional classes; and the pressing need is for hospitality with cultured families, in which the visitors will find the atmosphere and the standard of living to which they are accustomed. We would remind you also that the accommodation asked for is TEMPORARY, in some cases for a week or a month, in others, until the refugee can arrange to migrate elsewhere. Some of the visitors desire to make moderate payment for their accommodation.5

Lily Montagu, the founder and leader of the Liberal Movement and personal friend of Leo Baeck extended hospitality to refugee rabbis by opening her home. At her home, the ‘Red Lodge’, a castle-like building in London, she hosted rabbi Dienemann and his wife who were transiting through Britain on their way to Palestine. Other guests included Rudolph Brasch and Heiner Lemle and his family. In addition to taking in overnight guests, she also arranged for Friday night dinners for the refugees and her guests included Heinrich Stern, the former head of the Berlin community, and Rabbi Manfred Swarsensky who had been one of the most prominent Berlin community rabbis.6 This re-established ties within the network with Lily Montagu at the centre. The weak distant ties which had existed between the German rabbinate and Anglo-Jewish leadership were changed into close local ties with the arrival of the refugee rabbis in London.

The new arrivals had to be housed, fed and supported but arranging their own accommodation was only one of the many difficulties that they faced. Most of them had been unable to bring significant funds or personal property with them which meant that they were technically destitute. Their urgent financial situation drove them to the refugee organizations that were located throughout London, where a wide range of services were available. These organizations had pledged to support all Jewish refugees and to prevent any of them becoming a burden on the state. Most agencies were located at Woburn House and later moved to Bloomsbury House in central London. Amongst the refugees, the name ‘Woburn House’ was synonymous with a plethora of agencies and departments that were housed in this building. These included immigration bureaus, nursing and domestic services, training departments and hospitality committees. In addition, many committees, associations and organizations also provided financial assistance with job placement and training. One of them was the ‘German-Jewish Aid Committee’ that was later renamed the ‘Jewish Refugee Committee’, and was responsible for the care and support of refugees in Britain.7 Funded by the ‘Council for German Jewry’ it organized financial aid and support for Jewish refugees, including many rabbis. Rabbi Katz received financial support from the ‘Czech Refugee Trust Fund’ which supported its former
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citizens. Another aid organization was the CRREC that had special responsibility for the support of those it had helped to rescue. It had initially been established to supply kosher food to Jewish orphanages and hospitals in Germany. When this aid effort was terminated by the German government following the November pogrom in 1938, the CRREC changed its role to that of rescue and, when further rescue was no longer possible, it began to provide support to the refugees. Among the 985 refugees rescued by the CRREC were many rabbis and scholars who needed to be financially supported. For this purpose, the accounting department at the CRREC had created detailed lists which identified the criteria for disbursement with clearly defined rules and limits for payments. Many refugee families including families of rabbis were supported according to their need, family size, personal financial means and job perspectives. This intricate allocation of funds which allowed rabbis and their families to re-start their disrupted lives has been documented in detail in Appendix B which also documents the change of weak distant ties to close local ties.

**Employment and Assistance**

Finding employment was an important step towards establishing a new life in Britain for all refugees, and refugee rabbis were no exception. Supporting themselves and their families through their work would provide an alternative to the support they were receiving from the many aid organizations. But obtaining work proved difficult for all of them. Some refugees were not familiar with the language whilst others needed to be re-certified before re-entering into their professions in Britain. By far the biggest obstacle was the shortage of appropriate positions. While refugees including the rabbis relied on the agencies at Woburn House, rabbis were additionally assisted through their extensive network which was changing due to the physical proximity of the rabbis in Britain. Close personal and professional ties made a new start possible and the religious leadership of all three of the Anglo-Jewry’s movements, the Liberal, Reform and Orthodox gladly obliged.

After their arrival in Britain, many refugees found their way to the Liberal Jewish Synagogue. The word ‘*Liberal*’ attracted many Jews from Germany and Austria because they assumed that the services would be held according to the Liberal continental rite that they were accustomed to. This influenced the re-establishment of identity that was being destabilized in exile. The services included the organ and choir which was a tradition that British Liberals were unaccustomed to. With the influx of new congregants, the Liberals attempted to accommodate the refugees in their religious expression. So they began holding services in the ‘*Continental Way*’. Some well-known German rabbis were invited to hold these services on Friday nights. The original leaflet for the congregants explained these changes.
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In order to meet the religious needs of that section of Liberal Jews resident in London, who are accustomed to the form of service which prevails in the Liberal Synagogues in Germany, the Council of the Jewish Religious Union is arranging Sabbath services on Friday evenings at the Liberal Jewish Synagogue, 28 St. John’s Wood Road, N.W.8, at 8:30 p.m. The Services will be under the direction of a Committee consisting of English and German members, under the chairmanship of Rabbi Dr. I. Mattuck. Each service will last an hour, including the sermon. The prayers will be partly in English and partly in German. At some services a large portion will be in German with a short English summary, and alternatively in English with a short German summary. The prayer books to be used are the ‘Einheitsgebetbuch’ and the prayer book of the Liberal Jewish Synagogue. Congregational singing will be led by a Cantor and accompanied by the organ and will supply musical portions of the service.\(^\text{12}\)

For the rabbis, exchanging pulpits on a weekly basis had been regular practice in Berlin with its many synagogues and its thirty-seven rabbis. This provided the congregants with an opportunity to hear different speakers and viewpoints each week.\(^\text{13}\) The Liberal Jewish Synagogue picked up on this tradition and was able to provide a large number of rabbis with an opportunity to once again stand in the pulpit and to work - albeit temporarily. The first service at the Liberal Jewish Synagogue was held on March 24, 1939 and, following this, Rabbis Van Der Zyl, Brasch, Swarsenky, Schreiber, Italiener and Salzberger became regular guest speakers.\(^\text{14}\) Cantors Magnus Davidson from Berlin and Naumow-Fleischmann from Frankfurt also read the services. Reminding them of German services, these events stirred the refugees’ emotions: \(^\text{15}\)

="Some visitors had tears in their eyes as they heard Lewandowsky’s melodies they had been used to since childhood and a sermon in their mother tongue once again."

The LJS and the British Liberal movement were both different from the continental liberal Judaism. As much as both tried integrating one into the other was not viable. Surrendering the German Jewish tradition would have even further exacerbated the destabilizing effect of entry into exile. So the Refugees clung to the familiar ways of worship and the British community members did too. The refugee services with their divergent German religious practices could not be permanently accommodated and the need for a separate refugee synagogue soon became apparent. With that purpose, a committee calling itself the ‘Kommittee der Deutschen Refugee Gemeinde’ was formed as early as June 1939.\(^\text{17}\) Its purpose was to support the creation of a refugee synagogue, the ‘New Liberal Jewish Congregation’.\(^\text{18}\) Former leaders of the German communities served on this committee, including Moritz Rosenthal, Dr. Walter Breslauer, Heinrich Stern from Berlin, and Julius Bloch from Frankfurt.\(^\text{19}\) When the new congregation was eventually founded, Seligman, as senior counsellor, recommended his friend and former Frankfurt colleague Salzberger as its rabbi and Magnus Davidsohn of Berlin as cantor. At this synagogue, which originally met in Belsize Road, regular services were held in
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the German tradition and language and, as had been the tradition in Germany, guest rabbis were invited to take services, beginning with Rabbis Reinhart and Cashdan. This exchange of pulpits and providing a platform for sermons also helped to improve networking between both progressive movements and an exchange of ideas.

![Image of Rabbi Dr. Georg Salzberger and Cantor Davidsohn.](image)

Fig. 34
Rabbi Dr. Georg Salzberger and Cantor Davidsohn.\(^{20}\)

The regular exchange of pulpits made the weekly services more diverse and created an opportunity for a greater number of rabbis to work. The policy was applied in the Liberal and Reform synagogues, and the orthodox congregations followed suit. The importance of orthodox services in the ‘continental fashion’ was also soon recognized and these were advertised as enabling German and Austrian rabbis to contribute to ‘lifting refugee spirits’.\(^{21}\) Also in orthodox circles this became an important concern as the entry into exile had a destabilizing effect. An overview of the many rabbis who participated in these rotating pulpits can be found in Appendix C and provides a glimpse into the extensive rabbinic network establishing close ties with the Anglo-Jewish one.

The large number of Jewish refugees had created a great demand for these continental services were mostly held in Germany by former congregational rabbis. The refugees’ need to associate with their culture, religion and peer group increased synagogue attendances. This was not as a result of increased piety but was rather a need to associate with the ethnic subgroup and religion. As Malinowsksi and Geetz pointed out, religion and ritual served to provide stability in an uncertain life of the refugees.\(^{22}\) These services and religious practice thus served
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as a vehicle to enable them to integrate into the British way of life. These services became an expression of exile, of having arrived in Britain yet maintaining ties to home.

Thus temporary work was available for a large number of rabbis, in particular on the Holy Days of Passover, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, but obtaining permanent work remained very difficult. Few pulpits became vacant although some rabbis had actually been able to secure such positions. Through the support of Reinhart and Montagu, Lemle was sent to the Brighton Liberal congregation which had been established in 1933. 23 Italiener had obtained a position at St. George’s Settlement Synagogue soon after his arrival in March 1939. 24 He was the second refugee rabbi to be permanently placed. Whilst the rabbinic positions of Lemle and Italiener were a success, the Liberal movement with its three synagogues had exhausted its ability to absorb further rabbis. Despite this fact, Reinhart of the WLS in an attempt to expand the number of employment opportunities and proceeded to create an ‘employment agency’ for rabbis that would provide temporary work. He effectively functioned as a giant cluster in the newly establishing rabbinic network and was able to disseminate information to those connected to him with strong local ties. Many rabbis approached him, including Gerhard Graf. Shortly after his arrival in July 1939, he was referred to Reinhart by Lily Montagu. Graf inquired about potential positions and stated that he would be able to start work in an English-speaking environment immediately as he was fluent in the language. 25 The arrival of the refugee rabbis made expansion of the movements seem possible. So Graf suggested to Reinhart that expanding into Scotland and Ireland would be a possibility and subsequently put himself forward as rabbi in this capacity. 26 In 1939, the plans to expand into Scotland were only theoretical but, soon after, Graf obtained a pulpit at the Bradford Reform Synagogue. His work was initially on a temporary basis and he was sent there for the High Holy Days. 27 Utilizing the network made it possible for him to successfully start a new life.

Reinhart provided the refugee rabbis with both employment and networking opportunities and also became personally involved in their settlement efforts in England. He assisted with financial arrangements, provided solutions to their pressing problems and was therefore approached by many rabbis for help. One example of this is the interaction between Reinhart and Italiener. Italiener, who had been acquainted with Reinhart since 1934, asked for his support on a number of issues. Soon after his arrival in England, he asked Reinhart if he could possibly arrange for a warm overcoat for his wife so Reinhart subsequently sent a coat from his wife to Mrs. Italiener. 28 When Italiener’s personal shipment arrived from Germany, he was unable to pay the applicable fees and so approached Reinhart who took care of the necessary financial arrangements. 29 Later, when the ‘Alien Tribunals’ were being held, Italiener once again approached Reinhart for assistance on behalf of his daughter Hanna, and Reinhart wrote a
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letter of reference for her prior to her scheduled appearance before the Tribunal. These close ties provided rabbis with an advantage not available to many other refugees.

The idea of rotating pulpits provided some temporary work for the refugee rabbis and brought comfort to the refugee community but this was not enough to build a future career on. Alternative employment arrangements had to be organized. The CRREC had created a ‘Vacancy Subcommittee’ as early as November 1938. This effectively allowed the rabbis to become connected to the giant cluster in the orthodox network. When the CRREC requested further visas, the government stipulated that these would only be made available when those rabbis already in Britain had been placed in positions. The ‘Vacancies Committee’ began to centralize the search for employment and, in the name of the Chief Rabbi, sent out a standard letter to a large number of orthodox synagogues enquiring about vacant positions. In this letter, the refugee rabbis were referred to as learned men and it was emphasized what great contribution they would be able to make in Britain. In the letter the congregations were urgently asked for employment opportunities. As an added incentive it was suggested that the financial burden on any individual synagogue employing a refugee rabbi would be minimal because refugee maintenance was being handled by Woburn House. In spite of the prominence of the Chief Rabbi and his suggestion for alleviating the financial burden, these initial requests were met with rejection. Both the Manchester and Newcastle communities claimed that their funds were too tight to hire further staff. The ‘Vacancies Committee’ proceeded to extend the network’s reach with distant weak ties and expanded the search to include synagogues throughout the commonwealth.

Through the help of London Rabbi Eli Munk, the CRREC attempted to place rabbis with overseas communities in Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay, Peru, Singapore and Calcutta. In another local effort, the committee proceeded to directly match individual rabbis with particular congregations. In one example, the Chief Rabbi wrote to the president and a board member of the Central Synagogue in Hull trying to place Moritz Freier from Berlin. Similarly, Moses Bamberger was temporarily placed with the refugee community in Worthing. He was later placed in Nottingham and found permanent employment as the principle of the Gateshead Yeshiva boarding school. Another successful placement was Broch who went to Bournemouth and Jacobovits who was to be placed at Westcliff congregation before being appointed to the orthodox Beth Din, the rabinic court. The vacant position in Westcliff was awarded to Duenner and Holzer found employment at the Epsom and District Synagogue while Berkovits and Apfel went to Leeds. After initial rejection, the orthodox community of Manchester agreed to accommodate several rabbis - Theodor Weisz, Benjamin Gelles and Alexander Altmann were...

---

32 HL MS 183 F 289 1/1, Letter from CRREC to the congregations, 20. November, 1938.
33 HL MS 183 F 289 1/1, Letter from the CRREC to the congregations, undated.
35 "Gateshead” JC, 11.August,1944, 11.
36 HL MS 183 F 977, List “Refugees-Rabbis - List of rabbis for whom employment has been found”, undated.
37 HL MS 183 F 977, List “Refugees-Rabbis - List of rabbis for whom employment has been found”, undated.
placed there. Altmann worked as community rabbi and regularly held lectures. As a result of the placement efforts, the Council’s internal report dated October 1939 confirmed that refugee rabbis and teachers had been successfully placed. Twenty-three had found positions within Britain, six had been placed with refugee children’s hostels, another six were placed in London, and one, Isidor Broch had been sent to the Kitchener Camp. Eight rabbis had been placed abroad and one, Prof. Dr. Samuel Krauss formerly of Vienna had obtained an academic position in Oxford.  

All three movements recognized the value of the continuity for the refugees provided by the refugee rabbis. They were seen as an asset to each of the movements and were placed accordingly. But refugee rabbis additionally embarked on a wide range of other projects.

**Activities, Networks and Commemorative Work**

Those rabbis who had recently arrived found themselves in unfamiliar circumstances. Limited employment opportunities coupled with a new, a foreign language made it almost impossible to find a position. Under these circumstances, networking both among their peers and within the Anglo-Jewish community became increasingly important. Most refugee rabbis were already acquainted through the vast rabbinic network that had existed in Germany. Salvaging the remnants of this network was undertaken in an unlikely place - Rabbi Reinhart’s study at the WLS. On Monday mornings refugee rabbis gathered here in an informal setting to exchange ideas on matters of religious and theological concerns. These meetings soon evolved into weekly lectures which were seen as a continuation of former academic endeavours. These later became a training ground for former ‘Hochschule’ students who had been unable to complete their studies in Berlin. As part of the network although only connected with distant weak ties, they had found their way to WLS. Here they were given private tuition by members of an illustrious circle of rabbis, among them many former professors, district rabbis and former field rabbis. These gatherings later renamed ‘Monday Morning Lectures’, were propagated by word of mouth and rabbis brought their newly arrived peers to these lectures. For example, Italiner asked Reinhart for permission to bring Samuel Atlas who was then cordially invited. This is an example of how the information was disseminated through the network and effectively expanded its reach through the individual nodes. These meetings drew a large number of attendees, among them Loewenstamm, Italiner, Atlas, Katten, Maybaum, Graf, Salzberger and Warschauer. As a gathering place for continental rabbis, the office of Rabbi Reinhart served an important function. They constituted a refugee sub-group and created for themselves a forum for intellectual exchange. Within the context of emigration, these ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ represented a modest attempt at creating continuity within uncertainty. As

---

37 HL MS 183 F 977 “Refugees-Rabbis- Correspondence”, List of Rabbis and Teachers who were placed in the United Kingdom, undated.
40 Ibid.
exile is an in-between condition between two countries and cultures, grouping together among the peers provided an important vehicle for facilitating the transformation into a new cultural milieu.

These exchanges gave rise to the idea of publicizing their work. Publishing, as rabbis had done in Germany was difficult to take up again in Britain, but Reinhart was able to provide some limited assistance by offering the pages of the ‘Synagogue Review’ (SR) as a forum. He had initiated this community newspaper in 1926, which was published on a monthly basis. Its main purpose was to announce congregational events but, during the 1930’s, it expanded to also cater to the refugee readership and feature rabbinic penmanship. So rabbis were once again able to publish for a wider audience and with it contribute to providing comfort and spiritual guidance for the refugees. Additionally, these contributions also helped rabbis to earn a small monetary reward supporting their livelihood. This small magazine is a valuable source for re-creating the network around Rabbi Reinhart. Those who published in it were the inner circle of the refugee rabbinate and its extensive network.

The organisation of informal networks facilitated social interaction. Renewing old contacts whilst at the same time making new ones created a communal structure and provided both continuity and stability. This approach applied to the German and Austrian communities as a whole and also to the newly founded professional associations for refugees. The refugee rabbinate established its own representative organization, the ‘Executive Committee of the Union of Formerly German Rabbis’ which included forty rabbis from Germany and seven from Austria with the aim of representing the needs and concerns of refugee rabbis in Britain.\footnote{HL MS 171 AJ246, F17, Letter Georg Salzberger to Harold Reinhart, 22. April, 1940.} It intervened on behalf of rabbis who needed assistance such as Arthur Rosenthal from Berlin who had been asked by the CRREC to take up a position in Manchester. As he was unwilling to leave London, the CRREC threatened to withhold his financial support.\footnote{HL MS 171 AJ246, F16, Letter Secretary Pels of CRREC to Harold Reinhart, 19. October, 1939.} Through the intervention, the dispute was settled without Rosenthal having to move Manchester.\footnote{Ibid.}

The ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ and the rabbinic networks brought forth more academic and pragmatic projects. When the news of Leo Baeck’s deportation to Theresienstadt reached Britain, his close friends Warschauer and Seligmann and many of his former pupils started to think about ways of honouring Baeck and his work. One idea that was discussed in the ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ was to make Baeck’s book ‘Das Wesen des Judentums’ available to a wider British audience.\footnote{Ibid.} While this book had already been translated into English and published in Britain in 1936, the rabbis considered creating a shortened, edited and commented version.\footnote{This version, a people’s edition was never published.} A similar idea was discussed in the case of Dienemann’s book ‘Christentum und Judentum’. Translation on this work had already been started by Graf.\footnote{HL MS 171 AJ246 F15, Letter Gerhard Graf to Harold Reinhart, 13. October, 1939.} Both of these ideas were an attempt to keep them occupied with meaningful work whilst they were unemployed in order to


\footnote{HL MS 171 AJ246 F15, Letter Gerhard Graf to Harold Reinhart, 13. October, 1939.}
establish a sense of normality. However, neither book was ever published. The occupation with tasks similar to those in Germany but in a different context helped to ease the transition into exile as it establish personal identification with a meaningful occupation.

The rabbi's work extended beyond the pulpit and expressed itself in a wide variety of activities. The emigration and the separation from friends and family created an increased need for pastoral care. The refugees were faced with uncertainty surrounding their own future, and with the loss of home and country, having left behind family and friends. This condition brought the rabbis to commemorative work. The Chief Rabbi himself suggested that the first anniversary of the November pogrom in November 1939 should be marked with commemorative services held at synagogues. Throughout Britain the services at the 'United Synagogue' were held by orthodox refugee rabbis. Elsewhere, rabbis marked this occasion in the many refugee congregations. In Oxford, rabbis Eschelbacher and Karl Rosenthal held the commemoration of the November pogrom. In their leadership roles, the rabbis were responsible for the process of collective mourning by which the community came together and bonded in their collective pain. This created community cohesion among the refugees and helped to stabilize the individual's identity. As has been pointed out this was an important function out as a vehicle for transfer into exile.

These annual commemorative services were not enough to acknowledge the destruction that had resulted from the November pogrom. Many refugees felt that it needed to be also documented and preserved for posterity. So rabbis became involved in the creation of ‘Memor-

51 See discussion on ‘Ethnicity, Identity, Exile and its Impact on Religion’ in the introduction section.
Books’. These memorial volumes were a collection of information on their former synagogues and communities.\(^{52}\) Although the entire refugee rabbinate supported this project, it soon became divided along ideological lines. Both an orthodox and a non-orthodox commission were created to investigate the destruction that the November pogrom had caused.\(^{53}\) The non-orthodox project was under the leadership of Ernst Jacob, the former community rabbi in Augsburg and the son of the famous rabbi Benno Jacob. Together with several other rabbis, he had created a questionnaire which was mailed to former colleagues who were now in Britain.\(^{54}\) Their names and addresses had previously been collected as a networking tool but now proved useful in mailing these questionnaires to former community officials and members.\(^{55}\) All were asked to complete it and to provide additional information about the events of the November pogrom, the fate of the synagogues, the cemeteries, and the communities themselves. Whilst they all wanted to contribute to the project and to ensure that their former communities were commemorated, this data collection process proved complicated. The survey cover letter stated that the collected information was to be made accessible to a ‘wider audience’ and this statement created suspicion among the respondents.\(^{56}\) While some supported the notion of publicizing the collected data others were cautious or even fearful. Upon their release from concentration camp they had been warned not to speak about their experiences, not even after they had emigrated.\(^{57}\) They were afraid that German spies would monitor their actions and that this would have dire, even deadly, consequences for any friends and relatives that they still had in Germany.\(^{58}\) In order to circumvent the problem of personal attribution of letters, some either requested anonymity with their responses or replied anonymously.\(^{59}\) Italiener, who said that he had once been approached about a similar matter by US academics, refused to answer the questionnaire outright. This project, he felt, could do more harm than good because, if this information fell into the wrong hands, it would endanger their colleagues who were still in Germany.\(^{60}\) The cautious tone in many of the replies illustrates the fear of the Nazi government’s long reach and its own dangerous network in Britain. This widely held fear is confirmed in a British government report.

As most refugees still have relatives in Germany, Austria or Czechoslovakia, (…) the German secret service will be able to inform the authorities who will avenge themselves on their relatives in their own peculiar unpleasant way.\(^{61}\)

Several rabbis however did answer the questionnaire and provided the requested information. This project raised awareness of the documentation relating to the destruction so it was soon expanded and continued on a larger scale. This collected information detailed a stark

\(^{52}\) WL Kristallnacht: 1939-1959, Doc. Ref. 985/1, Lists of Synagogues Destroyed and Eyewitness Testimonies., WL Doc. Ref. 985/1, Letter Rabbi Dr. Max Koehler to Rabbi Dr. Ernst Jacob, 8. November, 1939.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., This survey is being referred to in several of the letters.

\(^{54}\) Ibid.

\(^{55}\) Ibid.

\(^{56}\) WL Doc. Ref. 985/1, Letter Max Koehler to Ernst Jacob, 8. November, 1939.

\(^{57}\) WL Doc. Ref. 985/1, Letter Davin Schönberger to Ernst Jacob, n.d..

\(^{58}\) WL Doc. Ref. 985/1, Letter Georg Wilde to Ernst Jacob, n.d..

\(^{59}\) WL Doc. Ref. 985/1, Letter Davin Schönberger to Ernst Jacob, n.d.


\(^{61}\) WL Doc. Ref. 985/1, Letter Bruno Italiener to Ernst Jacob, 3. November, 1939

picture of the destruction brought about by the November pogrom throughout Germany and Austria. Apart from the rabbis themselves, around 300 refugees also contributed their accounts to the documentation.\textsuperscript{62} Today, this collection is part of the holdings of the Wiener Library in London. The contributions of refugee rabbis to this project are detailed in Table 7 and are again a visualization of the span of the rabbinic network formerly in Germany and now in Britain.

The documenting process of the destruction of the communities served an important function that was similar to autobiographical writing. It recalled events and made them accessible to a wider audience. In contrast to a merely autobiographical work, this documentation excludes the self and focuses almost exclusively on the events. The narrator in this context merely functions as an observer. However, the documentation of the destruction is also a vehicle for coming to terms with loss. The process of defining what had been lost when people went into exile served as a bridge between Germany and Britain. It was an important attempt to confront experiences, not only within the context of the refugee lives, but also within the public sphere where it served to preserve the memory of German Jewry. ‘Exile’ connotes the loss not only of material possessions but also of heritage and with it the symbols of ancestry. This heritage was represented by the synagogues which were destroyed on the November pogrom. Acknowledging the loss of these symbols of ancestry was the first step in abandoning one state for the in-between state of ‘Exile’. This project additionally provided meaningful employment for the rabbis helping to stabilize their self-perception and self-definition and thus facilitate their own transfer into exile.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{63} See discussion on ‘Ethnicity, Identity, Exile and its Impact on Religion’ in the introduction section.
Table 7 Documented Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rabbis</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gelles</td>
<td>Monchengladbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochs</td>
<td>Gleiwitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>Cologne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliner</td>
<td>Berlin and Upper Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschelbacher</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilde</td>
<td>Magdeburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Memmingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Bachofen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Klingenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Wörth/Rhein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Kleinheubach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Kleinwallstadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Worms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Miltenberg/Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Seligenstadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>Aschaffenburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 36
Cover of a Leaflet for Fundraising Project and Membership Commemorative Committee.\(^{64}\)

\(^{64}\) Original Pamphlet; 1942; Ludwig Feuchtwanger Collection, AR 6001 MF 562 4/17; LBI.
Another memorial project was created in 1942. The ‘Committee for the Commemoration of the Destroyed Synagogues in Germany and Austria’ was set up with the intention of memorializing the former communities and synagogues in Germany and Austria and one of its aims was: ‘keeping alive the memory of their destroyed and desecrated synagogues’ and (...) making the flame which has burned the synagogues, a beacon in the conscience of our people which will remain and shine for generations to come.’\(^{65}\) In addition to being a memorial project, it was also a fundraising effort to support the German and Austrian refugees who had settled in Palestine. Together with the ‘Jewish National Fund’ in Jerusalem, the committee had created a new chapter in the ‘Golden Book’ which was to contain the names of the destroyed synagogues and communities. It was to serve as an ‘eternal chronicle’ in which the Jewish people all over the world record names they want to respect and honour.\(^{66}\)

The Committee consisted of a total sixty-five former community leaders - twenty-one rabbis and forty-four lay leaders, all of whom were listed in the original pamphlet reproduced in Fig. 36. This list is an impressive assembly of prominent refugees, former community officials. Among the rabbis representing their former communities were orthodox and liberal, old and young rabbis. This is as an impressive indicator of the extensive network amongst the former German Jewish community leadership not only in Germany and now in Britain but also reaching to Palestine. It also shows that cooperation among the religious factions was possible when working together on an important, common cause.

\(^{65}\) Ibid.  
\(^{66}\) Ibid.  
\(^{67}\) Julius Blau, undated (Call Number: F 370) and Heinrich Stahl, undated (Call Number: F 22936); both courtesy of LBI.
Commemoration was an important part of the mourning process and was a central part of life in the first years in exile for all refugees. Public expression of mourning and the mentioned commemorative projects facilitated this coming-to-terms process for the refugees. In addition to larger, community-wide efforts, many smaller, more personal commemorations were conducted. There, friends, colleagues, companions and compatriots who passed away were remembered in obituaries and memorial services. When the former head of the Frankfurt community, Dr. Julius Blau passed away in 1939 he was commemorated in an obituary in the JC written by Dienemann. Incidentally, this was Dienemann’s last publication before he passed away shortly after his arrival in Palestine in the same year. The memorial service for Blau was led by Lemle, Dienemann and Seligmann from Frankfurt.

In addition to mourning those who passed on in exile, those suffering and dying back home were also commemorated. When the news arrived in London that Heinrich Stahl, the former head of the Berlin community, had passed away in Theresienstadt, his friends and colleagues organized a memorial service. The former Berlin Cantor Davidsohn sang the ‘El Moleh Rachamim’ and former community officials, such as Warschauer spoke in his memory. He had been senior community rabbi in Berlin and worked with Stahl for forty-three years. Warschauer recited Stahl’s greatest wish for ‘unity among the refugees abroad so that they might concentrate their strength on helping their unfortunate brethren on the continent.’ In 1933, Heinrich Stahl had been elected chairman of the Berlin Jewish community and worked tirelessly for the emigration of the Jews. On June 11th 1942, he and his wife Jenny were deported to Theresienstadt. He died there in November of the same year of a lung infection at the age of 75.

More memorials followed such as the service for the former Vienna Chief Rabbi Dr. Israel Taglicht who passed away at the age of 81. Apart from these memorials, happy occasions such as birthdays and centenaries were also commemorated. Two of these occasions were Leo Baeck’s 70th birthday and the 100th anniversary of Sigmund Maybaum, the uncle of refugee rabbi Ignaz Maybaum. At that commemorative service, Sigmund Maybaum’s oldest pupil, Rabbi Warschauer, spoke about his experiences with his famous teacher. He spoke at the memorial service for his lifelong friend Rabbi Benno Jakob at the WLS when he passed away in 1945. Jacob’s former student Van Der Zyl held the eulogy and refugee rabbis Baneth, Italiener, Katz, Rosenthal, Salzberger, Schreiber and Seligmann were among the mourners. All of these occasions brought refugees and the refugee rabbis together. This also provided an opportunity for collective mourning and remembering the past which created community cohesion amongst

70 Ibid.
71 Dianne Ritchey Oummia, Guide to the Papers of Heinrich Stahl (1868-1942), AR 7171, LBI.
72 “Leo Baeck” SR, July 1943, 81-2.
74 “Benno Jacob Memorial” SR, April 1945, 57-58.
the refugees. Identifying those rabbis involved in the memorial work and services identified the close connections among the rabbis and between the Austrian and German rabbinate and also provides a glimpse into the remnants of a network established by a previous generation of rabbis.

In addition to these activities, the refugee rabbis became involved in the care of the Kindertransport children. This had a two-fold benefit because it provided both pastoral and spiritual care for the children and work for the rabbis. Rabbi Reinhart who had helped the refugee rabbis on a number of occasions was instrumental in arranging these temporary positions. The children were housed at a number of camps such as the Clayton camp. Another location was Barham House in Ipswich where Italiener was invited to provide services for the refugee children for Passover 1939. He had to decline this offer as he had already accepted another position at children’s hostels in Mapesbury Road and in Streatham, South London.
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Rabbis Dr. Sigmund Maybaum and Dr. Benno Jacob. 76

In addition to these activities, the refugee rabbis became involved in the care of the Kindertransport children. This had a two-fold benefit because it provided both pastoral and spiritual care for the children and work for the rabbis. Rabbi Reinhart who had helped the refugee rabbis on a number of occasions was instrumental in arranging these temporary positions. The children were housed at a number of camps such as the Clayton camp. Another location was Barham House in Ipswich where Italiener was invited to provide services for the refugee children for Passover 1939. He had to decline this offer as he had already accepted another position at children’s hostels in Mapesbury Road and in Streatham, South London.
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Wallingford Training Camp. 78

77 HL MS 171 AJ246 F15, Letter Harold Reinhart to Bruno Italiener, 14. March 1939. Asking to provide services at Barham House in Ipswich, which he had to decline because he went to Mapesbury Road, Streatham and South London instead.
Another example of the work that rabbis did with the children is the Wallingford Farm Training Camp in Oxfordshire. Originally established by the Christian Service Union (CSU), it was intended to be used to train young men in agriculture. The directors of the Royal Dutch Shell Company had approached the CSU about taking in Jewish boys from ‘anti-Jewish states’ on the continent. In cooperation with the Refugee Children’s Movement (RCM), one hundred boys from the Kindertransports together with the adult refugee supervisors were placed into agricultural training. The camp leader Colonel Grant had been in close contact with Reinhart about the welfare and religious instruction of the children and he requested that refugee rabbis should visit the camp to hold services and to provide religious instruction for them. Rabbi Van Der Zyl was working for the Refugee Children's Movement (RCM), the umbrella organization for the care of the Kindertransport children located at Woburn House. He was in charge of making the appropriate financial arrangements. Reinhart organized the rabbis and arranged for their visits. Several rabbis took turns and regularly visited the Wallingford camp, amongst them Schönberger, Katz and Salzberger.

The continuous bombing during the Blitz made travelling to Wallingford and to other hostels and camps difficult. Other political developments such as the instatement of ‘Alien Tribunals’ further impeded these efforts. An appearance before this tribunal in November 1939 made it impossible for Salzberger to return to Wallingford on the precise dates that Reinhart had requested. Salzberger had assured Reinhart that, upon passing the tribunal, he would be able to return to the camp.

---

to continue to travel either to Wallingford or to other hostels and refugee camps. Salzberger’s tribunal classification card is depicted in Fig. 40. He was exempted from internment and all further restrictions. His work however was hampered by additional obstacles such as an outbreak of diphtheria at the camp in November 1939 when Salzberger’s visit had to be cancelled. Apart from Salzberger, rabbis Katz, Schönberger, and Rosenthal also took turns in visiting the farm. These visits provided a sense of stability and a sense of ‘home’ for the children. They could experience the familiar language and traditions both in class and during the religious services. Rabbis also became role models and substitute father figures for the young men. They even supported those who aspired to the rabbinate like young Martin Ostwald, the son of a Dortmund lawyer, who had also arrived on one of the Kindertransports. He was very interested in becoming a rabbi and had even been recommended for the rabbinate by his community rabbi Moritz David who was now living in Manchester. The visiting rabbis took an interest in his development and supported his aspiration. (Ostwald did not actually become a rabbi. After his internment in Canada, he went on to study classics and became a prominent scholar.)

Assistance for the refugee children also came from the Liberal Movement. They too provided assistance to the refugee children and arranged for rabbis to visit hostels and boarding houses. Sawady was sent to the ‘Maude Nathan Home for Little Children’ in Shenfield, Essex every alternate Sabbath. He held services there and assisted the home’s own teacher with religious tuition. He used material from the West Central Liberal Jewish correspondence classes. This was a new concept for teaching children long-distance of particular importance when children could not attend classes due to the war. The Women’s society at the LJS actively cared for the children and frequently appealed to its membership to ‘open their homes and their hearts by offering hospitality to these children’. The Society organized fund-raising activities in order to finance the maintenance of fifteen refugee children who had been taken on. Further north at the Bradford synagogue, the local Ladies Guild also provided care and support for a group of twenty-six refugee children and Graf provided for their religious instruction.

Obstacles to settlement

The efforts of the refugees in settling in Britain into a new life were challenged by changed political circumstances. Britain’s entry into war and the evacuation of Dunkirk turned the refugees into ‘Enemy Aliens’. ‘Alien Tribunals’ were established and refugees were classified into categories. This was followed by internment and later deportation to Canada and Australia.

90 “With our Congregation,” LJM, January 1939, 79.
91 “With our Congregation,” LJM, February 1939, 89.
Other refugees enlisted in the armed forces and volunteered for the Pioneer Corps. The settlement process was interrupted and postponed to a later date.

Kitchener Camp
At the beginning of 1939, the Kitchener Camp in Richborough, Kent had provided refuge for around 4,500 men from Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia. It had been set up as a transit and training camp, providing refugees with a safe haven and giving them time and shelter in order to arrange their onward migration. Rabbinic leadership was considered an essential and integral part of camp life and refugee support and was to be provided by Van Der Zyl. He had been assigned to this position before his arrival in Britain. With a guarantee obtained through Lily Montagu and the support of Leo Back, he accompanied a Kindertransport and was able to remain in Britain. All the adults who accompanied the Kindertransport were usually obliged to return to Germany as the British government only permitted temporary entry for these people. Any infringement of this regulation would have threatened the entire operation. Leo Baeck himself had also accompanied several of the Kindertransports but, even though he had an entry visa for Britain and could legally have stayed, he chose to return to Germany. Van Der Zyl’s work as camp rabbi included pastoral care and religious services and he was assisted by Karl Rautenberg a former rabbinical student of the ‘Hochschule’. For the orthodox population in the camp, the CRREC had assigned one rabbi, Isidor Broch from Berlin, who had been rescued through their scheme. This camp officially opened in February 1939 and, at the first Shabbat,

\[95\] Letter to Josef Wilkes from Mrs. Anneliese Van Der Zyl, 26. April, 1988, private papers of Josef Wilkes.
the refugees held the service and the camp director held the first sermon. Sermons once again became an important tool and platform for the rabbi to relate current events to the Jewish tradition. On Purim the festival where Jews celebrate the rescue from annihilation, Van der Zyl explained its deeper meaning in light of recent events and experiences. At this celebration, the camp residents provided the entertainment. The musicians, actors and singers among them disclosed an amazing amount of talent. This Purim celebration in 1939 was followed by the festival of Passover, traditionally an occasion for prayer service followed by communal eating. At the Kitchener camp this celebration was attended by five hundred men. On this occasion, the camp rabbi spoke of the significance of the exodus from Egypt and placed it into the context of people’s personal experiences of exile. This camp was publicized as a successful rescue effort for continental Jewry and received a number of prominent visitors who wished to support this effort and further rescue of Jews from the continent. Among the visitors were the Chief Rabbi Hertz, Rabbi Schonfeld, Cannon Bradfield and many other prominent representatives of Anglo-Jewry and the British establishment. They wanted to gain an impression of the conditions at the camp and the welfare of the refugees. In his speech on the occasion of his visit, the Chief Rabbi advised the camp residents to remain staunch to the teachings of Judaism and not to give way to any sort of discouragement, despite anything that (they) might have been through.

The camp synagogue was consecrated on May 5th and in this celebration, the rabbi invoked the memory of all that had been lost.

(…) but everyone who saw such a burning knew at once intuitively, that this bad event in the community meant perhaps the end of this community, but never meant the end of Jewish life and existence.

One camp inmate, who was a former member of the Eisenstadt community, had rescued the Torah Scrolls and curtains from the synagogue. He had donated them to the camp synagogue. A synagogue and Torah scrolls in particular when having been brought from the former home of the refugees are particularly important. As a symbol of the former home it can be seen as a vehicle to stabilize the individual’s identity and with its familiarity ease the transfer from immigration to the in-between state of exile.

The camp had been set up as a training facility and the residents worked in the camp as labourers in the fields and on the farms in the neighbouring towns and villages. In return, local school teachers volunteered to teach the refugees English and visited the camp in the afternoons. This casual social contact with the local population created a friendly and cooperative atmosphere and can be credited for having been the basis for another unofficial rescue scheme. The individuals at the Kitchener Camp created their own information network
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with the local population. Many of the households near the camp in Kent began applying for
domestic service permits. This was one way for the wives, fiancées and families of camp
inmates to obtain visas to enter Britain. Many refugees were reunited this way and, as a direct
result of these reunions, many weddings were held at the camp. The first one took place in June
1939 at the new camp synagogue.¹⁰⁵

A wedding feast was prepared for the happy couple, in a hut, by the comrades of the
bridegroom. Poems, music and even a dance by the bride and bridegroom marked the
happy evening, and the speeches included one by the Camp Director.¹⁰⁶

Fig. 42
Learning at the Kitchener Camp.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ “Camp Wedding” *KCR* 5, July 1939, 3.
More weddings followed and were either held at the local registrar’s office in Sandwich, the camp Chuppah, or the Margate Synagogue, where the local rabbi Cohen assisted. With the inflow of more refugees, religious life also flourished. For the 1939 autumn Holy Day of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, separate services for the orthodox and liberal camp population were held. Each was attended by three to four hundred inmates with a large number of additional services taking place in the huts in order to accommodate all who wanted to attend. The increase in attendance was not owed any surge in religiosity but rather to the symbolism of these services. They were the vehicle on which a transfer from mere arrival into the condition of exile became possible and became the space for cultural transfer where the German-Jewish traditions were practiced in the new environment.

Both as camp rabbi and in his pastoral role, Van Der Zyl felt responsible for the well-being of the residents and he catered for their needs. As a former Youth Rabbi, he felt a particular responsibility for the younger generation. He was able to make suitable arrangements for one young man who had arrived without any appropriate clothing for the British weather conditions. 

When I arrived at the Kitchener Camp in July 1939, the rabbi noticed that I had not proper clothing for England, so he arranged for a few boys to drive to Ramsgate on a ‘shopping’ trip.

After arriving in England with their three-year-old daughter Monica, Van Der Zyl’s wife Anneliese went to live at the Kitchener camp. In Berlin she had been an accomplished concert
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pianist and in the camp she involved herself in the organization of musical activities. She supported the orchestra that was made up of camp residents, most of whom had been former members of famous orchestras such as the Wiener Philharmonic Orchestra and the Berlin Symphonic orchestra.\footnote{Letter Anneliese Van Der Zyl to Josef Wilkes, 26. April, 1988, private papers of Josef Wilkes. Bentwich, Risk, 52.} Both the orchestra and Anneliese herself gave weekly concerts at local homes near Sandwich which enriched the cultural landscape in Kent and further fostered friendly relations between the local residents and the camp inmates.

With the changed political circumstances, the camp was dissolved in May 1940. As a result of Britain's entry into the war the vast majority of its residents had signed up for the Pioneer Corps and the camp grounds were subsequently turned into their training facility. The camp was effectively divided into those who volunteered and trained for their war duty and those who did not volunteer. Those who did not volunteer were to be interned on the Isle of Man located in the Irish Sea. These 700 men were accompanied by their camp rabbis Broch and Van Der Zyl.
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\caption{The Kitchener Camp Orchestra.\footnote{The fact that the musicians wear uniform suggests that this photo was taken after the camp had been divided and turned into a training ground for the Pioneer Corps. BBC News Kent. "In Pictures: Kent's haven for German and Austrian Jews." http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-kent-16689530 (accessed 14 March, 2014).}}
\end{figure}
Internment

After the outbreak of World War II, in an effort to protect itself against the so-called ‘5th column’, or betrayal from within, Britain considered all foreign nationals arriving from warring countries as ‘Enemy Aliens’. Fear stirred up talk of segregation amongst the general population and this eventually led to the ‘Special-Alien Tribunals’, whose task it was to categorize refugees into groups.115 With the fall of France, the capitulation of the Low Countries and the evacuation at Dunkirk, the restrictions relating to ‘Enemy Aliens’ were tightened and their internment began. British public opinion was ambivalent: Segregation and internment seemed to be sensible self-defence measures, but there was increasing condemnation of this approach. Intellectuals and clergy, in addition to Union and Labour Party leaders, criticized the government for waging war on ‘it’s most devoted friends’.116 The pressure that had built up as a result of public opinion eventually led to a policy reversal before the end of 1941. But before they could be released, internees had to surrender themselves to an unknown fate. The round-ups of Jews were reminiscent of events in Germany. Internees were either summoned directly to the local police station or were picked up at their homes and then taken to makeshift collection points from where they were transported to camps on the Isle of Man. Many refugees who, together with the rabbis, had recently been released from concentration camps were now once again rounded up.

and sent to a camp. Within this context, religious work, services and pastoral care regained their
importance because they provided refugees with a familiar routine. The interned rabbis returned
to their roles as spiritual and community leaders.

There (at the Brighton Race Course) was a liberal rabbi called Lemle who helped
greatly, by constituting some kind of Jewish orientation and when it came to Friday
evening, he arranged with the commandant that we would be able to have a service. And he did that service, and it was a very memorable evening under the circumstances.

By June 1940, the total number of internees had risen to 7,000 men and 3,800 women. The Home secretary demanded a re-examination of individual cases as selection for internment was deemed lax. As a result, the number of internees increased to 20,000 by mid-July 1940.

A number of internment camps had been established on the Isle of Man and were inhabited by the refugees from Nazism, the ‘Enemy Aliens’. At one of these camps, at Onchan the internees organized themselves and wanted to establish who these ‘Enemy Aliens’, their fellow-internees actually were. They conducted a statistical survey on the make-up of the camp population. With it, these statisticians wanted to prove the educational and intellectual make-up of the internees and with it their fellow-refugees’ trustworthiness. This survey found that 500 men had been sent to concentration camps or Nazi prisons after the November pogrom and that 84% of the camp population consisted of refugees from Nazi persecution. One of the aspects covered as part of the data collection was people’s professional backgrounds and this is detailed in Table 8. Of the 1,143 internees at this camp, most had a university education and
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many others had a professional background.\textsuperscript{122} Among the internees were nineteen clergymen and included a vast number of refugee rabbis and rabbinic students. These are listed in Table 9 which reveals that an equal number of orthodox and liberal Jewish clergy were interned.\textsuperscript{123} Internment presented the refugees with an obstacle to freedom and a new beginning. Most tolerated being deprived of their personal freedom but the perception of internment differed widely among the internees. Those refugees who had been spared the experiences of persecution and concentration camp and had arrived before the November pogrom in 1938 were more likely to take their internment in stride. Professor Jacobsthal from Berlin had arrived in 1936 and in the quote below, he viewed both internment and his fellow internees with a sense of humour. His comment encapsulates the internee’s long descent from being part of the Jewish intellectual leadership to a life of deprivation.

\textit{The elite of Europe lived like boy scouts (…) deprived of all they previously had been able to enjoy.}\textsuperscript{124}

For others, in particular those who arrived after the November pogrom the barbed wire, inadequate sanitary conditions and inferior food reminded them of their experiences in concentration camp in Germany. But on the whole, these conditions of internment were far removed from what people had previously experienced. Here there was no fear of abuse or humiliation. The officials in charge of the camps were generally kindly disposed to the needs of the internees and this fostered peaceful co-existence and cooperation. The relationship between camp leaders and inmate representatives such as Van der Zyl, who had been the camp leader at the Kitchener camp, was always cooperative. In a character reference to the Under Secretary the official describes the relationship with the leaders of the camp population. ‘(He) has always had the happiest relations with the English officials and clergy.’\textsuperscript{125}

The unusual make-up of the camp population depicted in Table 8 proved challenging for the camp leadership at times and Jacobsthal, with his sharp sense of humour, made the following observations about his fellow-internees:

\textit{Jews are highly unsociable and utterly lacking the virtue of military discipline: (…) at the roll-call they always had their hands in their pockets, and went on talking while the officers counted them. This lasted until the commandant put a notice on the Board ‘the Roll Call is a parade. (…) It must be no easy job to govern Palestine.}\textsuperscript{126}

Apart from some difficulties in enforcing discipline, the people in charge of internment camps permitted and actively encouraged many activities such as art exhibitions, concerts, theatrical performances and various educational endeavours. The camp leaders made every effort to create harmony and unity among the Jewish internees and additionally encouraged initiatives

\textsuperscript{122} Published in the Onchan Pioneer and in Lafitte, \textit{Aliens}.  
\textsuperscript{123} Lafitte, \textit{Aliens}, 76-7.  
\textsuperscript{124} Paul Jacobsthal, “Private Papers,” (unpublished memoirs, IWM, London, 1980), 22. He had already successfully established himself at an academic institution when he was interned.  
\textsuperscript{125} HL MS 297 A890 F2/1, Van der Zyl Family Papers, 1928-94, Letter to Undersecretary of State, 5. September 1940. Character Reference to the Aliens Department appealing for the release of Rabbi Dr. Werner Van Der Zyl, by the unnamed former chairman of the Kitchener Camp.  
\textsuperscript{126} Jacobsthal, “Papers”, 27.
such as the creation of a camp newspaper and the setting-up of Jewish learning institutions. The publication of newspapers and booklets was also permitted and included the ‘Sefton Review’, ‘The Camp’, and three additional internment newspapers at Onchan.\textsuperscript{127} Literary contributions were printed in small booklets and included poems, short stories and creative writing.\textsuperscript{128} The camp newspapers served not only as a source of information but they tried to support a sense of individual responsibility for the future. It raised awareness of a heightened obligation towards their country of refuge.

\textit{We do not want merely to talk of our loyalty towards this country, we want to prove it. Although we are interned, although we fight and long for our release, as long as we have to be interned we want to do useful work, (…) which will benefit this country. In this way we shall be able (…) to prepare ourselves for the future when, by the training we obtain here, we shall re-establish ourselves in the economic life of this country.}\textsuperscript{129}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8 Professions of Internees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makeup of Internees at Onchan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientists and Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists and Literary Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Chemical Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers and Mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemists and Chemical Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispensing Chemists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Merchants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9 Interned Rabbis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansbacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehrentreu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rabbinic students

The focus on education was another attempt to support the re-settlement efforts, the transition into exile, the re-establishment of a normalcy and with it a sense of stability. Refugees were encouraged to learn and improve their language skills, but also utilize the opportunities to increase their knowledge in a wide range of areas. All had arrived with the hope of a peaceful and secure life but internment dashed these hopes. Yet, the awareness that they were sharing the same fate as other refugees provided a new focus and relief. The camp newspaper continuously attempted to provide encouragement in its articles. It attempted to raise awareness of the fact that all refugees shared the same fate, their lives were intricately connected and that this awareness increased community cohesion in internment.

\textit{Most of you, when you came to this country, thought that you could go your own ways, that the Committee, who gave the guarantee for you and your families would be responsible. Now, by the internment question, you have learnt that your case is not a...}

\textsuperscript{127} At Sefton Camp and at Hutchinson Camp respectively. At Onchan, The Young Spectator, Onchan Camp Youth, Onchan Pioneer: Lagerzeitung.

\textsuperscript{128} I.e. Stimmen hinter Stracheldraht, October 1940.

\textsuperscript{129} “These lines concern you, you personally” TC 4, no. 2, 15. October, 1940.
single one, that you belong to this community of refugees whether you like it or not. And that, if only the refugee problem can be solved as such, your own problem will be solved too.¹³⁰

Focusing on a future life in Britain created new hope and a more positive attitude towards internment. The time refugees spent on the Isle of Man could be considered as wasted time or turned into an opportunity. The contributors to the camp newspapers, refugees themselves, continuously called upon their fellow refugees to make the best out of the current situation. It was a collective attempt to turn the individual hardship into a positive experience on which a future could be successfully built.

*Teaching and learning, training and working, are far more important for your release and for your future existence than any grumbling and complaining. HELP US TO HELP YOU.*¹³¹

This objective was further supported by the establishment of learning and training centres. Former university professors, scientists and other academics among the camp population returned to their former professions and held lectures. They established the ‘*Volkshochschule*’, or ‘*Popular University*’, which was structured along the lines of the former German adult education institution.¹³² These educational activities not only provided intellectually challenging pastimes and additionally offered the younger internees a unique opportunity. While they were unable to complete their education in Germany or to continue their studies in Britain, they were now offered remedial courses and preparatory technical training.¹³³ Onchan Youth College offered these remedial courses and the interred rabbis also participated. Similar to their efforts in Germany, they too held regular talks particularly for the younger generation. As part of the educational program rabbis held lectures for the general internee audience. These represented an opportunity for the internees to increase their religious knowledge. One of these programs were the ‘*Jewish Evening Lectures*’ ranging in contents from Jewish History and Pentateuch to ‘*Jewish Language*’.¹³⁴ Rabbis lectured on Jewish Law, Philosophy and Religion, e.g. ‘*Shulchan Aruch*’,¹³⁵ and also held talks on Jewish life and culture.¹³⁶ Rabbi Otto Lehmann who gave Hebrew-lessons is one example.¹³⁷ He also delivered a series of talks on ‘Palestine and the present war’ and the ‘Development of modern Palestine’, in addition to giving talks on Jewish History, Mendelssohn and Disraeli.¹³⁸ He also regularly contributed articles on the importance of spirituality to the ‘*Onchan Pioneer*’.¹³⁹

¹³⁰ Ibid.
¹³¹ Ibid.
¹³³ At one camp where over 200 young men under 25 were interned, a school was organized so these students could attain matriculation or high school certificate. Professional training in courses such as Electro-Mechanics, Wireless and Television Telegraphy were offered. Lafitte, *Aliens*, 118-9.
¹³⁸ “Lectures at Popular University,” *OP*, no. 41, 8 June 1941, 10. Last Issue of *OP* on 20.7.1941, camp closed.
During the single year the ‘Popular University’ existed at Onchan - from May 1940 to February 1941 - a total of 496 lectures were held. These included twenty-four on Judaica, ten on Philosophy and sixty on History. At times, these drew crowds of up to 900 people.\footnote{\textit{Statistics on Popular University}, \textit{OP}, No. 25, 16 February 1941, 3.}

The religious lectures were part of religious life at camp, so were religious services. They became increasingly important in internment because they provided additional structure to the daily routine and gave the internees a sense of continuity. For both orthodox and liberal Jews daily and Shabbat prayer services were held regularly. Because of a lack of indoor space, Shabbat and Holy Day services, which attracted the highest attendances, were mostly held outdoors.\footnote{\textit{Onchan Pioneer Lagerzeitung}, 29 December, 1940.} These services were usually held from books with off-prints of the Torah. Thus the significance of worship increased when actual Torah scrolls arrived at the camp synagogue. These arrived at the Hutchinson camp in December 1940 and on this occasion orthodox camp rabbi Paul Holzer from Hamburg called on all of his fellow-internees to attend this important service. He highlighted the importance of these scrolls by emphasizing that they should be seen as a symbol of pride and heritage.\footnote{\textit{Arrival of a Thora}, \textit{TC}, 21 December 1940, 4.} For many internees, assimilation and the irrelevance of religious practice had been part of their lives before emigration. Additionally, many had turned away from religious practice as a result of the circumstances under Nazism. But they were still attracted to services in the camp. In the following extract from the camp newspaper, one internee describes the importance of these services. ‘\textit{This keeps our spirit high, gives us energy and strength not to despair in our sad situation.}’\footnote{\textit{Our Spirit}, Almanach 1940-1941, December 1940, 6.} He continues to speak of the impressive work of camp rabbis and their services.
Then I remember the solemn services and the inspiring speeches our Rabbis held specially on the high festivals with the holy quietness spread all over the camp, when I remember the joy of the tabernacles with the small, unsteady and shabby huts we built (for the festival of Sukkoth) with nearly no material but great zeal and enthusiasm, which we decorated inside as if they were designed for kings and princes. When we were sitting in those huts we did not even feel the chilly air when singing, learning and rejoicing, the joy of our festival. And it is not merely a formal act when we keep our religious rites with all their symbols, although not appreciated by many.\textsuperscript{145}

This quote by an internee confirms that religious services had a strong psychological effect as it gave joy and confidence in the surrounding uncertainties. Religious services were important for all denominations in camp. Besides the Jewish services Christian services were also held regularly. All of these services, apart from being a religious and spiritual highlight developed into a social event and pastime. The interned non-Jews and non-Aryan Christians frequently attended the Jewish worship; likewise, Jews came to attend the Christian services. This fostered an informal theological and social dialogue among the camp factions and further supported mutual understanding and community cohesion as well as identity building. The importance of inter-faith dialogue was officially expressed at numerous occasions. Services for British victory were held the ‘Day of Prayer’ and were led by both a rabbi and the local Anglican clergyman Reverend John Duffield.\textsuperscript{146} Five hundred Onchan internees of all religious denominations prayed together and this was described as an event that ‘brought people of different religions together across the entire camp.’\textsuperscript{147} Part of the inter-faith cooperation was also individual efforts for mutual accommodation in religious practice. Making this possible was of great concern of Rabbi Van Der Zyl. A group of Austrian Catholics, mostly made up of Austrian aristocracy who had opposed Hitler and had gone into exile, needed a place of worship. Van der Zyl arranged for their services to be held in the attic of a boarding house.\textsuperscript{148}

Caring for the living and providing support in these trying times was part of rabbinic work, but the passing of internees was another important facet. As the length of internment could not be predicted, it was anticipated that deaths could occur at any time, particularly amongst the many elderly internees. In preparation for this eventuality, a Jewish burial place had been established near Douglas on the Isle of Man. By November 1940, orthodox rabbi Broch, together with a representative of the CRREC, had consecrated this area as a cemetery.\textsuperscript{149}

In order to reach their audiences, rabbis contributed to the camp newspapers. In his New Year’s message of 1940, Rabbi Holzer acknowledged the deprivation of internment and the suffering and sadness that resulted from being separated from one’s family and native country. In this piece he stated that religion could provide strength, stability and hope and that it could help people to move forward in a positive and uplifting way towards an uncertain future.\textsuperscript{150} It was thus considered a vehicle for transiting into the in-between state of exile. Supporting this
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transfer was part of the spiritual and pastoral care rabbis provided for the refugees. It should be remembered that rabbis were refugees too and that they had suffered the same or even worse experiences as the other internees. As a result of his experiences in Germany and in internment, Eschelbacher suffered a serious personal and professional crisis where he actually questioned the purpose of the rabbinic profession. Through a chance meeting with a fellow internee, who was a law professor, he regained his conviction to his rabbinic calling. Eschelbacher, who was also a trained lawyer, recalls this conversation.

In the internment camp on the Isle of Man I met another professor of the same faculty (law). We met when he was on his way to a lecture and I was on my way to a Shiur. He had the Lehrbuch der Padekten, under his arm, I carried the Tenach. We spoke about both books. He said with resignation: Your book will remain when one does not want to know about mine anymore. At that moment was revealed to me, eye in eye with History, the meaning of the rabbinic profession. We served a revelation that will remain even when the great creations of the human spirit will have been forgotten.

What Eschelbacher describes above can be interpreted as a sign of an identity crisis. Like all others he had lost his profession, his home, his country and with it the frame of reference for his identify. While internment was far removed from his prison experiences in Düsseldorf he was faced with ‘exile’. As has been pointed out in the introduction, ‘exile’ is the inability or unwillingness to leave one state and enter into another, that of the host country. This difficult condition was further expanded and exasperated by the continued exposure to a prolonged ‘in-between’ state of extended internment and thus separation from the host society. This in turn hampered the new beginning. While internment would eventually end and the internees were released, others were further separated and deported to Australia and Canada.

**Australia, Canada or Release**

The continuous increase in internees began to exceed the capacity of the internment camps on the Isle of Man. In an effort to deal with mass internment, the government decided to start sending internees to Canada and Australia in July 1940. These trips to Canada took two weeks while the voyage to Australia took two months. One of the ships used to transport the internees to Australia was the ‘Arandora Star’ which had set sail at the beginning of June. Packed with internees, this ship was sunk by a German U-Boot shortly after its departure from the Isle of Man. A week later, on July 10th 1940, another ship, the ‘Dunera’ pictured in Fig. 48, set sail on the same route from the Isle of Man to Australia. Seen in Fig. 48 is also the ‘refugee perspective’ captured in a sketch. Just like the ‘Arandora Star’, it was overcrowded and understaffed. But only after the ship arrived in Australia, reports of abuse by the crew and fellow internees surfaced. During the voyage, British guards had apparently robbed the internees of their possessions and violent conflict had broken out amongst Nazi sympathizers who made up
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part of the internee population. Food shortages and deplorable sanitary conditions further exacerbated the situation on board. Even the accompanying rabbis were abused and mistreated. The around 2,300 passengers included German refugee rabbis Jonah Ehrentreu, Hersh Jakob Zimmels, Erich Bienheim, Moritz David (who was already 65 years of age) and Josef Ansbacher, a young rabbinic student. Together, they provided moral support for their shipmates and held regular services during the voyage. Their efforts were greatly appreciated by the men on board. One internee recalls the services that took place on board.

*I am not a religious man, but I must say, if ever a service made an impression on me, it was that service or these services, - very striking.*

Most passengers and the rabbis disembarked in Sydney and were sent across the country to Australian internment camps. The conditions in these camps were similar to those in Britain. The photograph of Tatura camp shows one of the main streets with huts on either side. The sketch in Fig. 49 shows the view from the window of one of the huts at Hay camp. As had been the case in Britain, internees in Australia were also allowed to govern themselves and they undertook a number of initiatives with both occupational and educational focus. As had been the case on the Isle of Man these efforts created community cohesion and a sense of normality which helped to stabilize the individuals in the uncertainty. The interned refugee rabbis held services and additionally organized themselves into the ‘Internees’ Rabbinical Committee’, similar to the ‘Allgemeiner Deutscher Rabbinerverband’, formerly the central German rabbinic
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organization. This was also an attempt to re-establish a rabbinic network. Under the leadership of orthodox rabbi Ehrentreu, the rabbis supervised and organized religious activities in the camp.\footnote{160} Again, as had been the case in Britain it was possible to be granted release from internment, on the condition of joining the Australian Armed Forces.

(... in a unit especially created for us. We found ourselves one day behind barbed wire guarded by armed Australian soldiers, and the next day wearing the uniforms of Australian soldiers. In war, allies and adversaries are often and easily interchangeable.\footnote{161}

The above observation was made by the rabbinic student Jonas Ansbacher who was the son of the former Wiesbaden rabbi. He joined the Australian forces. For security reasons, in case of contact with the enemy he was forced to anglicize his name and chose the name Asher. Those internees who did not volunteer remained in internment and were eventually repatriated to Britain. Bienheim and Moritz returned from Australia in 1942 whilst Ehrentreu stayed on in Australia beyond his release date. He had secured a rabbinic position at the Beth David congregation in Melbourne and remained there until 1942.\footnote{163} He was then hired by the Machzikai Hadath congregation in St. Kilda and only returned to Britain in 1948.\footnote{164}

Another destination for internees who had to leave the Isle of Man was Canada. Three rabbinic students of the ‘Hochschule’ in Berlin were sent there - Konrad Sawady, Emil Fackenheim and Karl Rautenberg. The three men had been friends since their student days in Berlin and were together in a concentration camp. During their voyage to Canada, Fackenheim and Sawady held services on board the HMS Ettick. ‘I arranged for a service with Konni
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\caption{Hay Camp and Tatura Camp in Australia.\footnote{162}}
\end{figure}
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Sawady, who was (...) our cantor. He conducted the service and I spoke.\textsuperscript{165} The people who attended the services were greatly impressed and felt that they provided both comfort and encouragement. Recalling what one worshipper had told him years later, Fackenheim wrote in his memoirs: ‘He said he had never forgotten what I had said at that Shabbath service. (...)’ and continued ‘You said that wherever we were going, God would be with us.’\textsuperscript{166} This again shows how important the continuance of religious tradition was in the context of giving rhyme and reason to suffering, injustice and evil. It was a coping mechanism.\textsuperscript{167}
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Painted Postcard from Internment.\textsuperscript{168}

The repatriation of internees from Australia was delayed until 1942 whereas repatriation from Canada took place earlier. Sawady and Karl Rautenberg were able to return to Britain as early as 1941. Their friend Fackenheim had decided to remain in Canada permanently.

By the end of 1941, internees in Britain were slowly being released. In response to public criticism as early as August 1940 the policy on internment began to change. At that time, the first major release of internees was ordered.\textsuperscript{169} New regulations had established eighteen additional sub-categories of ‘Enemy Aliens’ in order to further classify the refugees in category C. This additional categorization made the release of targeted subgroups, including that of clergy, possible.\textsuperscript{170} This included Rabbi Margulis, the former Chief Rabbi of Salzburg in Austria, who was interned at Onchan. In November 1940, he had pleaded with authorities for his release, citing as a reason his ill health which resulted from his incarceration at Dachau.\textsuperscript{171}
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Similarly, Rabbi Pfingst was released from internment in Douglas at the end of January 1941. He also had serious health problems because of his incarceration in a concentration camp. Some rabbis received prominent support in filing their applications for release. Lily Montagu personally appealed on behalf of Van Der Zyl and assured the authorities that she had a good chance of placing him in a position either in Britain or overseas through the WUPJ. As further support of his application, his former British colleagues at the Kitchener Camp issued a reference for him which attested to his outstanding character. In a letter attached to his application, Van der Zyl stated that, if he were released, he wished to remain on the Isle of Man voluntarily to continue his work as religious leader on behalf of his compatriots. His application was forwarded to the Under-Secretary of State in the Alien Department at the Home Office and his release was eventually granted. The release of Van Der Zyl from internment identifies the strong influence and powerful network around Lily Montagu. She also successfully intervened in the release of Lemle and successfully secured a position with a refugee community for him in Brazil that was financed through the WUJP. In his memoirs Lemle recalls his release.

My release from the internment camp was due to my having received a calling to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil with the assignment by the 'World Union for Progressive Judaism' (in December 1940) to found there a new Jewish community for the emigrated refugees from Europe.

The orthodox Chief Rabbi also attempted to obtain the release of orthodox rabbis. He wanted to use his influence with the Home Office to intervene. He tried to facilitate the release of the rabbis and argued that contrary to the agreement of the White Paper, clergy remained interned. But his efforts were unsuccessful which shows that the network around Lily Montagu and the Liberal Movement was more influential and powerful than that of the Chief Rabbi because it had closer ties to the more powerful individual nodes. By June 1941 58,056 internees had been sent home and, by May 1943, all of them had been released apart from three hundred mainly Nazi sympathizers.

The War Effort

Britain declared war on Germany on September 3rd 1939 which effectively stopped all rescue efforts and prevented the exit of Jews from Germany. The last of the Kindertransports arrived in Britain on August 30th 1939. On that day the last of the German rabbis also arrived. As the flow of refugees halted, several measures were introduced such as the classification as ‘Enemy Aliens’. At the same time, mobilization began. Many refugees wanted to join the armed forces but legal restrictions meant that they could only join the Pioneer Corps, an unarmed branch of the armed forces. Once internment had been introduced and ‘Enemy Aliens’ deported to the Isle of Man, entry to military service was blocked completely.

---
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While Britain decided to protect itself from betrayal through the classification of refugees, the government attempted to understand the nature and make-up of the refugee community. This was largely made up of citizens of countries that Britain was at war with. *Mass Observation*, a social research organization founded in 1937, recorded everyday life in Britain and had enlisted the assistance of around 500 volunteers and paid observers. Refugees in particular were observed and information was collected detailing their habits, attitudes and state of mind. A detailed analysis of the original Mass Observation project was undertaken by Tony Kushner in ‘We Europeans? Mass-observation, *race* and British Identity in the Twentieth Century’.\(^{178}\) A report on the political attitudes of refugees concluded that most of them avoided drawing attention to themselves and that they displayed ‘great altruism and interest in the allied cause’.\(^{179}\) The survey also found that refugees were very interested in world events and that they obtained their information through newspapers and the wireless. ‘(Refugees) (…) discuss the situation with an eagerness one could wish to see among English people.’\(^{180}\) Whilst these results might have been remarkable enough to have been recorded by *Mass Observation*, they were by no means surprising. Refugees had been on the receiving end of political developments and had been victims of it. Their livelihood depended on remaining well-informed. The efforts of the *Mass Observation* could be considered as ‘spying’ on the refugees. They however had a deep-seated fear of being spied upon. They tried their best to keep a low profile in Britain, mainly out of fear that their statements could potentially be divulged to German authorities. This, they feared, could then lead to repercussions for their family, friends and colleagues still in Germany.\(^{181}\) This continuously expressed fear indirectly speaks to the perceived or factually existing Nazi espionage network in Britain which also spied on the Jewish refugees. These espionage networks are identified by Panikos Panayi and James and Patience Barnes.\(^{182}\)

The political interest amongst the refugees and their opposition to Germany was noted in the reports which also established that they were eager for Britain to enter the war and were passionate about ‘not fighting against the Nazis but against the German people that could allow this regime to come to power’.\(^{183}\) This enthusiasm for the war was reflected not only in the refugees’ verbal support of the war but also in the enlistment process for the Armed Forces. Like the general refugee population, German rabbis also enlisted and actively participated in the war effort determined to fight for the allied cause. The enlisted refugee volunteers had a different status to that of British soldiers because they were not actually British citizens. If they were to be captured, these soldiers would then not be considered honourable prisoners of war and many feared that they would be ‘(…) shot as a traitor or, worse, may be tortured in
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concentration camp.\textsuperscript{184} But regardless of the danger, most men at the Kitchener camp volunteered for military service and the camp was subsequently designated as a military training ground for members of the Pioneer Corps. This effectively split the camp into two parts - those who had volunteered and those who had not. Of the 4,500 men, only 700 did not volunteer for a number of reasons such as age, health and fear of repercussions on family and friends left in Germany. The camp was split into two factions and a barbed-wire fence physically separated the soldiers from the remaining ‘Enemy Aliens’. Those who had not volunteered were later transferred to the Isle of Man accompanied by rabbis Van Der Zyl and Broch.\textsuperscript{185}

In World War I, German rabbis had volunteered to serve in the fighting forces, mainly in pastoral and spiritual functions. The so-called German ‘Field Rabbinate’ had around thirty members.\textsuperscript{186} This institution was not exclusive to Germany. Other countries such as Austria and Britain also had rabbis in the ranks that cared for the troops. This tradition continued in World War II when rabbis again enlisted into the British Army. The position of ‘padre’ or rabbi in uniform and with a rank was only awarded to British citizens such as Leslie Edgar of the Liberal Movement.\textsuperscript{187} But German rabbis still enlisted despite the fact that they were not able to serve in that capacity. Kurt Kassell, who had been in England for just three months, signed up for service in 1940 and served for six years in the armed forces.\textsuperscript{188} He held many positions in the Pioneer Corps which included road construction and later the artillery. He remembers the difficulties of this service.

\textit{(...) then I was able to change to the Artillery. Admittedly, I encountered difficulties there, as ballistics taught there as not connected to the (Jewish) Kabbalistics.}\textsuperscript{189}

When restrictions on ‘Enemy Aliens’ were relaxed and internment had ceased, Karl Rautenberg, who had returned from Canada in 1941, also enlisted.\textsuperscript{190} As was the case in Australia, all enlisted refugees were asked to anglicize their names for their own personal safety. Kurt Kassell therefore became Curtis Cassell and Karl Rautenberg became Charles Berg. Whilst unable to officially work as chaplains, these rabbis ministered in an unofficial capacity to the soldiers and so became an essential part of the chaplaincy.\textsuperscript{191} Rabbinic work gained new importance among the troops made up of refugees and religious observance took on a new appeal in maintaining morale. The soldiers ‘proudly observed the laws and regularly attended services’.\textsuperscript{192} It was a reminiscence of or substituted for the loss of one’s home.\textsuperscript{193} The regular Shabbat and Holy Day services provided group cohesion amongst the refugee soldiers. One example of the popularity of these services is the Passover service that took place at one
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of the training centres in 1940. It was attended by one thousand men.\footnote{Ibid.} The significant number of attendees at these services again speaks of the importance of religion as a vehicle for coping with unfamiliar circumstances and an uncertain future while providing familiar surroundings.

In World War I, German ‘Field Rabbis’ had reported from the front and had described their experiences to their communities back home. This idea was taken up again and the SR of WLS provided the enlisted rabbis with the same opportunity. The authors, who for security reasons were unable to reveal their identities or current positions, signed these reports either with ‘a rabbi in the ranks’, or ‘from the fighting forces’. When comparing the reports from both wars a distinct difference becomes apparent. Unlike the lengthy multi-part reports written by Baeck, Salzberger or Italiener in World War I, the segments in the SR were significantly shorter. Instead of describing the situations they encountered and the work they undertook in their capacity as rabbis, they merely related snippets of their experiences within a religious context. By doing so, they were able to describe the misery, deprivation and the humbling lesson that could be learnt about life at the front:

*How godly are thy tents, o Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel.* How cynical the description of life in a tent on a rainy day near the front of the war sounded.\footnote{“Life in a tent” SR, July 1941, 63-4.}

Not only were the living conditions used as a basis for theological interpretation, but patriotism and determination also became part of the experience that they were trying to convey:

*(..) And because we remember so well, it is not difficult for us, who have been fighting Hitler and his kind for four thousand years, to lay aside our pens for a brief time, to pick up rifles, to march against Hitler’s armies, to kill and to be killed, to play our small, obscure roles in this struggle to free humanity, or to die trying.*\footnote{“The Fighting Jews” SR, July 1943, 3.}

This rabbi speaks emotionally about his position where he is not so much in service for Britain but fights against Germany. This can be interpreted in a way that he has not sufficiently been able to identify himself with his new country of exile, but remains in the in-between state where he has left one context and has not yet entered another.

But there were also casualties amongst the enlisted rabbis. Rabbi Dr. Rudolph Seligsohn of Bonn had enlisted for the Pioneer Corps in 1939.\footnote{Bentwich, Risk, 45. Leah Rauhut-Brungs and Gabriele Wasser, *Rabbiner in Bonn: Spuren ihrer Tätigkeit zwischen dem 12. und dem 20. Jahrhundert* (Bonn: Gesellschaft für Christlich-Jüdische Zusammenarbeit, 2006), 114.} Born in 1910, he had been a student of the ‘*Hochschule*’ in Berlin and a protégé of Leo Baeck and his wife. Fig. 51 shows Seligsohn with Baeck during an excursion to the Erzgebirge region in Germany. He had been instrumental in moving the ‘*Jawne*’ Jewish High School from Cologne to England and had also accompanied one of the Kindertransports to Britain. In the Pioneer Corps, he was promoted to corporal and later to sergeant but was injured in a training accident. He passed away in 1943 as a result of
this accident. At his funeral, his friend and colleague Eschelbacher held the graveside eulogy.

Those rabbis who had been spared internment and did not volunteer for the Pioneer Corps attempted to restart their lives and careers. With the help of friends, acquaintances and the religious movements with their old and new personal networks, the refugee rabbis forged ahead. Many synagogues hosted German rabbis on a regular basis which was an opportunity for temporary employment. However, as the war progressed and the movements expanded, this all began to change.

![Fig. 51](image)

Rabbi Dr. Seligsohn with Rabbi Dr. Leo Baeck.

New Beginnings on the Home Front

German and Austrian Jews had organized themselves into refugee sub-groups immediately after arriving in Britain in an effort to create familiar community amidst unfamiliar surroundings. Their common background, culture, and religion supported them through the experiences of persecution, victimization and loss. It also helped them to deal with the in-between state of exile as this was the foundation for a new network or support structure, bringing about community cohesion. This dynamic created the refugee synagogues, the ‘New Liberal Jewish Congregation’ later called ‘Belsize Square Synagogue’, which still exists today.

The Association of Jewish Refugees (AJR) was created along the same lines as the refugee synagogues. It was a refugee support organisation founded in 1941 with the declared purpose...
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of supporting the refugees and their special needs. This organization supported the Continental refugees and devoted its energies to integration, financial support and networking in addition to facilitating their settlement in Britain. It was organized along the lines of the ‘Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens’ and the ‘Reichsvertretung der Juden in Deutschland’ and attracted the cooperation of the many former community officials residing in London. It was a Jewish but non-denominational organization, with orthodox and liberal refugee rabbis serving on its board. These included rabbis Bamberger, Broch, Eschelbacher, Salzberger, Maybaum and Italiener. One example of rabbinic involvement in the AJR was Graf who became the chairman of the local Anglo Refugee Club in Bradford, which later consolidated into the AJR in Bradford. He organized regular meetings which were held at the Bradford synagogue. Over the years, this organization became an influential, even political force and played an important role in the debate and negotiations surrounding the whole issue of restitution. It still exists today and supports ageing refugees but its activities also attract both the children and grand-children of the refugees.

The B’nai B’rith lodges were another example of a refugee organization with significant rabbinic involvement. On the continent, they had once been an important feature of the lives of cultured and assimilated Jews. The lodges had evolved into a central meeting point for the middle-class and were an important charitable organization. In Germany the lodges had ca. one hundred and fifty chapters with around 15,000 members. As previously mentioned, all
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rabbis had been members of the lodges in their home towns and had held positions of chairman or president. Continuing this tradition, many refugees joined the British branch of B'nai B'rith, the ‘First Lodge in England’, its London chapter. Their involvement in this organisation however sparked fears among the English members that their chapter would be turned into a ‘German Institution’. As a consequence, the lodge created a separate refugee chapter called ‘Section 43’. At its founding meeting, sixty former presidents of continental lodges attended, including rabbis Salzberger and Seligmann. At this meeting, rabbis Holzer and Loewenstamm were voted in as board members. ‘Section 43’ later became a fully-fledged chapter of B’nai B’rith and renamed itself as the ‘Leo Baeck Lodge’. It upheld the lodge’s cultural and intellectual tradition and organized cultural endeavours such as lectures and talks. The long list of speakers included refugee rabbis Salzberger, Seligmann, Eschelbacher, Loewenstamm, Jakobovits and Oberkantor Davidsohn, as well as Montagu, Reinhart, Marmorstein and Selig Brodetsky who were Anglo-Jewish personalities. This was yet another organization which attempted to ease the process of assimilating into the British environment, whilst maintaining its continental traditions. These institutions were founded by the refugee sub-groups for support and can be considered as the giant clusters of information where the individuals or nodes attached themselves to create a new network and revive the old existing ties. These institutional support networks and structures reinforce the cohesion of this ethnic sub-group by providing support and a familiar social context to its members.

While rabbis were active in a wide range of social, cultural and intellectual aspects, getting back into the religious aspect of rabbinic work was more complicated. The CRREC had made a great effort to provide several of the orthodox refugee rabbis with temporary pulpits. In this capacity, Berkovits ministered at the Great Synagogue in Duke’s place and at the Beth Hamidrash Hagodel in Leeds. Jacobovits worked at Brondesbury, Dollis Hill and at Gladstone in the Peak District. Bamberger became rabbi for a refugee community in Worthing. Maybaum worked continuously throughout the war and rotated between Hammersmith, Brook Green, Dennington Park, Brondesbury, St. John’s Wood, Stoke Newington, Dollis Hill Synagogue and Gladstone in the Peak District. He shared the pulpit with Lichtigfeld at Shemini Atseret in Hendon. Before immigrating to Britain, Lichtigfeld had been a rabbi in Germany and after the war would become the orthodox community rabbi in Frankfurt.
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Interestingly liberal rabbi Maybaum worked within an orthodox context, which was something that attested to the intensity of rabbinic training and scholarship of the liberal rabbinate.

In addition to the CRREC the progressive leadership also placed rabbis throughout their networks. Graf was active in Bradford while Schreiber, Katz and Brasch regularly served in Glasgow.²¹⁸ Before his internment in Britain and Canada, Fackenheim had served the refugee community in Aberdeen.²¹⁹ Following his release from internment Van Der Zyl obtained his first, temporary pulpit at the North Western Reform (NWR) Synagogue.²²⁰ Graf served in a newly founded congregation in Leeds in 1944, in addition to fulfilling his obligation to the community in Bradford.²²¹

In London, Italiener, who had been one of the first rabbis to obtain a position at St. George’s Settlement Synagogue in 1939, had different problems. He came into conflict with this synagogue’s founder, Sir Basil Henriques. Because of interpersonal differences, Italiener even contemplated leaving his position and turned to Reinhart.²²² In an attempt to reconcile both parties, he intervened and mediated by providing advice but Italiener eventually left his position in 1941. He became assistant rabbi to Reinhart at WLS and his pulpit at St. George’s Settlement was taken over by Konrad Sawady who had recently returned from internment in Canada.²²³

The demand for services in particular for the High Holy Day services continued throughout the war. As has been pointed out before, attending religious services provided stability in an otherwise uncertain world and common prayer, sharing a common heritage was a vehicle for community cohesion. It was a means of maintaining strength and enforcing individual identity. But these many services posed a logistical challenge. London synagogues did not have the facilities to hold all congregants wanting to attend services so overflow services needed to be continuously organized throughout 1945. On these occasions, rabbis who had been unable to obtain a permanent pulpit were now able to find temporary work at Wigmore Hall and St. Pancras Town Hall. Having been recommended by his friend Van Der Zyl, Hermann Schreiber from Potsdam obtained temporary work for the overflow services of the NWRC.²²⁴ But replicating the German tradition proved an added obstacle to organizing these services. The audience expected a choir, organ, conductor and an organist. Even among the vast refugee population, these talents were scarce and hoping to fill these positions advertisements in the JC were taken out.²²⁵

German rabbis had been involved in education. It was an important task of the German rabbinate which had a strong focus on adult education. Many refugee rabbis had even taught
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religion and philosophy at academic institutions. While most of them could not continue their academic careers, few did manage to find their way back into academia. Max Eschelbacher is one example. He was able to lecture in Cambridge, where he had taken up residence in 1944. Prof. Victor Kurrein, former district rabbi of Linz and upper Austria, continued his academic work and wrote a seven-part series on the ‘Symbolism of Jewish Dress’ that was published in the ‘Yehudit’ magazine of the Montefiore Theological College in Ramsgate in 1940. In an attempt to maintain the interest in Jewish learning, popular during internment, the ‘Institute for Jewish Learning’ was established in London in 1941. The lecturers included Rabbis Heschel and Maybaum. As refugees were absorbed in rebuilding their lives and livelihoods this venture eventually failed as interest in Jewish learning gradually began to wane. Refugee rabbis also held talks at local synagogues and organized initiatives that were less academic. Among them was Max Freier who was community rabbi in Berlin and was the husband of Recha Freier. She became famous as the organizer of the illegal children’s transports to Palestine. He spoke on Talmudic discourse and held his lecture in English at the Finchley District Synagogue in 1942.

The younger generation was another focus for rabbinic work. A British tradition Youth clubs had been established in the late 19th and early 20th century and youth work was considered as contributing to ‘social rescue’. A central theme of Jewish boys’ and girls’ clubs and the ‘Jewish Lad’s Brigade’ was relieving poverty whilst, at the same time, attempting to anglicize young immigrants. Similar, youth clubs were set up at many synagogues where young immigrants could socialize with their peers and began to establish their own networks. With the influx of refugees beginning in 1933, this idea was reinstated; one of the first of these clubs was the ‘33 Club’ at the WLS. In 1938, the ‘Friendship Club’ founded at the LJS. Here four rooms had been assigned to the club and had been furnished with donated furniture. Both clubs provided an opportunity for informal socializing and were another initiative to facilitate integration in England. These clubs proved very popular with the young people and were often frequented by around 250 young refugees. The former German community officials and refugee rabbis were frequent guests at the club. These clubs also offered educational opportunities with particular focus on languages, especially English, Spanish, French and Modern Hebrew. These were seen as important skills for starting a new life either in England or elsewhere in the world.

Rabbis were also actively involved with the Refugee Children’s Movement (RCM) which was the central organization for the welfare of the Kindertransport children. Van Der Zyl and Katz were representatives of the RCM and, together with a number of other rabbis, regularly visited the children. Their task was to check on the housing arrangements and the overall wellbeing.
During the frequent visits, they also held religious services on special occasions. On Hanukkah in 1942 they arranged a party for around 700 refugee children. In order to maintain religious instruction for the children, the RCM supported attempts to arrange religious correspondence courses for the children who could not be visited regularly. These courses were in the form of personal letters to the individual children and also contained stories, riddles and crosswords. This type of instruction had been the idea of the refugee rabbis and they published a number of booklets such as one on the meaning of the Holy Days. All activities were attempts to maintain and further the children's Jewish education and strengthen their Jewish identity. The establishment of these correspondence classes had unexpected consequences.

Over time the CRREC became increasingly concerned and critical about the religious instruction of these children and also objected to the environment in which the children lived. In particular, the fact that many Jewish children had been placed in non-Jewish homes was of great concern for the Chief Rabbi’s son-in-law Schonfeld. The subject of these correspondence classes split the RCM board and Schonfeld even resigned over the issue. Van Der Zyl, who had been one of the initiators of these classes and represented Reform Judaism on the board was personally criticised. Schonfeld stated that ‘by virtue of his association with the Reform movement, his services would not be used by the orthodox’. Schonfeld also claimed that Van Der Zyl would not be an appropriate representative of the Jewish community in Britain in the light of his influence on the committee which he felt ‘(…) might tend towards sectarianism’. These issues, combined with a number of personal attacks, led to Van Der Zyl’s resignation in 1943. Following his resignation, he was able to obtain a temporary pulpit at the NWRS. In his opinion, the correspondence courses had been a successful teaching tool for the children and he had them reinstated at NWRS as a teaching tool. During the bombing of London, children had been unable to attend religious classes so these correspondence courses became very important.

Expanding and Uniting

Historically, the Liberal and Reform movements had been slow to expand. The first Reform synagogue in Britain had been founded in 1840 and by the end of the 19th century, the Reform movement had expanded to include two more congregations. The Liberal Movement’s first synagogue was founded in 1910 and two additional Liberal synagogues followed in the 1920’s. In London’s East End, the St. George’s settlement synagogue was established as a joint venture between Reform and Liberal movements. Table 10 provides a consolidated overview over the non-orthodox synagogues founded before 1933 including denomination and the founding year.
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Table 10 Progressive Synagogues in Britain in 1933

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synagogues Founded</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West London</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Congregation of British Jews</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Synagogue for British and Foreign Jews</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Jewish Synagogue</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central Liberal</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South London Liberal</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George’s Settlement</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 identifies the sixteen synagogues which were founded after 1933 with its location, denomination and year. The seven synagogues founded between 1840 and 1929 - within 89 years - are in stark contrast to the sixteen synagogues that were founded between 1933 and 1944. Comparing the two tables shows how both movements had been impacted by the inflow of refugees. The significant increase in membership fostered expansion.

Table 11 Synagogues in Britain by 1945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synagogues Founded</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Western Reform</td>
<td>Golders Green</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow New Synagogue</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton and Hove Progressive</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgware and District Reform Synagogue</td>
<td>Edgware</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Liberal Jewish Synagogue</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Liberal Jewish Congregation</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Liberal - Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Hebrew Congregation</td>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorking Jewish Communal Centre</td>
<td>Dorking</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Refugee Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford United Membership Group Synagogue</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Refugee Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilfracombe Hebrew Congregation</td>
<td>Ilfracombe</td>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>Refugee Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking United Synagogue Membership Group</td>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>Refugee Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchin Hebrew Congregation</td>
<td>Hitchin</td>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>Refugee Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Lynn Hebrew Congregation</td>
<td>King’s Lynn</td>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>Refugee Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing Liberal Synagogue</td>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate and Enfield Liberal Synagogue</td>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinai Synagogue</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three new synagogues had been founded in 1933, followed by two in 1934 and four in 1939 just before the beginning of the war. These new synagogues attest to the need of the immigrants to come together as Jews and as continental refugees. It needs to be pointed out that none of these synagogues, except for the newly founded NLJC (Belsize Square Synagogue), were exclusively refugee congregations. All of them shared their membership with Anglo and continental Jews to varying degrees. These newly-founded congregations can be seen as facilitators for the settlement process of refugees in Britain. As has already been pointed out in the introductory chapter, integration and the reconstruction of identity which had
been shattered by the process of going into exile was facilitated through institutions such as the synagogues and this process was supported by the active involvement of Anglo-Jewish members.

The synagogues that were established during the war years after 1939 were created by refugees and evacuees and sprung up throughout the country. The communities of Ilfracombe and Cheltenham are two examples of these temporary communities. Both were situated near military bases and not only served the refugee and evacuee populations but also the religious needs of British and allied Jewish soldiers. Table 11 also shows that three of these evacuee and refugee congregations were founded in 1940, followed by two more in 1943, and one in 1944. The Southgate and Enfield Liberal Synagogue is an example of one of these new congregations. The process of its creation was similar to all other congregations. As the refugees began to settle nearby, the need for a religious and social centre arose. A survey was undertaken among the Jewish population in order to identify the viability of such a venture. They were asked whether they would support such an endeavour. In the Southgate area, this resulted in the founding of a new, liberal synagogue in 1943. Its inaugural service was held by refugee rabbi Brasch on 8th January 1944 who also became the congregation’s new rabbi.

By 1944, sixteen new congregations had been founded and the membership was made up of three subgroups - refugees, evacuees and Anglo-Jews. These newly founded congregations associated with the Liberal and Progressive movements needed to be connected with the already existing congregations. Uniting all congregations under one umbrella organization and thus creating a network was the idea of rabbi Reinhart and Robert Henriques. The ‘Association of Synagogues of Great Britain’ was subsequently founded in 1942. The idea was influenced by the German rabbis who brought with them an understanding of the ‘Einheitsgemeinde’ community structure which was a unified community prevalent in Germany. Reinhart emphasized the cooperation between both progressive movements and was keen to maintain a neutral title. The objective of the Association was

\[(\ldots)\text{ to promote and foster a robust and virile Judaism which will contribute to the life of an entire Jewish community, and which will play its part, together with other religions, in a spiritual and physical betterment of mankind.}\]

This new organization had seven constituent member congregations, the established congregations of Bradford, Leeds, Manchester Synagogue of British Jews, Glasgow Progressive Synagogue, North Western Reform Synagogue, St. George’s Settlement Synagogue, and the West London Synagogue. All congregations were confronted with similar tasks, questions and challenges and the ASGB attempted to address these jointly. This cooperation also yielded synergies and pooled resources for further successful establishment
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and maintenance of new congregations. Overall it can be said that the ASGB network strengthened individual congregational work and facilitated joint expansion.\(^\text{247}\) It facilitated and improved networking among the rabbis and the board members of the individual congregations and encouraged the exchange of ideas and experiences which further propelled the movement forward. The experiences of the refugee rabbis in continental associations further aided the success.

The ASGB addressed and resolved a wide range of issues for its network of congregations. The first to be taken on was that of a unified prayer book. Six of these newly-founded communities already shared the same prayer book, the one created by WLS. Under the leadership of Van Der Zyl and the NWRC, a newly revised prayer book became available in 1943. Many congregations within the ASGB were interested in obtaining this prayer book for their members but were unable to shoulder the significant reprinting and distribution costs. Most of the fledgling communities were short of funds. The ASGB, with WLS as its major financial supporter decided to subsidize the new edition.\(^\text{248}\) An identical prayer book would facilitate a unified prayer services which was one step in unifying the synagogues. Apart from NWRC, the congregations of Glasgow, Bradford and Manchester were the first to obtain these reprinted prayer books.

Education for children and young adults was another important issue the ASGB addressed. This was important for strengthening the children’s Jewish identity. Before its founding, religious education had been the responsibility of the individual synagogues and was organized in accordance with the local rabbi and community leadership. Unifying religious education had been previously attempted and resulted in the creation of the ‘Council for Progressive Jewish Education’. This eventually failed but was revived under the ASGB which saw education as one of its main tasks.\(^\text{249}\) Additionally, other youth work was also seen an important feature of synagogue association and a Youth Committee was founded. As a former Youth Rabbi Van Der Zyl was particularly interested in youth work and supported this committee. As many congregations had youth initiatives, he sought to increase closer cooperation between all of these Jewish Reform Youth Organizations.\(^\text{250}\) He saw the youth movement as an opportunity for the exchange of information and ideas and as a means to create and strengthen identity and increase ties to the Jewish faith. He travelled around the country to other reform congregations who had similar programs. At these local youth meetings he regularly held talks and spoke on subjects such as ‘What is expected of the progressive Jew?’ These were usually followed by a discussion with the young people. Young rabbinc student Jacob Petuchowski was also involved in this work.\(^\text{251}\) Rabbi Graf at the Leeds Synagogue invited Van der Zyl to speak at the local youth organization about ‘What is to be expected of a Jew of today?’\(^\text{252}\) The title of this talk speaks to the changing self-understanding of young Jewish refugees in Britain. With their

\(^{247}\) “A.B.S.” SR, April 1944, 55.
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former context of identification no longer existing, a new Jewish context for self-identification was beginning to establish itself in Britain and was acknowledged in these talks. The youth movement began to thrive and expand as a result of these efforts. Some of the projects involved organized holidays and outings for the young people, and Van Der Zyl remained actively involved as their rabbi.

The experienced German rabbis were a significant resource. With their experience and education they would be placed with new congregations. This process was influenced by Reinhart. Soon after their arrival, Italiener and Lemle had been placed in positions in London in 1939. Gerhard Graf became the third refugee rabbi to obtain a rabbinic post and was placed in Bradford. He had been a graduate of the 'Hochschule' in Berlin in 1938 and had worked in the Jewish community there. Bradford was one of the first reform synagogues in Britain. The town had traditionally experienced strong German Jewish emigration because of the textile industry and its reform congregation had served this immigrant population. This small community had existed since being founded in the 1850’s but had largely remained without professional leadership. In the 1930’s, Bradford had become a destination for refugees, and they eventually sought to create a religious and social centre in their community. Again, as had been undertaken elsewhere, the public interest in this venture had to be ascertained. In order to generate public interest in the establishment of a new congregation and synagogue and to evaluate the need for it, an advertisement was placed in the JC, attempting to attract worshipers. This had previously been a successful approach to the founding of the Southgate and Enfield congregation in London.

The services of the re-invigorated Bradford Reform Congregation were advertised as including ‘Choir and Organ’ in the traditional German way. As its membership continuously increased, the appointment of a community rabbi soon became necessary. After several temporary engagements Graf was permanently assigned to this position in 1940. He, like Italiener and Lemle, was fluent in English, which was an advantage and made his placement easier. His work extended beyond the pulpit and he carried out traditional duties such as marriages and burials. He additionally gave religious instruction for children and adults in the congregation’s adult education classes. He also regularly held lectures. The Bradford synagogue Ladies Guild became involved in the care for the children of the Kindertransport and took on the responsibility for a group of twenty-six refugee boys. Rabbi Graf was in charge of their religious education. He had successfully transferred from Germany into exile and began to leave the condition of exile for an integrated life in Britain.

---
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In the neighbouring town of Leeds, refugees were also interested in establishing a reform congregation and again an advertisement was placed in the JC, seeking ‘like-minded Jews’. Subsequently a regular Friday night service was established in 1944. Initially, these were conducted by lay leaders but, for the High Holy Days, Reinhart arranged for a rabbi to hold services. Graf was sent to hold these services and became this community’s permanent rabbi in the same year. He took on the responsibility for both congregations and regularly held services at Bradford and Leeds. Soon after Graf’s arrival in Britain he and Reinhart had discussed the establishment of new congregations as a way of expanding the movement. The Leeds congregation, later named Sinai Synagogue, was the beginning.

Further north, in Scotland, the influx of refugees and evacuation had led to an unprecedented increase in the Jewish population. In Aberdeen, the lawyer, Dr. Julius Fackenheim from Halle, became the head of a newly organized community in 1939. His son Emil, a recent graduate of the ‘Hochschule’ in Berlin, held their Friday night services. He went on to study at Aberdeen University and supported himself by teaching Hebrew. He was classified as ‘Enemy Alien’, interned and sent to Canada.

In Glasgow the Jewish community had been an orthodox community. With the arrival of the refugees rose the demand for progressive services. Subsequently Rabbi Reinhart whose network reached up to Scotland sent rabbis Schreiber, Brasch and Katz on a monthly basis to Glasgow to hold these services in particular for the High Holy Days.

![Advertisement for Dr. Winter's Home](image)

Fig. 53
Advertisement for Dr. Winter’s Home.

Whilst permanent positions were only available for young rabbis who were fluent in English, temporary work for the refugees was available where language skills were not a problem. Being only marginally connected to a network further hampered the settlement and professional re-establishment in Britain. After their arrival several rabbis opted to leave the rabbinate altogether.

---
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Rabbi Dr. Winter, the former community rabbi of Lübeck, moved to Bournemouth with his wife. There they ran a hostel for children and young adults which was one of the many homes for the Kindertransports children. It opened in December 1938 and called itself the ‘strictly orthodox Dr. Winter’s home’.265

After his release from internment Rabbi Pfingst had also approached Reinhart about a rabbinic position. He was interested in working as rabbi in one of the newly founded refugee congregations. Reinhart supported him by issuing him a reference letter.266 However, he was unable to find employment as rabbi and in 1942, found employment as a warden of a hostel for refugee children.267

Those unable to find positions had to rely on the many aid organizations. Many were supported by the CRREC while others received support from organizations including the Jewish Refugee Committee (JRC) and the National Assistance Board (NAB), a government agency. These took over the support of refugees not otherwise supported.

Rabbi Erich Bienheim had been the former community rabbi of Darmstadt and was a graduate of the ‘Hochschule’. As a liberal rabbi, the CRREC had refused to support him and he thus became dependent on the JRC and the NAB.269 After his return from Australian internment in 1942, he could not find work as rabbi. To support himself, he took on a position as cook and French Polisher in London.270 He eventually obtained a part-time position as religious teacher.271 Another example is that of Rabbi Ignaz Maybaum. He had been able to obtain temporary work at the orthodox synagogues around London but also continued his academic endeavours. He began writing and was able to publish his book ‘Man and Catastrophe’ in 1941.

266 Reference letter for Rabbi Dr. Pfingst by Rabbi Harold Reinhart, 23 June, 1941, Private Papers of Dr. Pfingst.
267 Gustav Pfingst JRC, e-mail message to author, 18 April, 2012.
269 Erich Bienheim, JRC, e-mail message to author, 18 April, 2012.
270 Erich Bienheim, JRC, e-mail message to author, 18 April, 2012.
271 At Northwood and later St. George’s Settlement Synagogue. “New Bradford Reform Minister” JC, 10 June, 1949, 15.
This was followed by another publication ‘*Synagogue and Society*’ in 1944. Only after the war was he able to permanently return to the rabbinate. Even with his prominence and academic background, he had been unable to find permanent work. Retired rabbis managed to find permanent living quarters and occasionally officiated in their new surroundings. Together with his wife Rabbi Moritz David, a retired rabbi from Bochum had managed to move to one of the newly established refugee retirement homes, the Morris Freeman Home in Manchester.\(^272\)

The political circumstances surrounding the war influenced rabbinic work. Britain increasingly became a base for allied troops when the United States entered the war in 1941. They were accompanied by a significant number of US military chaplains. Many of the Jewish clergy were friends or acquainted with Reinhart who was also an American and were part of his network. Naturally, WLS became the central point of focus for religious exchange among the Jewish military chaplaincy and Reinhart invited the military rabbis to preach at the weekly services. This program expanded to a regular exchange of pulpits throughout British reform congregations and the Manchester Synagogue of British Jews was just one of the synagogues where US chaplains preached.\(^273\) The idea of providing a platform for an exchange of religious viewpoints was developed further and resulted in the ‘*Conference of American Chaplains*’ in 1944. In this formal exchange and informal networking involved the Christian and Jewish clergy and the refugee rabbis.\(^274\) Among the many guest rabbis at WLS was Reinhart’s friend and mentor Stephen Wise who had also come to Britain. He preached at the WLS in April 1945 just one month before the end of the war.\(^275\)

The religious leaders of the allied forces had become intricately involved in the British social and religious landscape and the Jewish soldiers arriving with the allied troops also made their mark. The orthodox Jewish personnel had posed a logistical problem as they needed to be supplied with kosher food. This was a difficult undertaking with rationing and a general scarcity of resources. But despite the circumstances, the task was successfully accomplished and an additional 5,000 orthodox allied soldiers could be supplied with kosher food.\(^276\) All of the allied Jewish soldiers, orthodox and liberal, created a demand for religious services near the bases where they were stationed. At Ilfracombe in North Devon was a training centre established in 1942 where assault techniques for the impending invasion were being practised.\(^277\) There a new congregation sprung up, made up of refugees, evacuees and the military personnel. Similarly another new congregation was set up in Cheltenham, Gloucestershire. Here the building of the abandoned local synagogue could be used to set up the Cheltenham Hebrew Congregation. At this re-established synagogue, services for Canadian, US American and Australian soldiers and for the large numbers of evacuees and refugees were held there.\(^278\) The arrival of Allied Forces

---
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thus inadvertently impacted the expansion of the movements. Additional congregations were being created, but many of them only temporarily. This also marked the beginning of more expansion and more congregations.

This chapter depicted the arrival of the refugee rabbis and the obstacles they faced. When they arrived in Britain most were factually destitute. They relied on and were supported by a number of refugee organizations and private initiatives. These existing support structures helped them to integrate and they soon became involved in assisting their fellow refugees. Permanent rabbinic employment however was difficult to obtain. When work became available, many rabbis were only able to secure part-time temporary positions. Many of these were not in the pulpit of synagogues but focused on aspects of pastoral care and religious instruction. Rabbis thus mainly worked as teachers and pastors for the Kindertransport children both at boarding houses and in the children’s camps. They also regularly held services for the many refugees who had arrived in Britain. This way, they were earning a small income from their work which made their own resettlement process easier. This also helped their fellow refugees to find
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Footnote: Allied Forces celebrate the Jewish New Year, at the Balfour Service Club, London, 1943. IWM, (Cat. No. D 16282). Captain Judah Nadich (US) (standing centre), raises his glass as he offers the Kiddush prayer. To the left of Captain Nadich (originally from Baltimore, Maryland), hidden by his right arm, is Captain Gershon Levi, from Montreal, Canada, a Rabbi with the Canadian forces. A group of Allied servicemen and women in the hallway at the Balfour Service Club, following the Rosh Hashanah celebrations, 1943. WM, Cat. No. D 16288). On the blackboards on the left are chalked the names of all who attended the feast. According to the original caption, many people were able to meet up with old friends at the celebrations. A Union flag and a flag featuring the Star of David hang on the wall above their heads.
solace in the services that were being held in the familiar continental tradition. As has been pointed out throughout this chapter, these services and with it rabbinic work served to re-establish the context of identity for the refugees.

Besides continuing their leadership positions for the refugee community refugee rabbis shared the same fate as all the other refugees. They too were classified as 'Enemy Aliens', were interned on the Isle of Man and subsequently deported to Canada or Australia. Those rabbis who had signed up for the Pioneer Corps supported the fighting troops not only as soldiers but also in an unofficial capacity as rabbis. Regardless of the circumstances, rabbis returned to their former roles as community leaders and pastors and cared for the spiritual needs of their fellow refugee soldiers / internees / deportees. On the home front, a new Jewish sense of self-understanding within the context of Anglo-Jewry arose. The effects of the war with evacuation and later the arrival of the troops sparked the creation of new synagogues and with it brought rabbis back into a number of pulpits. This applied only to rabbis who were fluent in English and those who were young enough to adapt to the cultural context were able to obtain these positions. Those who weren't closely tied to the giant clusters of the network and had not mastered the language and culture could only assist on the High Holy Days when services were held in German. Refugee rabbis involved themselves in a wide range of initiatives such as commemorative work and memorial services, fundraising for refugees in Palestine, and supporting organizations such as the AJR and the B'nai B'rith. They also worked for the preservation of the continental tradition of rabbinic learning and became instrumental in establishing organizations such as the ASB and youth organizations as giant clusters within the network. These networks were instrumental in initiatives such as the unified prayer books and progressive religious expansion.

Apart from their public roles, it has to be noted that rabbis they had been victims themselves but, true to their profession, were able to provide relief and support to their congregants. In this role, they were an integral part of the newly established sub-group of German-Jewish refugees who had sought to re-establish their identity under conditions of exile. A kind of surrogate home was established within the congregations many made up of refugees and hosting German rabbis. Of the services held in the continental fashion, various sources speak movingly about the emotional reaction of the refugees. These services regardless where they were held provided a space for mourning and reflection. The rabbis' sermons attempted to spread comfort and hope. In this environment, it became possible for all to acknowledge survival and the loss of one's home, friends and relatives. In the transit and internment camps, rabbis immediately tended to the spiritual and religious needs of the refugees and, in serving others, were propelled into an exposed position.

Attending services regularly was a form of religious expression for the refugees. Similar to Germany, the increase in attendance was clearly not the result of a sudden increase in piety but showed that these services served an important function. As a communal event with a strong social aspect, these services increased the sense of belonging for example among the internment camp inmates. Religion in this context contributed to community cohesion and
increased the sense of the refugee’s inter-dependence and connectedness through their common tradition. Beyond the social cohesion, the services in the continental tradition also supported the newly created ethnic sub-group of German and Austrian refugees, while upholding their heritage and religious tradition. The psychological and emotional function of sharing cultural traditions expressed in religious practice supports the need for belonging. This is particularly important where there is instability and uncertainty or where human beings exist in a place between time and space. The non-permanent place for resettlement such as exile is a temporary state where any kind of continuation of tradition provides stability. Religious practice thus also increased bonding through its social aspect and in turn led to a positive association with other refugees. A refugee sub-group had been created which promoted social solidarity and a sense of oneness and harmony. In conclusion, it can be said that the increase in synagogue attendances, which necessitated a vast number of overflow services for the Holy Days, can be attributed to the refugees’ need to re-establish their sense of identity.

Acknowledging pain and providing religious care through rituals was important and included ministering for the High Holy Days, consecrating cemeteries and conducting funerals, as well as spiritual and religious support. The rabbis provided this encouragement and support, either personally, through their sermons, or in publications such as congregational and internment newspapers. Their spiritual writings, that were similar to those that had been published in Germany, attempted to relate the current experiences to religion. At the same time, memorial work provided a vehicle for communally working through grief. Here too rabbis were instrumental, not only through memorial services for individuals, companions, friends and colleagues but also supporting the annual remembrance services for the November pogrom.

In the Kitchener Camp and in the Internment camps, a leadership vacuum existed among the refugees. These camps were self-governed and received only rudimentary supervision from the British authorities. The ‘rational-legal’ authority lay with the camp directors or camp leaders who had been chosen from among the ranks of the interned. In many cases this leadership position was awarded to rabbis. In the armed forces, refugee rabbis were subject of another kind of ‘rational-legal’ authority. While they were not part of the official religious leadership structure as padres within the Armed Forces, in an informal way as soldiers they provided pastoral care for their fellow refugees. The rabbis who had not enlisted served the home front. They provided religious services for the refugees and visited the children in their hostels and boarding houses for religious instruction and services, for pastoral care and comfort. A result of the outside pressures coupled with uncertain circumstances the rabbinate involved itself in a plethora of activities. Subsequently it again rose in esteem.

The events between 1938 and 1945 including World War II first hindered and later facilitated the settlement in Britain and integration into British society. The political fallout with internment and deportation frustrated re-settlement efforts, but these extenuating circumstances were an opportunity and drew rabbis into new directions and positions. Their educational background, their experiences and their resilience drew them into a new and increasing network. As part of
this network they were able to contribute to the religious expansion in Britain and were further
drawn into leadership positions with a new prestige.
~
Ending and Beginning 1945 - 1956
Preserving and Building Anew

Our generation passes on and the following does not know much anymore about Jewish life in Germany.

Rabbi Dr. Max Eschelbacher

\(^{1}\) Letter Max Eschelbacher to Curt Wilk, 12. March 1959; Curt Wilk Collection AR1152 MF188; LBI.
During the war, refugees had begun to settle into their new lives in Britain. Whilst, for some rabbis this process began sooner, for rabbis in internment or those who were enlisted in the armed forces, a new beginning had to be postponed. All the resettlement processes were facilitated by a large number of German-style organizations that had been founded by the refugees themselves to provide all kinds of financial, social and cultural assistance. During this time, the three religious movements continued to support the rabbis and enlist their cooperation. This heralded in a new era. As this chapter will show in particular in the post-war years the movements continued to expand and refugee rabbis were able to obtain permanent positions.

The post-war religious reconstruction efforts in Germany, which had been planned before the end of World War II, had initially focused only on material reconstruction and support for survivors - mainly delivering food and clothing. Later initiatives recognized the need for religious reconstruction and centred on the supply of religious articles and prayer books. In addition the organizations sent religious personnel to Germany, among them refugee rabbis now returning to their former home. Soon after the end of the war, Jewish life in Germany began to re-establish itself but these new communities differed greatly from that of the pre-war years and were now mainly made up of Eastern-European orthodox Jews, survivors of the concentration camps. Hardly any German Jews remained. With their divergent religious tradition, there was almost no need for the liberal refugee rabbis. They occasionally visited or were invited to official commemorative occasions and for the High Holy Days.

This chapter will detail how the arrival of Leo Back in London in 1945 gave the liberal refugee rabbinate new impetus. Now ideas which had been considered during the war years could be realized. These were to manifest progressive Judaism as a permanent fixture of Anglo-Jewry. The orthodox movement also benefited from the influx and influence of the refugee rabbinate. The CRREC had supported many financially and with employment and in these positions the rabbis served as catalyst for change which additionally solidified the Chief Rabbinate’s power and influence which can still be felt today.

By 1956, the refugees and the refugee rabbinate had become an integral part of Anglo-Jewry but were still distinctly identifiable as one of its subgroups. Nevertheless, the transformation of German-Jewry had commenced. In that year Leo Baeck and many of the refugee rabbis passed away. Simultaneously at several London synagogues, a changing of the guard took place as older rabbis vacated the pulpit to make way for a younger generation. They catered to their need for a new, modern approach with different values, ideals and ideas.

This chapter highlights the post-war developments in Germany and Britain and identifies their relevance and impact. It will examine the process of restarting professional careers and will detail the slow path of leaving the in-between state of exile for integration into Anglo-Jewry with the help of intricate networks. Additionally, it focuses on the attempts undertaken to salvage the remnants of German Jewish heritage as part of cultural transfer, an undertaking of limited success, as the introductory quote by Eschelbacher implies.
Post-War Relief in Germany

While refugees were becoming more rooted in Britain and focused on rebuilding their lives they still experienced the strong affiliation with what they once considered ‘home’.

My roots rest deeply in German soil. When I attempted to extricate them, some broke off and remained in the soil. How else could I explain that sometimes a quiet force from far away silently, but insistently tugs at my heart?\(^2\)

The daughter of the former Berlin cantor, Davidsohn, describes her exile with her roots inextricably bound to German soil. This is also reflected in the bonding among the refugees and the establishment of this ethnic sub-group but also in the concern for Germany and the remaining, surviving Jews. Thus many refugees became involved in post-war reconstruction and assistance to the needy. As early as 1942 the CRREC initiated the first efforts at post-War Religious Reconstruction on the Continent and created the ‘mobile ambulance synagogue scheme’. Ambulances were refitted as first-aid clinics but with the possibility to serve as fully-equipped mobile synagogues. These ambulances also delivered food and religious supplies to the survivors. They brought Sabbath candles, prayer shawls and Tefillin. These mobile ambulances had the purpose to ‘facilitate the mental rehabilitation of Jewish sufferers’\(^3\)

As the war progressed and hopes that Germany would be defeated rose, other organizations also prepared for Germany’s eventual liberation and reconstruction. In January 1943 the CBF financially supported the founding of the ‘Jewish Committee for Relief Abroad’ (JCRA), which planned to supply food and clothing to the survivors. This pragmatic approach served the physical needs of the survivors, while the CRREC’s efforts focused on mental and spiritual rehabilitation. Both efforts eventually merged and were later renamed as the ‘Jewish Relief Unit’ (JRU). For political reasons, this organization wanted to remain neutral and to refrain from getting involved in any political or legal issues.\(^4\) In particular Zionism was a complicated and antagonizing issue and needed to be refrained from. Taking a political position or cause could have alienated British officials in government and military offices and would have undermined the entire effort. Until the end of the war, the committee recruited and trained volunteers and prepared them for their work with survivors. Countless refugees had volunteered their service in a wide range of capacities and among the volunteers were also twenty-five rabbis. Strict selection criteria were applied in choosing the volunteers. Only British citizens could go to Germany which excluded the refugee rabbis as they had not yet been granted citizenship. Only non-Zionists and among the rabbis, only orthodox were chosen, with four refugee rabbis becoming part of this reconstruction effort in Germany.\(^5\)

Rabbis were an essential part in the liberation of the concentration camps and provided for the most basic spiritual needs of the survivors. Clergy were among the liberators of the concentration camps. Fig. 50 show the prayers of a Christian and Jewish military chaplain at the site of one of the mass graves in Bergen-Belsen and the first religious services held outdoors

\(^2\) Ilse Stanley, Die Unvergessenen (Wien: Desch, 1964), 12.
\(^3\) Pamela Shatzkes, Holocaust and Rescue: Impotent or Indifferent? Anglo-Jewry 1938 - 1945 (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), 207. Referring to war time correspondence between Schonfeld and the War office.
\(^4\) Ibid., 203.
\(^5\) Ibid., 204.
just after liberation. This camp soon turned into a Displaced Person’s camp (DP camp) and was inhabited by survivors until the 1950s when it was dissolved. The Jewish population in the DP camps was mostly made up of Eastern European Jews. Their religious leadership was taken on by rabbis who represented their religious convictions, mostly from the Chassidic school. Whilst the displaced persons lived mainly in the DP camps, the surviving German Jews generally resided amongst the German population in towns and villages. There, soon new communities were being created and religious services were reinstated - at times in the remnants of the old congregations. The religious services were often conducted by lay leaders with prayer books supplied by the JRU. They had also sent Tallesim, Mezusot and where possible additionally assisted in recovering looted synagogue silver, wherever possible. All over Germany there was an urgent need for rabbis and religious teachers at this time. No other religious leadership apart from the Jewish chaplains of the Armed Forces and the few survivor rabbis and teachers was available. This is confirmed by data from Berlin. This, the largest of the re-established Jewish communities had at the end of 1945 already 540 members, but not a single rabbi among them.

Fig. 56
Rabbi at a Mass Grave in Bergen Belsen and First Prayer Service after Liberation.

By 1947, the ‘Joint Distribution Committee’ (Joint) estimated the Jewish population in Germany to be around 16,000, and this figure excluded survivors residing in the DP camps. Of these, 4,500 were in the American Zone, 4,000 in the British zone and 500 were in the French Zone. By that time, the Jewish population in Berlin had increased fifteen-fold to around 7,500.

---
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9 IWM, Catalogue number: BU 4270. Two British Army chaplains, Rev Leslie H Hardman, Senior Jewish Chaplain to the 2nd Army, and the Roman Catholic Padre Father M C Morrison, conduct a service over one of the mass graves before it is filled in, April 1945.Bergen Belsen, Germany, The first prayer after the liberation at the Liberation Square in the DP camp, April 1945. Yad Vashem Photo Archive, Item ID: 21983; Album Number: FA185/154. In the center of the photograph (from left to right): Rabbi Leslie Hardman (US), Dr. Zvi Helfgott, and Rabbi Goldfinger.
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Whilst re-settlement efforts for the survivors outside of Germany continued a debate about the future of Jewish life in Germany was ongoing. While this debate about the impossibility or inability to start again in Germany went on, Jewish life in Germany had already started anew.

With the lack of Jewish leadership in the re-establishing communities Germany, rabbis in exile could have returned to Germany to assist. But rabbis in Britain either could not or would not return. Many obstacles prevented them from becoming involved in the reconstruction of Jewish life in Germany. First and foremost there was the issue of nationality which had prevented many from returning. By 1945, very few of the refugees had been able to obtain British citizenship. This had been one of the prerequisites for working for the JRU. Another obstacle was the fact that the CRREC only accepted orthodox rabbis for reconstruction work. Additionally, personal ambivalence or unwillingness on the part of many refugee rabbis precluded their return to Germany. Alexander Carlebach, an orthodox rabbi from Germany who had decided to return and was given the necessary permits to do so was part of the reconstruction effort. He reported his experiences and noted the lack of spiritual care for the survivors.

Jews in Germany have a serious grudge against their brethren abroad: that their spiritual assistance was quite out of proportion to the material help given. As one of their leaders said: “It seems easier to bring hundreds of tons of food into Germany than a dozen rabbis and teachers.” The chief complaint however is against their own former rabbis. If they had to leave - and who was there to tell them not to? - why hadn’t they, or some of them, come back now when it was not longer a matter of life and death?\(^\text{12}\)

An explanation for the unwillingness of rabbis to return to Germany was expressed by journalist and author Robert Weltsch.

We cannot presume that there are Jews who feel attracted to Germany. Here it smells like corpses, gas chambers and torture chambers. But indeed a few thousand live in Germany today. (...) this rest of Jewish settlement should be liquidated as fast as possible. Germany is no soil for Jews.\(^\text{13}\)

The JRU was aware of the lack of teachers and rabbis and of their importance for spiritual and religious support. In return this organization encouraged rabbis to obtain leave from their British congregations so that they could help out in Germany. In his position as rabbi in Germany, Carlebach appealed to the Jewish communities abroad not to forsake the remnants of German Jewry.

The future of German Jewry is dark, and clouded with many external and internal difficulties. It cannot be expected to fend for itself. (...) Even if we had a choice, World Jewry could not disinterest itself in the fate of German Jewry, however much reduced in numbers and however poor spiritually and materially. But we have no choice, and, with so many problems and troubles on our hands already, this one must receive the loving and intelligent attention which the Jewish people owe to his “lost tribe” of Israel.\(^\text{14}\)

Most rabbis refrained from returning to Germany permanently but there were three exceptions: Isidor Broch had held a position at an orthodox synagogue in London when he was granted leave and went to Germany. Just like Carlebach, he remained for one year and was financially


\(^{14}\) Carlebach “Future”, 297.
supported by the JCRA.\textsuperscript{15} Working with the JCRA he had initially been assigned to temporary reconstruction work in Germany. Later he was appointed as Chief Rabbi in the British Zone, a position he held from 1948 until 1949 when he returned to Britain. Broch’s placement was intended to be only temporary and he was to be replaced by a local rabbi. Paul Holzer from Hamburg also assisted in Germany, he had been unable to obtain a pulpit in Britain which made him more inclined to return to Germany. As no local rabbi could be found to succeed Broch in 1949 Holzer was eventually awarded this position. He also worked for the CRREC in the British Zone and was appointed ‘Landesrabbiner’ for Nordrhein-Westfalen in 1951. He served in this position until his retirement in 1958.\textsuperscript{16} His work and position were both financed by the JCRA and the CBF.\textsuperscript{17} Another rabbi, Moritz Freier originally from Berlin regularly visited his former home town and worked there on temporary assignments of varying length. He was appointed community rabbi there in 1949.\textsuperscript{18}

In the post-war years these JCRA efforts supported the reconstruction and re-establishment of communities. Nearly one hundred Jewish communities were established on German soil. These fledgling communities were eventually able to manage their own affairs and they were later united under the ‘Central Council of German Jews’, the ‘Zentralrat’.\textsuperscript{19} This development was a tremendous success of post-war reconstruction but these newly-founded Jewish communities experienced instability and conflict caused by divergent ethnicity and religious belief. The once thriving German Jewish communities had made way for orthodox Eastern European religious tradition. In a report for the ‘Joint’ this change in German Jewish religious landscape was aptly summarized and it concluded in 1948 that ‘German Jewry had ceased to exist.’ Many of these briefly thriving communities eventually dissolved as its members, all of whom were survivors, emigrated abroad.

Those rabbis who had served in the Pioneer Corps or in other branches of the military and had already completed their tours of duty were asked to return to Germany. The occupational forces there needed interpreters and intelligence officers who were fluent in German language and culture. They were required as translators and to help with the various reconstruction and de-Nazification efforts. De-Nazification was the process of ascertaining the level of NSDAP, Gestapo and Wehrmacht membership amongst the German population. Karl Rautenberg, who had changed his name to Charles Berg, served as a private in military intelligence.\textsuperscript{21} Rabbi Kurt Kassell, now Curtis Cassel served in the rank of Staff Sergeant. As a translator for de-Nazification, one of those officials he interviewed was Konrad Adenauer who would later become the first post-war chancellor of Germany.\textsuperscript{22} Both rabbis shared their experiences with...
the readers of the SR back in Britain and painted a picture of hope rising above the unspeakable suffering in Germany.

_Rabbi Charles Berg, a private in the British Army (…) gave a first-hand account of the plight of the surviving Jews on the Continent, and how, despite their horrible suffering, they heard the call of the Sabbath of Comfort (…). And so amidst the scene of despair and devastation the spirit of Israel lives on_.

The protracted citizenship issues and the restrictions imposed on returnees working in Germany had prevented preacher Max Abraham from joining the British reconstruction efforts. Determined to go to Germany and assist, he instead signed up with the ‘American Army of Occupation in Germany’ and assisted in rebuilding Jewish life there. Writing about his experiences in the SR, he declared that with his return and work there he wanted to _bring back humanity into the relationship between men_. As part of his duties, he worked as spiritual guide, pastor and rabbi in newly re-constituted communities in Offenbach and he held Holy Day services in 1945. The Jewish reconstruction efforts continued well into the 1950’s, and more rabbis, including Leo Baeck, were now willing to travel to Germany.
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The arrival of Leo Baeck in Britain in September 1945 marked the beginning of a new era. After the November pogrom, he had remained in Germany as the head of the ‘Reichsvertretung’, the representative body of German Jews, and had been deported to Theresienstadt in 1943. There he became the head of the ‘Judenrat’, the camp representative body. After liberation, he arrived in London in September 1945 where he resided with his daughter and son-in-law, Ruth and Hermann Berlak. Even though his experiences in Theresienstadt had put a great strain on him, he immediately involved himself in a number of activities for the refugees and the refugee rabbinate who received him enthusiastically. He
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immediately became a central node in the network with close ties to the refugees, the refugee rabbinate and an important personality in the Anglo-Jewish landscape. At a dinner given in his honour at the WLS, all of his former friends, students and colleagues now in Britain were assembled. They were all the members of the liberal rabbinate in exile and included rabbis Baneth, Bienheim, Cassell, Italiener, Katten, Katz, and Kokotek, Loewenstamm, Maybaum, Reinhart, Rosenthal, Salzberger, Schreiber, Seligmann, Van Der Zyl and Warschauer. Baeck addressed this gathering and reiterated his own perception of the rabbinate and its role within the centre of the Jewish community. For him, being a rabbi was a *solemn purpose he had always cherished to make the name Rabbi honoured, and of the privilege he had always felt in bearing the title.*

He immediately took on his role as leader of German Jewry - albeit in exile. As its principal representative, he was awarded many honorary chairmanships, presidencies and board memberships such as presidency of the *Council for the Protection of the Rights and Interests of Jews from Germany*, the presidency of the *American Joint Committee*, leadership position in the *World Jewish Congress* and countless others. Speaking at one of their meetings, he looked towards Germany and was adamant about its Jewish future. He reiterated what the *Joint* Committee had concluded that same year and stated clearly that the history of the Jews in Germany had come to an end. Whilst he acknowledged that there was still Jewish life in Germany *‘their creative history had come to a close; honour and dignity did not permit us to live on German soil.’*
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For Leo Baeck and many other rabbis, living in Germany was out of the question, but visiting Germany was an important part of reconciliation and post-war reconstruction. In 1948, Baeck went on an extensive trip of the Western Zones. As he attempted to identify where and how Jewish organizations could assist, his main concern was for the living conditions of the survivors. In 1949, Eschelbacher who was already 65 years old also returned to his former community in Düsseldorf. There he held High Holy Day services, presided at a number of official occasions as the community’s former representative and in that capacity was also received by Allied military and German officials. The JRU had organized a lecture tour for him; he held a radio address and visited several of the larger congregations including Berlin. There he observed the lack of religious personnel. This was needed to support the Jewish population and to also once again defend Judaism.

*In Berlin and elsewhere there was a lack of rabbis who could represent Judaism internally and externally, able to answer the many questions of Jews and with the rising religious exchanges be able to counter the Christian theologians.*

Soon, other rabbis would follow suit. In 1950, three rabbis Eschelbacher, Holzer and Schreiber were sent to the British zone. Max Eschelbacher, Paul Holzer and Hermann Schreiber formerly of Potsdam, held High Holy Day services in Cologne, Dortmund and Düsseldorf. In the same year, Salzberger was asked to attend the re-opening of the reconstructed Westend Synagogue in Frankfurt. In his speech, he emphasized the pain he had felt in revisiting his old place of employment and the centre of his community that had now perished.

*But you will understand that for me personally there mixes melancholy memoirs into the joy over this building, as it is a reunion which I celebrate after eleven years with this synagogue.*

By 1953 Jewish life had become a permanent fixture in Germany and regular High Holy Day services were being held in many communities. Again the refugee rabbis Eschelbacher, Broch and Schreiber travelled to Germany to their former communities and continued to conduct services there. Not only the High Holy Days were an occasion for rabbis to travel to Germany, but also memorial services for the November pogrom. Eschelbacher deliver a memorial address on the 15th anniversary of the November pogrom in Düsseldorf in the same year. On this occasion, Leo Back also travelled to Germany and gave a radio address about ‘the significance of the destruction of the synagogues’.
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Post-War Britain

Liberation and reconstruction had brought Jewish life back to Germany. In Britain, a sense of normality was also returning as refugees continued to rebuild their lives. This new beginning was intricately connected to the question of citizenship. Refugees were no longer German but were not yet British and thus were caught between two identities. Already during the war, many had already applied for naturalization but these applications were not being given consideration by the Home Office. Even those applicants who had joined the Pioneer Corps were being refused citizenship. Many refugees who had joined the forces had unsuccessfully argued at the beginning of the war that with British citizenship they would be protected under international law should they become prisoners of war. But this argument was rejected and the issue left unresolved. By November 1945, shortly after the end of the war, some categories of refugees did become eligible to apply for citizenship. However, the high number of applications coupled with limited capacity and unwillingness on the part of the Home Office created a time lag of up to two years between citizenship application and naturalization. Those refugees who had belonged to the fighting forces were given earlier consideration and granted citizenship before other refugees and so Curtis Cassell was naturalized as early as 1946. At that time, he had already been a community rabbi in Glasgow for over a year. In an article in the SR, he reflected on the entire issue of citizenship calling it a gift to be cherished.

_Citizenship, as many other virtues, is not a natural gift; we have to acquire it; we may lose it; but, above all we have to nurse it most carefully: (...) and to approach this question as Jews is only natural, because it is as Jews that we are and must be citizens._

The issues surrounding citizenship and naturalization were being resolved between 1947 and 1948, when all refugee rabbis were finally being allowed to apply for naturalization. This made a new beginning possible and aided the transfer from a condition of statelessness to new citizenship and with it a fresh self-perception. Joseph Asher, son of Rabbi Jonas Ansbacher from Wiesbaden reflected on the new feelings his father had for Britain upon his naturalization in 1949.

_A new patriotism had blossomed in my father's breast and intellect. When he received his British citizenship and passport a few months after I received mine, he sent me a congratulatory letter: Mazal Tov. You are now second-generation British!_

This changed self-perception de-emphasized the importance of clinging to old habits, patterns, ideas and ideals. The in-between state of exile was slowly dissipating and a new identity rose up. One of the most significant outward sign of this change was the decreasing use of the German language another move towards integration into Britain and Anglo-Jewry. Services that had previously been entirely or partly conducted in German had changed and
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were increasingly being held exclusively in English. The social and cultural heritage the refugee brought to Britain paired with the condition of exile had created a new identity: a ‘British-German-Jewish-Refugee-Citizen’ identity. Asher continued to reflect on this change of identity.

Several years in England fashioned for my father as deep a sense of loyalty to Britain as did centuries of living in Germany for his ancestors. I do not know whether this is a German trait but it describes, perhaps in the most elementary way, the Jews’ fierce attachment to the world around them. Their commitment to Western civilization has been second only to their commitment to Jewish values.\[44\]

Integration into Britain also entailed the letting go of the ties that bound refugees to Germany. This was welcomed a sign that they were moving forward. But Leo Baeck called on the refugees to make an effort to preserve their common heritage. He was head of the ‘Council for the Protection of the Rights and Interests of Jews from Germany’ an organization devoted its efforts to negotiating restitution with post-war Germany. In that position, he continuously reminded the members that they and the organization were entrusted with the leadership of all German Jews who had settled in Britain. At one of the conferences he called on its members not to forget their declared task - to preserve their own heritage - at least for the lifetime of the German-speaking generations.\[45\] Whilst proclaiming that German Jewry had effectively come to an end, Baeck supported every opportunity to help transfer this common heritage into a new context. In particular, he acted as the catalyst for a large number of organizations and initiatives where he gave new impetus and legitimization to those efforts aiming to preserve and continue the history of German Judaism and the German rabbinate.

Jewish Learning

With the arrival of the refugee rabbis in Britain started the ‘Monday Morning Lectures’, in rabbi Reinhart’s office at WLS. They had become an essential part of the rabbinic experience in Britain. Initially, these meetings were intended as a regular weekly social meeting which facilitated networking but soon became an intellectual exchange on theological, philosophical and historical topics. Word of mouth had spread news of its existence to all newly arriving rabbis and it became a gathering of the continental rabbinate in exile. These gatherings had the function of facilitating entry into exile while providing a protected environment for continuing the familiar professional existence. The weekly attendances numbered between forty and seventy-five rabbis, teachers, professors and intellectuals.\[46\] These lectures were soon evolving into an educational institution, preserving the memory of the ‘Hochschule’ in Berlin and the ‘Jewish-Theological Seminary’ in Breslau. Among the rabbis were many of these institution’s former professors. With their cumulative knowledge they helped former rabbinic students also attending these meetings to now complete their disrupted rabbinic studies with private lessons.\[47\] In a small way and within a limited circle, this was an attempt to salvage the remnants of these institutions and transfer them into a new context in Britain. Before the outbreak of the
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war, efforts were made to move the entire ‘Hochschule’ from Berlin to England but since Baeck could not be convinced to preside over this newly created institution, these plans were never realized. Anecdotal evidence suggests that Baeck actually spoke about plans for continuation of this institution in England to one of his students in Berlin in 1942. ‘Should we survive the war, I will make sure that the work of the Hochschule will be continued in England.’ With the arrival of Leo Baeck in London in 1945, the character of the ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ began to change. His presence gave the lectures the prominence and attention needed in order to turn them into a serious academic endeavour with new direction and focus. Attendances increased over time and the lectures became the forum and catalyst for renewed Jewish learning in Britain.

One of the earliest members of this circle and one of its pillars was Caesar Seligmann, a well known personality, scholar and eloquent preacher. His powerful contributions to the meetings are described by Salzberger, who attended as one of the members. He provides a brief glimpse into this illustrious circle of rabbis and their weekly meetings when he admiringly describes Seligmann, showing the intellectual calibre, not only of Seligmann, but of all who attended.

In London (...) as senior of the rabbis from Germany he regularly visited Baeck’s outstanding Monday lectures and was always the one who impressed the participants in the discussions with his expansive general and Jewish knowledge, his certain judgment and extraordinary memory. The rabbis realized the educational value of these ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ for a wider audience with the potential to increase Jewish learning in Britain. With this in mind, two sets of public lecture series were created. One aimed at general, popular interest and the other geared towards an academic audience. The once informal meetings were now transferred into a more formal setting and culminated in the founding of the ‘Society for Jewish Study’ in 1946. According to the Society’s statute this new public format was to realize the premise of providing Jewish learning free from denominational differences. In this effort, it was supported by all segments of the community, both orthodox and liberal. With this unique approach and support, the ‘Society’ filled a gap in Jewish learning. No other scholarly institution existed in Britain devoted to overarching, non-denominational Jewish scholarship. Prominent members of Anglo-Jewry supported the ‘Society’ and its aims and became its trustees. These included Viscount Bearsted, Lord Justice Cohen, Basil Henriques, Leonard Montefiore, the Marquess of Reading, Anthony de Rothschild and Rabbi Reinhart. He additionally had persuaded Baeck to become the society’s first president, feeling that this would guarantee its success.
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The program of lectures was not just representative of Jewish learning, but also presented the very latest scientific research in topics such as philosophy, psychology, the Bible, archaeology, history, literature, the Hebrew language and Jewish culture. Leo Baeck himself divided his time between the US and Britain and lectured regularly at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. In his absence, lectures were held by a number of presenters. They came from England, Israel and the United States. Listed in Table 12 are some of these prominent speakers who appeared between 1948 and 1952. These lectures were not anymore exclusive to the refugees but combined scholarship from Anglo-Jewry, American academics, Israeli professors and a number of intellectuals who were not active in the academic world. The list of speakers reveals the intricate worldwide network that had been created among the many academics and intellectuals who were rooted in Jewish studies.
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This network that was partly based on the remnants of the former German network can be seen as an effort to preserve Jewish learning, which once had been a central aspect of German Jewry and the rabbinate.

The ‘Society for Jewish Study’ was only one of the projects dedicated to the transfer of German Jewish learning into a new, British context and soon found another purpose. The umbrella organization for progressive congregations, the ASGB had since its inception in 1942 continuously identified a lack of qualified Jewish teachers able to serve the congregations. Over time a number of ways had been discussed for solving this problem, but no solution had been found. At the ASGB annual conference in 1950, this topic was discussed again and analyzed. One of the problems was the lack of appeal of this profession. Making it more appealing was
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seen as one of the many ways to remedy this shortcoming. As a result efforts were undertaken to find suitable candidates for these positions. They would have to be university graduates, willing to continue their education and train as Jewish teachers. As an additional incentive to attract these suitable candidates, a scholarship fund was set up which would award £50 annually to each candidate. Among the same line was the lack of rabbinic candidates identified, also difficult to find. Hoping to attract them, the ASGB placed advertisements in the Jewish Chronicle calling on young men to apply to train as rabbis. These positions also offered the additional incentive of a scholarship. Later, on the occasion of Leo Baeck’s 80th birthday in 1953, this scholarship fund was renamed as ‘The Leo Baeck Scholarship Fund’ and received an additional endowment of £30,000. Its declared purpose was to support the training of ministers and teachers of religion.

Table 12 Presenters at the Society for Jewish Study 1948-1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leo Baeck</td>
<td>Professor at Hebrew Union College</td>
<td>Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Altmann</td>
<td>Community Rabbi Manchester</td>
<td>Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Eshelbacher</td>
<td>Occasional Lecturer in Cambridge</td>
<td>Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Katten</td>
<td>Member Rabbinic Court</td>
<td>Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg Salzberger</td>
<td>Community Rabbi Belsize Square Synagogue</td>
<td>Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Baneth</td>
<td>Rabbi Jewish Society for the Blind</td>
<td>Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner Van Der Zyl</td>
<td>Rabbi North Western Reform</td>
<td>Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Cassell</td>
<td>Rabbi West London Synagogue</td>
<td>Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Zettlin</td>
<td>Professor Rabbinic Literature</td>
<td>Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Neumann</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Dropsie College, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwin Rosenthal</td>
<td>Reader in Oriental Studies</td>
<td>Cambridge University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.L. Teicher</td>
<td>Lecturer in Rabbinics</td>
<td>Cambridge University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Daube</td>
<td>Lecturer in Roman Law</td>
<td>Cambridge University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernhard Lewis</td>
<td>Lecturer School of Oriental and African Studies</td>
<td>Cambridge University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Walzer</td>
<td>Lecturer Greek and Arabic</td>
<td>Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaim Rabin</td>
<td>Lecturer Post-Biblical Hebrew</td>
<td>Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Simon</td>
<td>Hebrew Scholar</td>
<td>Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Buber</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Hebrew University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar Rabinowicz</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Hebrew University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Heller</td>
<td>Lecturer Hebrew Department</td>
<td>University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Birnbaum</td>
<td>Researcher School of Oriental and African Studies</td>
<td>University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob Levene</td>
<td>Department Oriental Printed Books and Manuscripts</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst Mueller</td>
<td>former Librarian Wiener Kultusgemeinde</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Diringer</td>
<td>British Linguist, Palaeographer and Writer</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Reichmann</td>
<td>Historian and Author</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Emden</td>
<td>British Historian</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The training took place at the ‘Society’ which was located in the Annex of WLS. While the training was supported through fundraising, the majority of its cost was being borne by the WLS. In the post-war years, fundraising for the ‘Society’ and for Jewish learning in Britain became
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increasingly difficult. Since the creation of the State of Israel, most of the fundraising went towards supporting its establishment and its institutions. As a result, many of the Jewish institutions and charitable causes in Britain supporting British causes experienced financial shortages. However, despite these financial difficulties, the ‘Society’ continued with its training work of rabbis and teachers by its vast number of highly-qualified members. This training was named the ‘Monday Morning Seminary’ and was placed under the auspices of the ‘Society’. Arthur Loewenstamm, formerly community rabbi in Spandau was the society’s librarian and secretary and became the director of studies for this seminary. Together with Rabbi Max Katten from Bamberg, he created both the lecture series and the seminary program. Together with Curtis Cassell, they also organized the teacher refresher courses. These classes usually lasted a few days and were taught by the refugee rabbis. Hermann Schreiber taught Hebrew, Baeck and Loewenstamm both taught Talmud, Midrash, Codes, Jewish Philosophy and Bible Exegesis. Eschelbacher and Van Der Zyl, who was also the chairman of the seminary, lectured regularly on a wide range of subjects. In an effort to transfer Jewish knowledge and foster a positive association with Judaism, the ‘Society’ additionally focused on young adults. In this context, Rabbi Bruno Italiener held lectures geared towards adults aged over sixteen. The ‘Society’ provided an essential service for both the refugees and Anglo-Jewry and became an integral part of Jewish intellectual learning. Other institutions with similar purpose had also been set up. In order to differentiate itself from them, the ‘Society’ vehemently emphasized that its quality of courses and lecturers was superior. It stood apart from organizations such as literature clubs or ‘Volkshochschule’, (‘People’s University’).

The ‘Monday Morning Seminary’ trained religious teachers and rabbis and provided qualified personnel for the non-orthodox congregations and their religious instructions. Modelled on the German rabbinic training process, rabbinic education was undertaken in two parts: candidates initially trained to become preachers or ministers and, following further training, were ordained as rabbis. Those who had passed their exams and were graduating were officially ordained in the traditional way. For that purpose, a ‘Beth Din’, a commission of three rabbis would convene and examine the candidates. This commission usually consisted of rabbis Loewenstamm, Katten and Baec, who made up the ‘Examination Board for Reform Rabbis’. By 1952, the Society had ordained two ministers and had trained one student as a rabbinic candidate. Whilst the names cannot be verified today, it is most likely that these were rabbis Konrad Sawady, Charles Berg and Jakob Petuchowski respectively. Cultural transfer to the next generation had begun and with it the younger generation entered the re-established network and expanded it with their own contacts.
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All of these educational initiatives would not have been possible without the extensive library at the WLS that contained 3,000 books in Hebrew and English and covered many subjects including Jewish learning and the broad area of the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’. Immediately after the war, many Jewish books were discovered all over Germany and these unclaimed books were collected at a central repository in Offenbach depicted in Fig. 60. The allied plan was to donate these books to Jewish institutions throughout the world and to make them once again accessible to the public. With the help of the ‘Committee for Restoration of Jewish Books, Museums and Archives’ it was possible for the WLS to acquire a vast number of additional books. It can be presumed that this was possible through Rabbi Reinhart’s ties to the US Forces who led the efforts around the central repository. Among them were many books which had once belonged to the ‘Hochschule’. This increased the collection of WLS by another 2,500 books. Today, these books form part of the collection in the Leo Baeck College Library in London.

In 1948, the members of the ‘Society’ engaged in a discussion about its future direction. In eight years it had evolved from an informal lecture circle into a temporary training institution. But the work of the ‘Society’ was to be further expanded. In an attempt to foster its academic ambition the ‘Society’ wanted to begin funding scientific research and support the publishing of
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Additionally, the education of rabbis and teachers was to be professionalized. Under the pragmatic leadership of Van Der Zyl, the ‘Jewish Theological College’ was established in 1956. It was the first non-orthodox training centre for teachers and rabbis in Britain. Up until this point, the exile rabbinate had been able to prepare rabbinic students for their future roles but, as time passed, these aging men were no longer able to undertake this training. Consequently, a new generation of rabbis including Jakob Petuchowski and Hugo Gryn had to be sent to the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati to complete their education. Gryn, who had survived Auschwitz, had arrived in Britain in 1946 in a post-war children’s transport that had been arranged by the CBF in London. There, under the influence of Leo Baeck and Lily Montagu, he became interested in the rabbinate. After completing his initial training in London under the auspices of the refugee rabbis and the ‘Society’, both men were then sent to the US to finish their training. Financing their education and stay in the US was partly taken on by the ASGB and the ‘Society’s’ scholarship funds.

When the ‘Jewish Theological College’ opened in 1956, it had already taken on the first rabbinic candidates - Lionel Blue and Michael Leigh, who had answered the advertisement in the JC. Just one month after the College had officially opened, Leo Baeck passed away. In his honour the college was then renamed the ‘Leo Baeck College’. To date 150 rabbinic graduates and hundreds of religious teachers have been educated there.

Consolidation and Expansion

Since the ASGB was founded in 1942, one of its goals had been the expansion of progressive Judaism beyond its seven constituent congregations.\(^8^1\) These expansion plans needed to include the training of a new generation of rabbis and Jewish teachers, the essential personnel and the key to the success of the newly-founded congregations. Another important factor in unifying the congregations was the common, a standardized prayer book for all member congregations. Other goals included an emphasis on religious education for children and adults, which was also regarded as an urgent matter.\(^8^2\) In light of contemporary modern life, Jewish religious practice was increasingly being neglected. Initially religious education had been the individual responsibility of each congregation with lessons at the discretion of the congregation rabbi. With this individualized education the quality and content varied widely among the congregations. Standardizing religious school curricula, so the contention of the ASGB, would lead to a better quality of education. So the ‘Council for Progressive Jewish Education’ was founded and its president became Curtis Cassell. The changes the Council implemented led to a huge increase in the demands for religious education. By 1950, 633 children were receiving instruction at the nine different congregations. While more children wanted to enrol in this educational program and congregations had spare capacity, a shortage of qualified teachers made further expansion impossible.\(^8^3\)

The ASGB revisited the issue of a standardized prayer book. The WLS prayer book had been re-published in 1943 and become the standard work for the ASGB congregations. In 1952, this prayer book underwent another revision by the ‘Assembly of Ministers’, an umbrella organizations were many refugee rabbis were members.\(^8^4\)

While many of the above issues pertained to the inner workings and a standardization of the congregations other more personal issues had been brought into the congregations by its members. These centred on individual personal status of marriage, divorce and conversion. In a Jewish context these issues are generally resolved by a rabbinic court or ‘Beth Din’ which would give the necessary rulings in accordance to Jewish law and provide resolution in an authoritative fashion. The ASGB annual conference concerned itself with these problems and decided in 1947 to establish such a court. It was created in 1948.\(^8^5\) Establishing this pivotal institution was only possible because of the refugee rabbis. They had necessary extensive experience and in-depth knowledge of the subject matter. Jonathan Romain, an academic and rabbi, wrote extensively about both the history and the rulings of the Reform ‘Beth Din’ and confirmed this.

The Beth Din was manned exclusively by refugee rabbis for the following two decades since its establishment. They were Baeck, Berg, Bienheim, Cassell, Curtis, Dorfler, Graf, Italiener, Katten, Katz, Loewenstamm, Maybaum, Sawady, Schreiber, and Van

---

\(^8^1\) “A.B.S.” SR, April 1944, 55.
\(^8^2\) “A.S.G.B.” SR, July 1948, 1.
\(^8^3\) “The Conference” SR, June 1950, 245.
\(^8^4\) “Association of Synagogues in Great Britain” SR, November 1952, 76.
Der Zyl. Without them the formation of the Reform Beth Din would have been impossible.  

This rabbinic court met several times a year to discuss the problems that had been brought to the attention of the community rabbis and to formulate uniform procedures for resolving them in accordance with Jewish law. While deeply rooted in tradition and adhering to Jewish law, the court sought to provide a modern, progressive approach and apply an inclusive interpretation of the law. Michael Leigh, one of the first rabbinic students at the Leo Baeck College wrote about the aims of the ‘Beth Din’ in 1975.

This characteristic attempt to remain within the field of Jewish law while remedying what may be considered anachronisms in the Law, has been the hallmark of British Reform in the post-war years.

Orthodox Anglo-Jewry had its own ‘Beth Din’, as part of the community structure. It was presided over by another German rabbi, Julius Jacobovits formerly of Koenigsberg. Unlike the orthodox court, the liberal court had no professional Dayanim or judges and the only paid member was the clerk of the court. It was set with rotating membership and included both rabbis from the constituent congregations and refugee rabbis who no longer held a pulpit, such as Schreiber, Katten and Loewenstamm. Many issues arose as a consequence of the Holocaust - where the religious identity of children was unclear, the issue of Agunah rose again, conversion and re-marriage with non-existent death certificates of previous partners etc. arose. A detailed analysis of these issues from an orthodox perspective was written by refugee rabbi Hirsch Zimmels. Providing pragmatic solutions to problems and answers to pressing questions was to be the foundation upon which uniform policy could be created and applied to all the progressive congregations. In February 1948 in a worldwide precedent, the Reform ‘Beth Din’ held its first court sitting. No other Reform movement anywhere in the world had managed to establish its own ‘Beth Din’.

As had been expected, this caused severe conflict with the Orthodox Chief rabbinate and its institutions. The established Reform ‘Beth Din’ infringed upon the absolute authority of the orthodox movement, particular undermining its authority regarding conversions and divorces. Since Dayan Abramsky had become head of the orthodox ‘Beth Din’ in the 1930s, conversions had been impossible to obtain. In all aspect of life, he and his court enforced a strict interpretation of Jewish law. Rabbi Graf observed that, although there was a difference in opinion regarding the interpretation, the ideological gap between the two movements was not so wide. Defining the differences between Reform Judaism and Orthodoxy for his daughter, she remembers.

---
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He explained the differences between Reform and Orthodox Judaism and why we do things differently, and that Reform is as much a commitment as Orthodoxy and NOT an easier option of a watered down version of it as some might mistakenly think.92

A great deal of conflict followed the creation of the ‘Beth Din’ and has persisted right up to the present day. Accusations of the orthodox ‘Beth Din’ arose in 1956 that conversions were becoming far too easy. Van Der Zyl defused these and argued that the progressive standard of knowledge required for conversion exceeded that of the orthodox demands.

The Beth Din of the Association imposes on the prospective proselyte the highest level of knowledge and education which could reasonably be demanded ad from that aspect it might be easier to pass the Beth Din of the Chief Rabbi’s Court.93

The attacks continued and escalated and, in 1962, official orthodox rhetoric defined the Reform ‘Beth Din’ in the following manner:

The subversive elements in our midst - subversive to obedience to the laws of Moses and of Israel, subversive to the historic customs and traditions that have shaped and moulded the Jewish home … whose repudiation of the Divine authority of the Torah is playing a major part in the disintegration of the Jewish family in our community.94

Neither the authority nor the rulings of the Reform ‘Beth Din’ were recognized by the orthodox leadership. But this institutions popularity within Anglo-Jewry and the countless requests for their rulings on individual circumstances vindicated its establishment. Ironically, even Jews from the orthodox United Synagogue approached the court wishing to have their issues resolved. The orthodox resistance to the ‘Beth Din’ effectively resulted in the fact, as Romain concluded, that ‘orthodoxy had lost its monopoly over matters of status.’95

With an eye on the future, the ASGB intensified its focus on the younger generation. Combining a religious and social context thus binding them to the Jewish faith and strengthening their identity was attempted with the creation of youth organizations as early as 1945. Van Der Zyl suggested that organizing these within a central organization would foster closer cooperation among them.96 This resulted in the creation of the Youth Association of Synagogues in Great Britain (YASGB) in 1947 which initially only had two congregations as members.97 The particular focus of this organisation was the integration of young people into synagogue life. This was supported through congregational youth organizations and a newly created ‘Junior Memberships’ at the synagogues.98 Within a year of its creation, a total of nine youth groups had joined this organization, bringing the overall membership to five hundred.99 Established rabbis Van Der Zyl and Cassell, young rabbi Sawady and rabbinic student

93 Romain “Beth Din”, 17.
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96 North Western Reform Congregation Minute Book 1943-1956, June 12, 1945, 31.
97 “The Association of Synagogues in Great Britain” SR, November 1947, 33 + 36.
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Petuchowski were its leaders. For the young people, regular trips were organized including an excursion to Hawkshead for a week of ‘fun and learning’. Other activities included summer schools and study weekends and, as one participant observed, it ‘generally created a spirit of fellowship amongst Reform Jewish youth.’ The youth organization included many young people who would eventually rise through the ranks of the individual Liberal and Reform movements and help to shape its future. The efforts around the Youth Movement served several purposes. Bringing young people together under its roof strengthened the network among them. Bonding and community cohesion helped along in the process of strengthening individual identity and thus eventually leaving the in-between state of exile for arriving at a new understanding of ‘home’.

The goal of the Reform and Liberal movements was to both expand and increase progressive observance in Britain. Realizing this goal had already begun during the war through the many newly-founded congregations. German refugees had played an instrumental role in this expansion but they were not the only factor. With the extension of the London Tube in the late 1920s and early 1930s, the suburbs began to expand, creating a mass movement and, with this, came the demand for new places of worship. These were created by adopting a modern approach to Judaism that was better suited to the young suburban generation. As has been pointed out earlier, wartime evacuation from London into the country led to the establishment of new congregations and many had refugee rabbis as their religious leadership. New Reform congregations had sprung up in Southend, Bournemouth, Cardiff, Southport, Hendon, Wimbledon and Blackpool. This continued into the 1950’s with congregations being established in Harlow, Maidenhead, Brighton, Weybridge and six more congregations being founded in the 1960s. Equally even if not as pronounced, Liberal congregations were being established in Wembley, Finchley, Ilford and Dublin, which was first initiated in 1945. Rabbi Brasch, a friend of Lily Montagu and a former rabbi at a new Liberal congregation in South London, was inducted as community rabbi a year later. Table 13 lists these sixteen congregations that were founded between 1945 and 1956, sorted by date.

---
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The creation of new congregations had peaked in 1956 with only one new congregation being created thereafter. The statistics of the Reform movement underline this expansion trend. It had 4,000 members in 1940, 15,000 in 1960 and by 1973 19,000 adults and 13,000 children. The member congregations of the ASGB had grown from seven to a total twenty-six.  

The refugee rabbis had assumed the responsibility for many of these congregations and were pivotal to their success. Jonathan Romain concluded that this expansion was a direct function of the refugee community and its needs. ‘On a wider level, it mirrored the contribution of German refugees to the religious life of Anglo-Jewry (…).’ While many congregations had refugee rabbis in the pulpit, not all could be provided with one. Many refugee rabbis were around retirement age while others had not yet mastered the English language to the necessary degree of fluency. And new generation of rabbis was only just beginning to emerge. The refugee rabbis who held positions in the newly created congregations are listed in Table 14. Interesting in that context is also the succession list of rabbis, also depicted. It reveals the close network that existed between the refugee rabbinate and the ASGB which was responsible for their placements. However, this placement process was not only driven by the ASGB, but also by the congregational demands. Many congregations that had previously employed a refugee rabbi were once again inclined to acquire the services of a refugee rabbi. The data reveals that out of a total of eighteen congregations, ten once again employed a refugee rabbi. Two of the congregations listed dissolved and the remaining six opted for other rabbis.

Table 13 New Post-War Congregations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin Jewish Progressive Congregation</td>
<td>Dublin, Ireland</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend and District Synagogue</td>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembley and District</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth Reform</td>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Reform Congregation</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southport New Synagogue</td>
<td>Southport</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendon Reform Synagogue</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon and District</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool Reform Jewish Congregation</td>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester Progressive Jewish Congregation</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow Jewish Community</td>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finchley Progressive Congregation</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidenhead Synagogue</td>
<td>Maidenhead</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton and Hove Reform</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Essex and Settlement</td>
<td>Iford, Essex</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Surrey Synagogue</td>
<td>Weybridge, Surrey</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The creation of new congregations had peaked in 1956 with only one new congregation being created thereafter. The statistics of the Reform movement underline this expansion trend. It had 4,000 members in 1940, 15,000 in 1960 and by 1973 19,000 adults and 13,000 children. The member congregations of the ASGB had grown from seven to a total twenty-six.  

The refugee rabbis had assumed the responsibility for many of these congregations and were pivotal to their success. Jonathan Romain concluded that this expansion was a direct function of the refugee community and its needs. ‘On a wider level, it mirrored the contribution of German refugees to the religious life of Anglo-Jewry (…).’ While many congregations had refugee rabbis in the pulpit, not all could be provided with one. Many refugee rabbis were around retirement age while others had not yet mastered the English language to the necessary degree of fluency. And new generation of rabbis was only just beginning to emerge. The refugee rabbis who held positions in the newly created congregations are listed in Table 14. Interesting in that context is also the succession list of rabbis, also depicted. It reveals the close network that existed between the refugee rabbinate and the ASGB which was responsible for their placements. However, this placement process was not only driven by the ASGB, but also by the congregational demands. Many congregations that had previously employed a refugee rabbi were once again inclined to acquire the services of a refugee rabbi. The data reveals that out of a total of eighteen congregations, ten once again employed a refugee rabbi. Two of the congregations listed dissolved and the remaining six opted for other rabbis.

---

Table 14 Pulpits of Refugee Rabbis and their Succession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synagogue</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Rabbi from</th>
<th>Rabbi until</th>
<th>Rabbi from</th>
<th>Rabbi until</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West London</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Reinhart</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West London</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Italianer</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Reform</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Graf</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Reform</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Korkotek</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George’s Settlement</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Italianer</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Western Reform</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Van Der Zyl</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Reform</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Cassell</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgware and District</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Maybaum</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Pfingst</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>dissolved</td>
<td>both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade Square</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Salzberger</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Pfingst</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>dissolved</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate and Enfield</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Brash</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinai Synagogue Leeds</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Graf</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Pfingst</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin Progressive</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Brash</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Kokotek</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth Reform</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Reform</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Graf</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendon Reform</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon and District</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Katten</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to keep in mind that expansion was not just merely a function of the refugees and the refugee rabbinate, while they did have a great influence. With the help of their network refugee rabbis had been able to establish themselves in a leadership position in the Anglo-Jewish landscape. However, not all of the newly founded congregations were refugee congregations, nor did all have a significant number of refugees as members. Many congregations had been founded without any discernible influence by refugee rabbis and their absence in the expansion of many progressive congregations throughout England is most striking. These newly founded congregations without refugee rabbis are detailed in Table 15. This also attests to the appeal of the modern, progressive approaches to Judaism amongst the general Anglo-Jewish population.

Table 15 New Congregations without Refugee Rabbinate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Synagogue</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Southend and District</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Wembley and District</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Southend and District Synagogue</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Southport New Synagogue</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Blackpool Reform Jewish Congregation</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Leicester Progressive Jewish Congregation</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Harlow Jewish Community</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Finchley Progressive</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Maidenhead Synagogue</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Brighton and Hove Reform</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>South West Essex and Settlement</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>North West Surrey Synagogue</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Refugee Rabbinate

Even before they arrived in Britain, the refugee rabbis had been part of a closely connected network. In exile, these ties were renewed and strengthened to a large extent, because rabbi Reinhart actively supported this. The exchange of birthday tributes is an outward sign of this close network. These tributes were the expression of mutual respect and friendship among them. In the AJR Information, the organ of the ‘Association of Jewish Refugees’ established in 1946, these birthdays and other occasions were marked with tributes honouring the work and life of the refugee rabbis in Germany and Britain. As an example of the many tributes published are the 70th birthdays of Eschelbacher and Wilde in 1947 and 1950. Tributes appeared in this journal also on the passing of a refugee rabbi, increasingly becoming a regular occurrence. Many rabbis were elderly and the experience of persecution and exile had taken its toll on them. Of the eighteen non-orthodox rabbis born before 1900, eleven had passed away before the end of 1956, as depicted in Table 16. This was almost two-thirds of the entire refugee rabbinate. Among those who had passed away were Leo Baeck, Malwin Warschauer, Caesar Seligmann and Bruno Italiener. At the memorial service for Caesar Seligmann, Salzberger, Baeck and Reinhart spoke in his honour while the service was conducted by Schreiber and Cassell. Leo Baeck also held the eulogies for both Warschauer and Italiener - just one month before passing away himself. Rabbis also honoured their colleagues in obituaries published in the JC, SR and the AJR Information, such as the page-long obituary for Warschauer written by Salzberger.

Some of the rabbis died of old age. Seligmann passed away at ninety, Baeck, at the age of eighty-three and Warschauer lived to the age of eighty-four despite his frail health. Other rabbis passed away under tragic circumstances, or simply died too young. Schreiber returned to Berlin in 1954 with his wife at the invitation of the Jewish community to hold High Holy Day services at the Pestalozzistrasse Synagogue. During the evening services of Rosh Hashanah, he suffered a fatal heart attack in the pulpit and passed away in the synagogue at the age of seventy-two. In 1956, at the age of seventy-five, Bruno Italiener was climbing a ladder to observe handymen repairing his home when he fell to his death. Konrad Sawady, a young rabbi and former student at the ‘Hochschule’ and friend of Fackenheim and Rautenberg also suffered a fatal heart attack in 1956. He was only forty years old.

A generation was passing away. These men had been the representatives of German Jewry, had preached and ministered to the large congregations before and during Nazism. With their passing, a transition was taking place. The network of which the older individuals had been a part of began to change with the younger generation accumulating power and influence.

While there are no personal accounts of the close rabbinic network among the refugee rabbis, it played an important role in their successes in Britain and abroad. An inside look at this network re-establishing itself in the United States is provided by the son of Joseph Ansbacher-Asher.

At rabbinical conferences, a group of German-born rabbis would always get together and exchange jokes and stories. A number of them, my father included, had had difficulties acculturating to American life in the thirties and forties as well as additional problems with professional acceptance. Consequently, they took special pleasure in sharing their professional successes as a group. A number of this country’s national leadership positions and important pulpits in the 1970s and 1980s were now occupied

**Table 16 Older Generation of Rabbis - Non-Orthodox**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Orthodox</th>
<th>birth</th>
<th>death</th>
<th>died at age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vogelstein, Herman</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Benno</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weisss, Samson</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliner, Julius</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilde, Georg</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seligmann, Caesar</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schreiber, Hermann</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warschauer, Malvin</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baeck, Leo</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David, Moritz</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italiener, Bruno</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katten, Max</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baneth, Ludwig Leo</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bienheim, Erich</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschelbacher, Max</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loewenstamm, Arthur</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzberger, Georg</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybaum, Ignaz</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17 Younger Generation of Rabbis - Non-Orthodox**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Orthodox</th>
<th>birth</th>
<th>death</th>
<th>died at age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sawady, Konrad</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfingst, Gustav</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg, Charles</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokoieck, Jakob J.</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Zyl, Werner</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassell, Curtis Emanuel</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graf, Louis Gerhard</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz, Arthur</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by those German-born rabbis who had been inspired with the lofty stature of the pulpits in the German synagogues.\textsuperscript{113}

Because Britain is significantly smaller, the refugee rabbi’s network was closer and more intensive than the network that existed in the United States. Increased interaction in a number of different social, academic, religious and commemorative contexts further deepened their relationships. The many birthday tributes, memorial services and obituaries attest to this fact. This network based on personal interaction gave rise to the idea for a professional, rabbinic organization - not just in Britain, but throughout Europe. The idea was to revive the former ‘Allgemeiner Deutscher Rabbinerverband’ on a larger scale so the ‘Association of European Rabbis’ was founded as a platform for the exchange of ideas for rabbis of all Jewish denominations. At its first conference in Luxemburg in 1955, Leo Baeck spoke and again invoked the importance of ensuring both the continuation of the German rabbinate in the future and Jewish learning as a function of this association.\textsuperscript{114} He stated the purpose of the organization.

\begin{quote}
(…) to train its spiritual guides who should only later decide, what trend of Jewish religious thought and organization they permanently wish to be associated with.\textsuperscript{115}
\end{quote}

While the intention was to include rabbis from all denomination and was supported by both Liberal and Reform movements, no orthodox rabbis did participate. They founded the conference of European Rabbis in 1956.\textsuperscript{116}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption*{Fig. 62}
Leo Baeck speaking in Luxemburg in 1955.\textsuperscript{117}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{113} Moses Rischin, ed. The Jewish Legacy and the German Conscience: Essays in Memory of Rabbi Joseph Asher (Berkeley, CA: Judah L. Magnes Museum, 1991), 43.
\textsuperscript{115} ibid.
\textsuperscript{117} Leo Baeck, Adolf Kober and unidentified man; meeting of rabbis; Luxemburg, 1953 (Call Number: F 19441) courtesy of the Leo Baeck Institute.
Changes in the Pulpit

With many rabbis passing on, a new generation was beginning to enter the rabbinate and its network. In this new generation were young men who had been unable to finish their rabbinic studies in Germany, who had been ordained in Britain or rabbis who had been ordained in Germany shortly before their emigration. These men who were now taking over the pulpit were beginning to stamp their own mark on British congregations and Anglo-Jewry.

In the post-war years the demands of the congregants and the direction of the congregations changed. The older generation of rabbis were faced with new ideas and requirements that were not necessarily compatible with their own. As they were nearing retirement, some were asked to vacate their positions in order to make room for younger rabbis. Refugee rabbis had attempted to uphold the religious values that they had imported, whereas the mostly Anglo-Jewish community officers were concerned with different, more elementary needs of the community. In the post-war years, Anglo-Jews found a new self-understanding and were keen for their communities to reflect this new, modern approach rather than the old, continental ways. Influenced by American Judaism, modern rabbis brought modern ideas to both the pulpit and the services. Any concerns about decorum, the organ and choir, rabbinic costume or the wearing of a top hat to services all disappeared. Instead, there was a trend towards a populist approach that focused on tying the new generation into modern religious practice. This new generation questioned the values and approaches of its forefathers and this created additional conflict between the rabbis and their congregations.

Rabbi Reinhart was the first casualty of this changing attitude. He had been instrumental in the expansion of Reform Judaism throughout Britain and had also played a key role in the welfare of countless refugees and the refugee rabbinate within British society and Anglo-Jewry. Although his efforts were a great credit to him, he personified certain values and was trying to uphold traditions no longer compatible with the post-war approach to religion and to life in general. Reinhart felt that the congregation had moved away from its ultimate purpose which was to provide Jews with the opportunity to increase their spirituality and to be able to gain knowledge from and through their religion. These old ideals had made way for a new, a commercial approach to Judaism and synagogue life. With the ideological differences and his age close to retirement, he was approached and asked to vacate the pulpit in favour of the younger generation. He did not leave the WLS quietly and, following his departure, he founded the ‘New London Jewish Congregation’. A significant number of congregants and his assistant, Rabbi Curtis Cassell joined him. Reinhart felt so strongly about the separation of commercial and religious life that the statutes of the new congregation stated that any kind of commercial involvement was to be eliminated. Instead a more important purpose of the congregation was emphasized. ‘(...) no services or privileges shall be bought.’ Cassell, his assistant rabbi who
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had also resigned out of a sense personal loyalty and solidarity did not remain in Britain. He took on a new congregation in Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{121}

An inter-generational conflict also arose in the ‘New Liberal Jewish Congregation’ which had changed its name to ‘\textit{Belsize Square Synagogue}’. Rabbi Salzberger had also reached retirement age and had been asked to vacate the pulpit. Since the creation of the community in 1939 he had been its rabbi. As his successor, Rabbi Jakob Kokotek was chosen. He was a graduate of the Breslau Seminary and, before coming to Britain, had held rabbinic positions in Silesia from 1934 until 1939. He gained experience in the pulpit by working in London, Dublin and Liverpool before being called upon to replace Salzberger.\textsuperscript{123} Personal conflict between the two men and the board of the congregation escalated and Lily Montagu tried to intervene and mediate. But even she could not reconcile them.\textsuperscript{124} In light of the developments at WLS where former rabbi Reinhart had resigned and created a new congregation, Kokotek feared a similar situation could arise with Salzberger. Subsequently he asked that Salzberger be restricted from working within a square mile of ‘Belsize Square Synagogue’ so as to not lose any of the congregants.\textsuperscript{125}

Another problem facing the older generation of rabbis was that they no longer preached to all of their congregations. Their peers, members of the older generation, whose ideas and ideals the rabbis represented were no longer in a majority within the congregations. The German style of sermon with its strong academic context and lofty style was no longer compatible with the religious and intellectual education of Anglo-Jewry. It was simply not in tune with the aspirations of the younger generation. A change in refugee identity and self-understanding which the rabbis

\textsuperscript{121} ‘\textit{Anglo-Judaica},’ \textit{AJRI}, August 1957, 8.
\textsuperscript{122} Leo Baeck with Rabbi Jacob J. Kokotek; Liverpool, England, 16. September 1951. (Call Number: F 1877), courtesy of the Leo Baeck Institute.
\textsuperscript{123} ‘Rabbi J.J. Kokotek at 70,’ \textit{AJRI}, July 1981, 3.
\textsuperscript{124} Antony Godfrey, \textit{Three Rabbis in a Vicarage: the Story of Belsize Square Synagogue} (Larsen Grove Press, 2005), 163.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
represented had taken place. They were slowly leaving the state of exile and entering a new state and self-understanding. Only the younger refugee rabbis who were able to adjust to these changes, demands and the Anglo-Jewish context would be able to succeed. It was only these men who had served during the war and had played an active role outside of the refugee community, only those who had mastered the English language and culture who were able to retain and expand their positions and influence in Anglo-Jewish society.

The refugee rabbinate had attempted to preserve its German heritage and had laid the groundwork for future generations to benefit from their experience and knowledge. As the younger generation of rabbis gradually took over, the older rabbis began to withdraw more and more. Those who had already reached or passed retirement age refrained from further work. Rabbis Moritz David and Arthur Loewenstamm retired to the Morris Freman home in Manchester which was a refugee retirement home.126 At the age of 79 Eschelbacher keenly observed this change and realized that he too belonged to the older generation. Writing to his friend Curt Wilk in Argentina he included observations about the other elderly refugees, their life in Britain and the passing from one generation to the next.

(...) also here everywhere (...) friendship clubs are set up. The youngest creation in this area is a club where the minimum age for membership is 60 years, geared toward aged and old people, mainly but not exclusively for men and women in retirement (...)127

The elderly were socializing in the above-mentioned clubs. But these social events were attended by increasingly fewer people, once so important to the refugee community. A generational change was noticeably taking place. The younger generation had been able to adapt to the new circumstances in Britain and had been able to adjust themselves and their identification with Britain and Anglo-Jewry, but the older generation was much less able to do so. They remained within the state of exile unable to leave it for a new beginning and self-understanding. Whilst many members of the older generation had passed away by the 1950’s, the younger ones were no longer interested in maintaining the links with the German
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experience. Eschelbacher continued to write about the memorial services that had once been so important as a communal gathering of the refugee community.

At the memorial service (...) was only a small funeral procession, our generation is going and the following does not know much anymore about Jewish life in Germany.\(^{129}\)

Salzberger also agreed with this sentiment and claimed that the younger generation took over many aspects of life, without being aware of the great loss that had taken place. 'A younger generation that knows little or nothing of the past stepped in its place.'\(^{130}\) Personally, he felt that an epoch was ending, marked with his resignation from office at the age of 74. 'I myself (...) feel that an era of German Jewish history was coming to an end.'\(^{131}\)

An era was coming to an end and the older generation had done all it could to transfer its knowledge and traditions, the remnants of German Jewry onto British soil. As time and old age took their toll, the older generation simply had to stand aside and observe how their German Judaism had merged into a new context and had become a new kind of Jewry - a modern progressive Anglo-Jewry.

~

The end of the war in May 1945 brought refugee rabbis back into contact with Germany. Some returned temporarily and very few remained permanently. As a result of the Holocaust the religious landscape there had changed dramatically. Hardly any German Jews had remained and the newly established Jewish congregations were dominated by Eastern European Orthodoxy. The refugee rabbis represented a different kind of identity incompatible with that prevalent direction in the new Jewish communities. The refugee rabbis only returned to Germany for remembrance celebrations, to hold High Holy Day services in their former communities or to attend the re-opening of their former synagogues. Most rabbis stayed in Britain and focused their attentions firmly on their new home. Those who had held temporary positions during the war or had returned from their service with the armed forces were now able to obtain permanent pulpits in the newly founded synagogues and could start their lives afresh in Britain.

With the arrival of Leo Baeck in 1945, the refugee rabbinate attempted to salvage the remnants of German Jewish learning which had been the tradition of the ‘Hochschule’ in Berlin and the ‘Jewish Theological Seminary’ in Breslau. This was an attempt to maintain tradition while focusing on transiting into exile and establishing a new context. The forum of the ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ was expanded and resulted in the creation of the ‘Society for Jewish Study’. Its aim was to open the circle and its activities to a wider, general audience and increase Jewish learning in Britain, not available outside of Oxford and Cambridge. The ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ sparked other initiatives such as the teacher training seminary, rabbinical training and structured lectures for young adults. The humble private lectures and the remedial teaching for

\(^{129}\) Letter Eschelbacher to Curt Wilk dated 12. March 1959, Curt Wilk Collection, AR1152 MF188, LBI.

\(^{130}\) Georg Salzberger Leben und Lehre (Frankfurt: Kramer, 1962), 139.

\(^{131}\) Ibid.
rabbinical students evolved into an academic setting culminating in the creation of the ‘Jewish Theological Seminary’ in 1956, later renamed the ‘Leo Baeck College’.

By 1956, twenty-eight of the refugee rabbis including Leo Baeck had passed away. A younger generation of rabbis was beginning to emerge and influence the future direction of the rabbinate and with it that of Anglo-Jewry. The refugee rabbis had attempted to preserve the legacy of German-Jewry and its rabbinate but it began to merge with Anglo Judaism into a new, vibrant movement that was gaining strength and momentum and expanded throughout Britain. Likewise, orthodoxy had also been able to increase and expand as it too had benefitted from the influx of learned rabbis from the continent.

Post-war developments made it possible for the individual resettlement process to enter a new phase. What had previously been regarded as a state of exile was now increasingly turning into home. It was no longer necessary for the rabbinate to function as a symbol and catalyst. They had accompanied the refugee community through grief and mourning. Commemorative events and anniversaries had been part of the long path to a new beginning but were no longer central to the refugee lives. As outside pressure eased reconstruction and a new beginning was achieved.

The refugees and the rabbis began to settle into their new life as many obstacles such as the citizenship issue were being removed. The condition of exile - that insecure and in-between state - was being left behind to make way for a permanent place in Britain and in British society. This was symbolized by the fact that most rabbis did not return to Germany, neither temporary nor permanently. Religious services remained an important pillar of strength and were a connection with the ethnic sub-group of German-speaking refugees with its rabbinate and heritage. While all still came together in the halls and sanctuaries of the newly founded British synagogues, the process of reverse ‘Ethno-Genesis’ had begun and refugees increasingly became part of Anglo-Jewry. A cultural transfer was taking place and rabbis in particular attempted to manifest the institutions of Jewish learning as a vehicle for the transfer of German Jewish culture.

Over time and in particular with the next generation many of the distinctive traits of the ethnic sub-group faded. It eventually lost its ethnic identity but still today certain markers of this identity remain dominant, even with the complete integration into Anglo-Jewry. That is why organizations such as the AJR and Belsize Square Synagogue still have a strong appeal even with the next generations.

The extensive rabbinic networks were again expanded, driven first and foremost by Leo Baeck and his activities on both sides of the Atlantic. He was the undisputed authority, but with the end of the war, general rabbinic authority began to fade. In particular the traditional authority was no longer of paramount significance. Through the establishment of the ‘Beth Din’ the vast resource of traditional authority personified by the refugee rabbinate was utilized. Additionally, the rational-legal authority once represented by doctoral titles faded and these were no longer relevant prerequisites for congregational positions. What remained was the charismatic authority, still the most important part of the progressive rabbinate today.
It was not possible to permanently preserve the remnants of German-Jewish culture and its rabbinate, a notion that even Leo Baeck had acknowledged. Only the generation of German-speaking Jews could continue this heritage because they had known its culture, history, achievements and relevance. Baeck knew that these remnants would eventually merge with mainstream Anglo-Jewry but would influence its future course beyond his lifetime.
Conclusion
Heritage

(…) the fact that every generation inherits the past, but has to reclaim it for them anew. “What you inherit from your father must first be earned before it’s yours”

Rabbiner Dr. Georg Salzberger

1 Georg Salzberger, Leben und Lehre (Frankfurt: Kramer, 1982), 139.
This study of ‘German Rabbis in British Exile and their Influence on Judaism’ has touched on a vast number of research areas within the field of Holocaust study, German Jewish history, Exile and Jewish studies. It placed the findings into the contexts of Jewish identity, life history and network theory and additionally considered theories around Jewish leadership, rabbinic authority and communal reaction to disaster. This work ties all of these research areas together and provides a detailed picture of the last generation of German rabbis from the onset of Nazism to their exile in Britain until 1956.

The rebuilding of the lives of a refugee sub-group in exile can only be understood as a continuation of a previous life in Germany. Subsequently, this study was divided in two narrative sections. The first describes the position of the rabbinate and its members while depicting the developments under the Nazi regime and the events leading to rabbinic emigration. It contains the experiences of the rabbinate from the onset of Nazism in 1933 through to the November pogrom, subsequent deportation to concentration camps, preparations for exile and the eventual departure from Germany. The second part depicts the experiences of rabbis in Britain from their arrival after the November pogrom in 1938 until 1956. It shows how refugee lives were being re-started and highlights the obstacles placed in their path. While all refugees had landed in an entirely different foreign cultural and religious context, the rabbinate was immediately drawn into the midst of the refugee community. Even though most refugee rabbis were destitute and many were barely able to master the English language, they all became an integral part of this community. At the end of the war the pressure eased and a sense of normality began to set in. The rabbis together with all other refugees were able to continue the settlement process. In particular, the expansion of the progressive movements provided the refugee rabbis with employment enabling them to earn their livelihoods and restart their careers. But the decline in outside pressure impacted and the leadership position of the German rabbinate began to diminish. The rabbinate in particular attempted to preserve its German Jewish heritage but this was only possible in a most basic way. It was placed into a new context and given a new interpretation when it merged with Anglo-Jewry. This concluding part presents the overarching results of the study and relates them to the underlying theories. The resulting implications are analyzed, followed by recommendations for further research and a final summary statement.

The historical narrative of the German rabbinate illustrates how it had been dismantled and changed its purpose and contents through creativity and flexibility. The men personifying the rabbinate had been able to adapt to the demands of emancipated German Jewry. World War I had been a turning point for German Jewry as a whole and had brought a new dimension into the rabbinate that increased its importance. The institution of ‘Field Rabbi’ was established with the purpose of providing pragmatic pastoral care to the Jewish soldiers in the field and supporting them with religious services, kosher food, religious literature, guidance and
assistance. Rabbis acted as representatives of Judaism not only on a religious level, but also became advocates against the increasing anti-Semitism rising in the ranks. These experiences in the field and among the soldiers changed the direction of the rabbinate. In the period between the wars it increasingly rose in defence of the Jewish faith - in the pulpit, in newspapers, and even in court. The rise of Nazism and anti-Semitism further strengthened their role in the synagogue and the congregations, making them a prominent part of Jewish leadership within an extensive network. This new importance and prominence was fostered by the Nazi perception of the rabbinate. Similar to their Christian counterparts rabbis were seen as the pre-eminent leaders of their faith and the Jewish people making them the central point of contact and interaction with the local Nazi leadership which also continuously exposed them to harassment.

Rabbinic importance also increased by changing religious attitudes. Religious values are an integral part of upbringing and make up the moral and ethical code that governs daily life. Through these, life and religious expression are intricately connected. Adherence to the Ten Commandments and its value system was not just limited to religious observance within synagogues but also found its expression in many other areas such as increased philanthropic activity. However with the increase in outside pressure during the Nazi era Jews returned to the synagogues and religious practice. The overflowing synagogues did not signify a return to or sudden increase in piety but rabbis understood that these were a counter reaction to persecution coupled with a need for community cohesion. Through their extensive writings in the Nazi era they provided an additional tool for identity forming and re-shaping. Many who had turned away from the Jewish faith were re-identified as Jews and were able to acquire knowledge through these materials. An ‘Ethno-genesis’ was also taking place for those who had considered themselves Christians but were identified as ‘non-Aryan Christians’ an ethnic subgroup to Jewry.

With the increasing built-up of outside pressure social venues were closed down and synagogues increasingly became the centre of Jewish life in all its many manifestations. The pulpit remained the means of addressing Jews in a public forum with the rabbinic sermons as a vehicle to disseminate information. In these sermons anti-Semitism and persecution were placed into a historical and religious context and with it the sermon changed from a distant religious message to one of comfort and support. Rabbis also attempted to advise their congregants and answer pressing questions of the time. Through their work, they contributed to individual and communal strength and supported community cohesion. With increasing exclusion and persecution pragmatic pastoral care took on increased importance as congregants became more dependent on the community structure for their physical and emotional support. As part of this structure, rabbis assisted with the urgent needs of their community members and helped in emigration matters, supported and advised the younger generation on professional choices and helped to solve inter-generational conflict.

With these many roles, rabbinic authority increased and was expressed as a ‘rational-legal’, ‘traditional’ or even ‘charismatic’ authority. As other sources of authority within the Jewish context were dismantled and replaced by the destructive forces of Nazi authority the charismatic
authority of the rabbis filled this void as Jews searched for much-needed leadership and guidance. Particularly the younger generation of rabbis rose to a level of fame that was unprecedented within the rabbinate. Rabbis such as Prinz, Nussbaum and Swarsensky were increasingly beginning to represent German Jews, whilst rabbis belonging to the older generation could no longer provide the necessary leadership and guidance. They were asked to retire and free up the pulpit for their younger colleagues. The increase in prominence and importance that outfitted the rabbis with new responsibilities created an unprecedented moral dilemma. With it rabbis had responsibility and obligation for their congregations but as private individuals rabbis also held responsibility and obligations for their own families and themselves. The question that had to be answered was whether to stay or leave.

Leaving Germany was difficult and complicated whilst entering Britain was full of obstacles. The differences between German and Anglo-Jewry were significant but historically these communities were inter-connected. Through the centuries the Anglo-Jewish landscape had been influenced by religious developments in Germany but unlike German Jewry, Anglo-Jewry had not continuously been exposed to external and internal pressures. As religious observance had lost importance, Anglo-Jewry professed ‘non-observant orthodoxy’. Similar to Germany, religious observance and its expression of Jewishness had been replaced by charity and philanthropic activity - mitzvoth had replaced observance. Subsequently, most Jewish ministers and reverends were of minor importance. This condition had created both a vacuum and a need for a new approach to the Jewish religion and religious fragmentation with the creation of the Reform and Liberal movements were primarily attempts of countering secularization. The close ties between Germany and Britain and their Jewish leadership with its intricate network impacted the rescue efforts for the rabbinate.

As early as 1933, shortly after the ‘Machtergreifung’ the first refugees from Nazism arrived in Britain. The process of ‘Ethno-Genesis’ had established refugees as an ethnic German-Jewish sub-group which was part of British and Anglo-Jewish society. Assisted through the wide network re-established in Britain they became active in initiating further rescue efforts with many of these privately organized and financed. Being considered for this rescue depended largely on personal connections and close local and distant weak ties to the network nodes in Britain and Germany. Those who were part of the religious institutional networks and constituted a particular sub-group were targeted in a number of different rescue schemes. However as more people applied for rescue than could be helped selection processes were instated. These identified individuals for rescue who would potentially become self-sufficient but also those who would promote ideas or movements or contribute in a number of ways to cultural, scientific, economic developments in Britain. Among those selected were many rabbis who were part of the intricate religious network that existed between both countries. They were also later supported in their settlement efforts by all three of the Anglo-Jewish religious movements. Each movement with its own selection process focused on its own peer group and allocated visas to the appropriate individuals. This led to rejections and unsuccessful rescue attempts, ultimately death sentences.
For the refugees, the trip to Britain was the culmination of a long and arduous process of expulsion from their home. They arrived in Britain with a sense of relief and apprehension. Very few had been able to ship their property and most were destitute. Arriving in a new cultural and linguistic environment proved difficult but Anglo-Jewry provided help. They assisted with hospitality, financial support, positions, housing, training, etc. and supported the refugees in their efforts to becoming self-sufficient. Refugees also helped themselves by creating a vast number of self-help organizations and institutions to support the settlement process. The support of Anglo-Jewry contributed to community cohesion of the group and of Jews in Britain as a whole which facilitated the transfer process from emigration into the condition of exile and became the catalyst for the amalgamation of both Anglo and refugee Jewry. The continental refugees remained separate from the Anglo-Jewish context. One of the factors that provided stability in uncertainty and means for coming to terms with loss were the religious services held in the particular German way.

Starting anew and integrating into British society was further complicated by the political developments in Britain and on the continent which ultimately culminated in World War II. These political developments interrupted the efforts for a new beginning. The classification of refugees as ‘Enemy Aliens’ meant for many deportation to ‘internment camps’ in Britain or abroad. The refugee rabbis were part of this experience and returned to positions of leadership - religious and secular. In the transit camps and internment camps, on board the deportation ships to Australia and Canada they provided religious support and leadership. Those who had been spared internment were actively involved in caring for their fellow-refugees, in particular the children of the Kindertransports. Refugee rabbis gave religious instruction and spiritual care for them. For the German-speaking refugees, rabbis held services at the many synagogues and it was not only the progressive movements but also the orthodox that recognized the importance of maintaining these German services as a support system for the refugees. These distinct services also provided community cohesion and contributed to a cultural transference into exile. While it had been attempted to phase these services out and return to the local tradition the refugees were not yet able to leave the state of exile and become part of Anglo-Jewry. As a consequence they founded their own refugee synagogue which still exists today.

Since their arrival in Britain, the progressive rabbis had continuously come together in the office of Rabbi Reinhart, where an informal centre for Jewish learning was being set up. In these ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ the young student rabbis who had been unable to complete their education in Germany were being trained and ordained. As most refugee rabbis attended these meetings the once intricate rabbinic network was re-established. As the end of the war approached further changes were taking place. With the imminent defeat of Germany, Jewish reconstruction in Germany was being planned and refugee rabbis became part of this effort. The end of the war brought them back into contact with their former home. Some returned temporarily but very few permanently because among other factors the religious landscape there had dramatically changed. Hardly any German Jews had remained and newly-established Jewish congregations were dominated by Eastern European orthodoxy. German Jewry, out of
which the pre-1938 German rabbinate had emerged, had ceased to exist. Several progressive rabbis however travelled to Germany on official occasions such as commemorative events or for holding High Holy Day services at their former congregations. The main focus for most refugees was on their new home in Britain.

The arrival of Leo Baeck in London was an important event for the refugee rabbinate because he infused their efforts around Jewish learning and the continuation of the German-Jewish tradition with new energy. His presence in their midst permitted and facilitated this work and eventually laid the foundation of a merging of German Judaism with Anglo-Jewry. Expansion of both progressive movements and efforts to establish Jewish studies had begun during the war and continued with added zeal. The focus of educational efforts had been placed on training progressive Jewish teachers. They were elementary for the expanding movements and their new congregations. Additionally the need for new rabbis increased and sparked the creation of an educational institution which resulted in the founding of the ‘Jewish Theological College’. The efforts of the progressive refugee rabbinate facilitated the transfer of religious and academic Jewish heritage into the permanence of Anglo-Jewry. This also applied to orthodoxy but as it already had sufficient infrastructure the changes were not as pronounced.

The post-war years heralded in a new era, with new expectations and demands. Rabbis obtained their British citizenship between 1947 and 1948; an outward sign that ties with Germany had been severed. With it a new identity was beginning to rise and the status of exile could be abandoned. As refugees had arrived in British society it did not entail the abandonment of the ethnic sub-group of ‘Continental Refugee’. On the contrary, this condition gained new importance as refugee organizations began negotiating restitution with the newly established Germany. These further accentuated their losses but also made way for a new beginning. Up to this point, the rabbinate had been the preserver of a heritage and had functioned as the representative of German Jewish tradition. The rabbi, seen as a representative of past lives and traditions, was a symbol for the refugee community. He represented values and ideals and a particular identity that was beginning to fade. During the years of exile, which were often accompanied by much insecurity, maintaining this virtual tie to Germany was important but, as refugees increasingly integrated into British society and became an integral part of Anglo-Jewry, this preservation lost its importance. These ties were in fact hindering the move forwards.

The rabbinate with its paramount importance during the last years in Germany and the early years in Britain had outlived itself. Many of the older rabbis had unsuccessfully tried to establish themselves in Britain. They had been unable to master the language to a professional proficiency and so did not obtain a pulpit, despite the strongest network connections. These connections however provided for their financial support, on which they remained dependent. The younger rabbis had been able to adapt to the new circumstances, had mastered the language and culture of their new home land and had been able to utilize the refugee rabbi’s network as well as that of Anglo-Jewry. During the post-war years, they thus were able to meet the new, modern expectations of their congregants and to find their new roles.
The only bridge to the past and the continent from the perspective of the progressive rabbinate was the educational institution of the ‘Jewish Theological College’ later renamed ‘Leo Baeck College’. But this too changed as its founders realized that education in the college could not be of the same calibre as that of the former academic and theological institutions on the continent. The college had only a fraction of the teaching staff and a mere handful of students who could be brought together for Jewish learning. Equally, and this continued to today, academic qualifications or the rational-legal authority that culminated in a doctoral title are no longer of paramount importance for the rabbinate. These have made way for charismatic authority expressed in strong oratory skills and personal charisma.

A generational change took place when by 1956 Leo Baeck, Bruno Italiener, Caesar Seligmann, Max Dienemann, Benno Jacob, Malwin Warschauer and around two dozen other rabbis had passed away. An attempt was made to preserve their legacy and that of German Jewry but it was increasingly becoming part of Anglo-Judaism, merging into a new, a vibrant and expanding movement. Orthodoxy had also gained from the influx of learned rabbis from the continent and was able to shore up its position within Anglo-Jewry, manifesting its influence and power in the post-war years. These developments still resonate in Britain today.

Historically, the British rabbinate had maintained a subordinate position that had no real authority in comparison to Germany. The arrival of the refugee rabbinate changed this as they asserted authority in Judaism and Anglo-Jewry and the refugees acknowledged this authority. The Chief Rabbi had begun to increase his reach and authority already in the mid-1930s when he had strengthened orthodoxy and re-invigorated the rabbinic court, ‘Beth Din’. He used his network through the ‘Agudah’ and placed refugee rabbis with charismatic and traditional authority throughout Britain. This strengthened the rational-legal authority of this institution. Rabbinic authority in the progressive context was also increased by the arrival of the refugee rabbis. For Reinhart of the Reform and Montagu, Mattuck and Montefiore of the Liberal movement, representing the rational-legal and charismatic authority, it brought the resources to realize a vision of a strong and powerful future and expansion. The arrival of the refugee rabbis added the aspect of traditional authority as they brought with them the long and rich tradition and history of the rabbinate. They provided traditional and religious legitimization and solid religious authority. The modern approach of the Liberal Movement however was not entirely compatible with the ideas and ideals of the refugees and their rabbis. Several of the younger rabbis became part of it but the broader appeal lay with Reinhart and British Reform. The new network around Reinhart helped them with their careers and they became pillars of the Reform until their own passing in the 1980s.

Under the leadership of Leo Baeck in the post-war years, the refugee rabbinate had worked to transplant the ideals and ideas, experiences, convictions and philosophy of German Jewry into new soil. It was not possible to preserve it as an ever-valid remnant of the past, a fact that even Leo Baeck had conceded. Continuation of the heritage would only be possible for the generation of German speaking Jews who had known its culture, history, achievements, and relevance and who were, despite their assimilation, deeply rooted in its tradition. This identity
was getting lost and was being replaced. Baeck knew that this remnant would eventually merge with main-stream Anglo-Jewry.

Three Ketarim of Jewish Leadership

Throughout the study, the issue around Jewish leadership continuously manifested itself. Placing it in the construct of the three Ketarim of Jewish leadership gives the refugee rabbinate added importance within the overall emigration history of German Jewry and emphasizes its importance in the midst of the refugees. This correlation between the concepts of the three Ketarim of Jewish leadership is an essential finding and is further detailed here.

Throughout Jewish history, the unique leadership structure made the Jewish community a vibrant and diverse organization where no one direction could claim complete and overarching power over the entire Jewish people. The concept of the Ketarim divided Jewish leadership into a tripartite structure with each part defining a separate aspect of Jewish life. Each part is able to function independently yet there is a strong inter-dependence between all Ketarim. Keter Torah used to represent the administration of divine law and in the 19th century made way for Jewish learning within the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’. In the Keter Kehunah or priesthood, rabbis acted as intermediaries between the divine and the congregation and as pastoral care was added as an additional function the rabbinate gained increasing importance in times of need. The third pillar is the Keter Malkhut the administrative, secular branch within Jewry, with responsibility for managing community affairs such as charities or finances. All of these three Ketarim can be traced through each chapter and are an important finding as they confirm the theories of Elazar and Cohen.

Under Nazism, Keter Torah or the realm of Jewish learning was no longer a central aspect of the rabbinate. It was rather used in a public way to uphold morale and instil pride in Jewish heritage, history and tradition with the many publications and public events. In a very pragmatic way, Keter Kehunah or the priesthood which included pastoral care had taken over much of the rabbinic duties with the growing needs of the congregants. Keter Malkhut or the administrative branch of Jewish leadership also increasingly became part of the rabbinate not only because Nazi officials considered rabbis to be the sole representatives of the Jewish people, but because of the thinning ranks of administrative staff within the Jewish communities. As Nazi rule continued the Jewish leadership structure was continuously dismantled in many ways and with it the distinctiveness of the three Ketarim began to disappear. But as these three areas of responsibility needed to be exercised, they began to merge in the role and person of rabbi and are best personified by Leo Baeck, the sole leader of German Jewry, who was also a rabbi.

On the surface, Anglo-Jewry was unified through the office of the Chief Rabbi which did not acknowledge the legitimacy and authority of the progressive movements. This had ignited individual creation of Ketarim within each of these movements and made the application of this concept to the entirety of Anglo-Jewry difficult. To forces outside of the Jewish context, the office of Chief Rabbi was seen as the only authority that represented Anglo-Jewry, which in turn gave this office much power. Rabbinic authority in Britain however was significantly different
than in Germany. In Britain, only the Chief Rabbi was allowed to bear the title of ‘rabbi’, which shows a changed perception of the rabbinate in the population.

The concept of Ketarim can again be identified in the arrival and settling of the refugees in Britain. Under the influence of the refugee rabbis, the Keter Torah was increasingly strengthened in all three religious movements. Not only progressive congregations but new orthodox ones and Yeshivot could be outfitted with qualified religious personnel. Within the progressive movements, the refugee rabbis increased Keter Torah through the ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ which became the tool for transplanting the remnants of the once flourishing Jewish learning institutions into a British context. Keter Kehunah increased in importance as refugees were in need of assistance and pastoral care in light of the identity-shattering experience of exile and their work bolstered the refugees. Keter Malkhut also became part of the refugee rabbinate with their support of the children of the Kindertransports. Furthermore, organizing new refugee communities was an administrative task that was supported by the refugee rabbis. Internment is another example of how the three Ketarim were united within the persona of the rabbi. A leadership vacuum existed in these camps as they were self-governing and only received scant supervision from the British authorities. The rational-legal authority had been transferred to the camp directors or camp leaders who had been chosen from amongst the internees - in many cases, this authority was transferred to the rabbis who then became holders of all three Ketarim.

The reconstruction of a tripartite organizational structure began in exile where it was adapted to the existing structures within Anglo-Jewry. For a period of transition and in the context of the refugee population, the refugee rabbinate temporarily maintained all three of the Ketarim during the first years in Britain. The first of the Ketarim to be transferred was Keter Malkhut, the administrative tasks of a community. It was returned to those refugees who had been administrators in the former communities or to Anglo-Jewish representatives already occupying these functions. This transfer of power within the Ketarim relieved the rabbinate of many of its functions. Keter Kehunah was the only remaining pillar on which the rabbinate now rested with pastoral care as its main aspect.

In the post-war years more changes within the leadership structure can be traced. While during persecution and exile the refugee rabbinate had risen to a position of unprecedented power, authority and prestige in uniting all three of the Ketarim in its position - the end of the war marked a turning point. As outside pressures subsided, the rabbinate was increasingly being demoted to a diminished role within the Jewish community. The realm of Keter Torah the former very essence of the rabbinate was transferred to the ‘Monday Morning seminaries’, the ‘Society for Jewish Study’ and the ‘Leo Baeck College’. Refugee rabbis began to concede authority to academics rooted in the field of ‘Jewish study’.

Many of the refugee organizations continued to exist in the post-war era but just as the rabbinate they too were losing their importance. Eventually all Ketarim were returned to their rightful owners, Keter Malkhut was returned to the secular leadership and the Keter Torah was returned to Jewish academics, leaving the rabbinate to its pastoral and spiritual functions, the
Keter Kehunah. From its former position rooted in Keter Torah the rabbinate had risen to unify all three of the Ketarim only to be returned to a single Keter, that of Keter Kehunah, which it still holds today.

Communal Reaction to Disaster

Another concept that is important to understanding the German rabbinate and its experiences in Germany and Britain is the concept of disaster recovery. As part of the Jewish leadership structure rabbis maintained particular responsibilities and roles in dealing with the disasters that struck the community and they helped with its recovery. Rabbis were the first line of support and became the respondents. They embraced this role and provided this help wherever possible.

The rise of anti-Semitism after World War I can be considered as the pre-disaster period, with many warning signs and threats to German Jewry. The rise of Nazism and the consequences cannot be seen as a single impact-event but rather can be defined as a number of consecutive disasters with increasing strength. Before the November pogrom Nazi regulation continuously targeted both individuals, Jewish sub-groups and the whole of the Jewish people. At each of these steps rabbis were helping their community to cope with both the impact and the consequences of Nazism. Conditions gradually worsened and rabbis attempted to lessen the impact of further blows. The exodus from Germany as the last of a succession of disasters provided temporary reprieve. Soon further disasters befell the refugee population. The Blitz and the classification as ‘Enemy Aliens’ caused fear and uncertainty, and were an obstacle to sparking a cohesive communal reaction to the past events. The set pattern that has been previously introduced cannot be clearly and conclusively identified and traced in the early years in Britain. Refugees were exposed a number of subsequent events that each can be seen as a disaster. The arrival in Britain, internment, deportation to Canada and Australia can each be seen as additional Impact events which would warrant its own disaster recovery reaction. As it all culminated several Heroic phases can be identified, beginning with the mere recognition of survival, the individual achievement of escape. Heroic was also enlisting in the Pioneer Corps or other armies with the prospect of fighting against Nazi Germany, which was a counter-reaction to victimization and provided individual empowerment. For one refugee sub-group not further exposed to impact events, a Honeymoon phase began entailing community cohesion when refugees were able to re-build their lives in Britain. A catalyst for community cohesion was found in the many self-help organizations that were created but also at the synagogues, their friendship clubs and women’s organizations providing room for community building. The Disillusionment phase following the Honeymoon was again disrupted with additional disasters - further tribunals for ‘Enemy Aliens’, Britain’s entry into war, and subsequent internment. Under these circumstances, rabbis attempted to give meaning and purpose to the experiences. They helped others to relate to themselves, to the world and to God, attempted to help other victims to recover their own spiritual resources and tools. Acknowledging their pain and giving religious
care through rituals was important, it included ministering for the holy days, consecrating cemeteries and conducting funerals, as well as providing answers to religious questions. Rabbis provided encouragement and support, either personally or through their sermons, additionally with publications in congregational and internment newspapers, where spiritual pieces attempted to relate the current experiences to religion.

Memorial work was a vehicle for communally working through grief, and rabbis were instrumental in this effort. Not only through memorial services for individuals, companions, friends, colleagues but in the annual remembrance services for the November pogrom. All of these were Trigger Events, elementary occasions and important stepping stones for coming to terms with grief - thus contributing to the refugee’s successful establishment in Britain.

As peace spread throughout Europe, normalcy was beginning to take hold and the rabbinate was no longer needed to function as a catalyst for dealing with the effects of disaster. Within this context, it was apparent that the greatest community cohesion was achieved through the presence of outside threats - the war, the ‘Enemy Alien’ classification and internment. The absence of pressure and of further impact events ignited the Disillusionment phase which rabbis attempted to counteract. A return to normalcy was only possible when acknowledging and working through grief while trying to come to terms with loss. The rabbis accompanied the refugees through this phase and were equally part of it. Commemorative events and anniversaries, mourning the loss of friends and colleagues were part of the long path to a new beginning. But over time, the importance of these events faded and only the older generation was clinging to the past. As outside pressure eased with the end of the war, reconstruction and a new beginning was achieved. In the post-war years, the disaster phase had come to an end. As a community, the refugees had gone through every stage of the post-disaster reactions, and, overcoming additional obstacles had finally arrived at the reconstruction phase. This was further strengthened with the resolved citizenship issue that also impacted refugee identity. The community and the rabbinate had been able to come to terms with grief and loss. The trigger events for revisiting the trauma were and still are today the commemorative events around the liberation of Auschwitz now known as Holocaust Memorial Day and the 9th of November, commemorating the November pogrom. Even after 75 years these anniversary events still trigger massive reactions in the survivors and have become important markers for the Jewish community worldwide. Overall it can be stated that the cycle of disaster recovery can be traced through the events and experiences of the refugees and the rabbinate in their midst.

Concluding it can be said that this study has successfully established the refugee rabbinate as a refugee subgroup that had previously not been identified or investigated. This documentation of their role in Germany and in Britain and its impact in both contexts, show a continuance, a relationship between both, where one is the direct result of the other. The reconstruction of their lives helped to identify commonalities and differences in their biographies and experiences. This led to a comprehensive picture of another previously unexamined aspect
of research on refugees in Britain. This study established the refugee rabbinate as part of the entirety of the refugee population but also as that of Anglo-Jewish leadership by identifying a network with its nodes and clusters reaching from Germany to Britain and the world. This network extended beyond the religious and secular and even bridged the great divide in all movements, Orthodox, Reform and Liberal.

The study’s prosopographical approach combined primary sources from both Germany and Britain and together with biographical and autobiographical accounts, created a comprehensive picture of the public and private personae of the rabbis. These were then correlated with the overall status quo of Anglo-Jewry, both historically and within the context of present Judaism in Britain. Additionally examined were the concepts of Jewish leadership identified by the three Ketarim and the expression of rabbinic authority. These were continuously traced from the 1930s to 1956, when the study ends. Additionally identified were the communal phases of disaster recovery, which tied into the duties of the rabbinate.

The overarching result of this study is a documentation of a previously unidentified refugee sub-group. The resulting documentation was then juxtaposed with several concepts, which had not previously been applied to the context of the refugee rabbinate. Initially, the idea of networks among the rabbis has been explored and resulted in the awareness that career success, rescue and the re-establishment of careers would not have been possible without it.

While it has previously been contended that religion played a minor role in refugee lives, the study showed that the social context around religion and its continued expression contributed to a number of aspects. It helped to re-establish identity and assisted refugees in the transfer from the state of exile to a state of normality. Examining the established concept around disaster recovery, the study proved that the refugee experience unfolded along these stages until the recovery phase had taken hold. The concept of leadership was applied, which too was influenced by the events and a changed perception of rabbinic authority. It had moved from traditional to rational-legal, but in the post-war years, this has made way for the charismatic authority represented in the pulpit. The leadership concept of the three Ketarim was successfully applied and proved its validity outside of the biblical realm in the context of the refugees in Britain. Within the rabbinate all three Ketarim merged when the Jewish people was exposed to annihilating outside pressure. This power transfer served as a survival mechanism for the Jewish community. When this outside pressure subsided, the leadership functions were separated out and returned to their proper authorities. This diminished the importance of the rabbinate and allowed it to focus again on the Keter Kehunah, the priesthood, which it still holds today.

The successes of the German rabbinate into Britain would not have been possible without the absence of a respective institution in Britain. The vacuum that existed in Anglo-Jewish leadership created a pull for the German rabbis and led to the massive expansion all three movements experienced. The traditional German rabbinate however could not maintain its particularities and continue. Despite best efforts to preserve it and with it the remnants of German Jewry, it lost its appeal and importance for the next generation of refugees, rabbis and
institutions. However, the importance of the German rabbinate can still be felt today. While new generation of rabbis came into its own in the 1960s and 1970s and made their mark on Anglo-Jewry, a significant number of rabbis today throughout Europe are descendants of former German Jews and uphold its tradition and heritage in a small but noticeable way.

**Implications for Further Research**

Future research based on this study can be conducted into a number of directions. As this work can be seen as a foundation several areas for further investigation have been identified. One of the areas is Jewish leadership. In particular during the Holocaust it has often been criticized and subsequently stigmatized. Research into the underlying implications of leadership and how it was exercised on a daily basis in Nazi Germany has not been conclusively undertaken and the rabbinic leadership which was wedged between Nazism and Jewish communities has only now been identified. While this study focused on Britain other territorial contexts such as Czechoslovakia, Austria and Eastern European countries need to be studied. Here the rabbis and their positions under the conditions of persecution should be further studied. Other countries where the refugee rabbinate should be researched are the Netherlands, Belgium and France where much research on Jewish emigration already exists. However, the refugee rabbinate and its work in this temporary exile have never been studied. In several other countries of exile a detailed examination of the refugee rabbinate has also not yet been systematically undertaken. Among these countries is the United States where forty-six refugee rabbis found refuge. They left their mark not only on the rabbinate but also furthered religious and rabbinic education. Most prominently German rabbis became personally involved on the political stage with the ‘Civil Rights Movement’ on which they had a strong impact. Other countries of rabbinic emigration which also have not yet been studied were Palestine, Denmark, Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Australia where the refugee rabbis had a pivotal impact on Jewish life.

In this study the concept of the three Ketarim was successfully applied to the rabbinic emigration in Britain. The resulting insight into how the Ketarim merged and were then separated again might also be found in other contexts of persecution and exile. The question that arises is whether this concept can also be applied to the expulsion of Jews from Spain and Portugal, or the post-war migration from Arab countries to Israel. Another concept that was applied throughout was the concept of communal reactions to disaster and how it related to the experiences of the German Jewish refugees and their leadership in Britain. This entailed a look at increased community cohesion as a function of reactions to disaster. In further studies these findings should be compared and contrasted with other disasters that befell Jewry, either historically or in the present time.

One aspect that has continuously been discounted in existing academic discourse is the expression of religious affiliation within the refugee community. The importance of religious services for the refugees has been highlighted in this study but is an aspect that should be
examined more closely. A future study should look at the importance of religious concepts as part of the moral and ethical makeup of the individual refugees, how adherence to religious values became important and was expressed in a community setting and in the synagogue. Identifying this aspect is important, because this study contradicts what has been suggested in the past that religion played a subordinate role within the refugee community and in Britain. Massive expansion of the religious movements underlines the findings of this study. Additional research could contribute to a differentiated understanding of refugee religious practice and the post-war surge in synagogue creation.

The practical implication of this study could be a closer look at the role of the rabbinate today. Comparing it with the role and function of previous generations of rabbis could help the rabbinate find new importance in their work and re-define their positions within the community.

The lives of progressive rabbis stood in the foreground of this study. But the orthodox refugee rabbinate was equally maybe even more important in its influence with massive consequences still felt in Anglo-Jewry today. Many of these rabbis as this study uncovered eventually moved to B'nai B'rak in Israel in their retirement years, the stronghold of ultra-Orthodoxy. This confirmed that modern direction of ‘Torah im Derekh Eretz’ had merged into an ultra-Orthodox direction. A look at the remnants and heritage of the Samson Raphael Hirsh movement is a research perspective that has not yet been considered. This should preferably undertaken by an orthodox scholar who can provide an in-depth inside view. Concluding it can be said that the research on German rabbis in British exile and their impact on Judaism is only the beginning of other important research in this area.

In the concluding remarks on this study, it is once again emphasized that through this research, an intricate connection between the historical developments in Germany and the exile experience in Britain has been developed with one being a function of the other. The exile rabbinate was defined as a professional group within the refugee population and their impact on the refugee community, Judaism and Anglo-Jewry was identified. In addition to documenting the individual rabbis, their experiences were also compared and contrasted with underlying theories and concepts and created a comprehensive picture of the overall experiences of the refugee rabbinate. Its importance was documented with regards to their authority, their leadership functions in the Ketarim and in the response to disaster and its recovery. The rabbinate was important in the in-between condition of exile, was part of the refugee sub-groups and even created their own extensive network. Their German-style services assisted in the re-establishment of the shattered lives and identity of refugees. German rabbis had attempted to preserve German Jewish heritage but were only marginally successful. This heritage ceased to exist anywhere in the world in any significant and influential context. The last remnants will fade with the passing of the last generation that was born in Germany. Concluding this work are the words of Rabbi Prof. Dr. Petuchowksi who was a student at the ‘Monday Morning Lectures’ in
the office of Rabbi Reinhart and became professor at Hebrew Union College in the United States. He has aptly described what was to remain.

There are isolated communities in England (…) which, founded by German Jews, attempted to continue the German Jewish tradition on a new footing in a liberal and orthodox direction. However, it does not appear that the next generation will make a conscious effort to ensure that it continues. Children and grandchildren have inherited a certain trait from their ancestors, which originally led to the creation of a purely German Judaism, which is a great ability to completely assimilate into the environment. So the descendants of German Jews subsequently merged completely within English Judaism.²
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Appendix A Rabbinic Biographies

Providing rabbinic biographies serves to further deepen the context of the study and the understanding of individuals portrayed. As not the entire biographies of rabbis can be detailed, the most relevant categories were chosen, providing an overview over the religious and secular educational background.

Unless otherwise indicated, the following rabbinic biographies are based on:
Further details can be found there.
The entries are sorted alphabetically.
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HUC Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio
HWJ Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, Berlin
ITL Israelitisch-Theologische Lehramstalt, Wien
JTS Jüdisch Theologisches Seminar, Breslau
JTSA Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, New York
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rabbinic Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smicha</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congregations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David, Moritz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Born</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Died</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rabbinic Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smicha</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congregations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dienemann, Max

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1875</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Krotoschin, Posen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Breslau, Ratibor, Offenbach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dünner, Joseph Hirsch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1913</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Cologne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Agudah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>Hildesheimer, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>Hildesheimer, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Adass Yisroel, Königsberg, Jewish Refugee Community, Westcliff, Adass Yisroel, London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ehrentreu, Jonah Ernst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1896</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Agudah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>Hildesheimer; Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>Hildesheimer, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Elz Chaim, Berlin, Pressburg, Munich, Melbourne, Australia, St. Kilda, Australia, Bridge Lane Beth Hamidrash, London, Kehalah Adath Yeshurun, London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eschelbacher, Max

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1880</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Bruchsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Rostock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Bruchsal, Düsseldorf, Cambridge (temporary), Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fackenheim, Emil²</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freier, Moritz</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelles, Siegfried</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heschel, Abraham Joshua</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Died</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Orthodox, Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>HUC, Cincinnati, Ohio, JTSA, New York, New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Holzer, Paul**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Krotoschin, Posen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Erlangen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Neue Dammtor Synagoge Hamburg, Epsom and District, Surrey, Hamburg, Chief Rabbi of British Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Italiener, Bruno**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Burgdorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal, British Liberal and Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Erlangen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jacob, Benno**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1862</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Frankenstein, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Göttingen, Dortmund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jacob, Ernst**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1899</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin, JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Congregations | Saarbrücken  
|              | Augsburg  
|              | Springfield, Missouri  

**Jakobovits, Julius**

- **Born**: 1886  
- **In**: Lackenbach, Austria  
- **Died**: 1947  
- **In**: London  
- **Affiliation**: Agudah  
- **Rabbinic Education**: Yeshivah, Pressburg  
- **Hildesheimer, Berlin**  
- **Smicha**: Hildesheimer, Berlin  
- **Doctoral Degree**: Würzburg  
- **Congregations**: Adass Yisroel, Königsberg  
- **Berlin**: Dayan of Beth Din

**Katten, Max**

- **Born**: 1892  
- **In**: Bonn  
- **Died**: 1957  
- **In**: London  
- **Affiliation**: Liberal  
- **Rabbinic Education**: JTS, Breslau  
- **Smicha**: JTS, Breslau  
- **Doctoral Degree**: Giessen  
- **Congregations**: Görlitz  
- **Bamberg**: Lecturer LBC, London

**Katz, Arthur**

- **Born**: 1908  
- **In**: Prague  
- **Died**: 1996  
- **In**: London  
- **Affiliation**: Liberal, British Reform  
- **Rabbinic Education**: Chust Yeshivah  
- **Smicha**: Chust Yeshivah  
- **Doctoral Degree**: Prague  
- **Congregations**: Sobeslav  
- **RCM, London**: RCM, London  
- **West London Synagogue, London**: West London Synagogue, London  
- **Hendon Reform Congregation, London**: Hendon Reform Congregation, London

**Köhler, Max**

- **Born**: 1899  
- **In**: Kassel  
- **Died**: 1987  
- **In**: Jerusalem  
- **Affiliation**: Agudah  
- **Rabbinic Education**: Halberstadt Yeshiva  
- **Hildesheimer, Berlin**  
- **Smicha**: Hildesheimer, Berlin  
- **Doctoral Degree**: Marburg  
- **Congregations**: Talmud Torah School, Frankfurt  
- **Borken**: Borken  
- **Schweinfurt**:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Rabbinic Education</th>
<th>Smicha</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree</th>
<th>Congregations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Königshöfer, Emmanuel</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>After 1977</td>
<td>B'nai B'rak, Israel</td>
<td>Agudah</td>
<td>Breuer Yeshivah, Frankfurt</td>
<td>Hildesheimer, Berlin</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Dresden, Gateshead Yeshivah, Yeshivah Or Yehuda, Kfar Saba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maybaum, Ignaz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1897</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal, Orthodox, Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>ITL, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Bingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frankfurt, Oder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friedenstempel, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neue Synagoge, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer at HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennington Park, London (temp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edgware Synagogue, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer LBC, London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nussbaum, Max

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Suceawa, Bukovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal, Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muskogee, Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollywood, California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ochs, Samuel Moses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1886</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Zborow, Galicia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Gleiwitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer at JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various Synagogues (temp.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pfingst, Gustav

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal, British Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Oppeln, Upper Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nordhausen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West London Synagogue, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheltenham Congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinai Synagogue, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prinz, Joachim
Born 1902
In Burkhardsdorf, Upper Silesia
Died 1988
In New York, New York
Affiliation Liberal
Rabbinic Education HWJ, Berlin
Smicha JTS, Breslau
Doctoral Degree Giessen
Congregations Friedenstempel Berlin

Rosenthal, Arthur
Born 1885
In Köthen
Died 1951
In New York
Affiliation Agudah
Rabbinic Education HWJ, Berlin
Smicha HWJ, Berlin
Doctoral Degree Heidelberg
Congregations Rybnik, Upper Silesia
Berlin-Gesundbrunnen
Beuthen, Upper Silesia
Berlin Lichtenberg
London (temp. work)

Rosenthal, Karl
Born 1885
In Lage
Died 1952
In Wilmington, North Carolina
Affiliation Liberal
Rabbinic Education HWJ, Berlin
Smicha HWJ, Berlin
Doctoral Degree Köln
Congregations Hörde, Westfalen
Berlin Reformsynagoge
Studies in Oxford
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Salzberger, Georg
Born 1882
In Kulm, West Prussia
Died 1975
In London
Affiliation Liberal
Rabbinic Education HWJ, Berlin
Smicha HWJ, Berlin
Doctoral Degree Heidelberg
Congregations New Liberal Jewish Congregation, London
(Belsize Square)

Sawady, Konrad Ernst
Born 1916
In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Died</th>
<th>1956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>Monday Morning Lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>St. George’s Settlement, London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schönberger, Davin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1897</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Nordhausen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Birmingham, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>HWJ, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Königsberg, East Prussia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schreiber, Hermann**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1882</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Schrimm, Posen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal, British Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Potsdam, West London Synagogue, London, Pestalozzi Strasse, Berlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seligmann, Caesar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Landau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>JTS, Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Breslau, Hamburg, Frankfurt, Society for Jewish Study, New Liberal Jewish Congregation, London (Belsize Square)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seligsohn, Rudolph Arnold Sylvester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1909</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Stratford-upon-Avon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weisz, Theodor</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilde, Georg</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Congregations

Breslau
Magdeburg
No congregation in UK

Winter, David Alexander

Born 1878
In Mönchen-Gladbach
Died 1953
In London
Affiliation Orthodox
Rabbinic Education Hildesheimer, Berlin
Smicha Hildesheimer, Berlin
Doctoral Degree Halle
Congregations Myslowitz, Upper Silesia
Lübeck
Kiel
Boarding House for Refugee Children in
Bournemouth

Austrian Rabbis

Herzog, David Prof. Dr.

Born 1869
In Tyrnau, Hungary
Died 1946
In Oxford
Affiliation Agudah
Rabbinic Education Hildesheimer, Berlin
Smicha Hildesheimer, Berlin
Doctoral Degree Leipzig
Congregations Ahawas Scholaum, Berlin
Uhersky Ostroa, Austria
Smichow, Prague
Chief Rabbi of Styria, Carinthia, Austria
Professor at Graz University
Academic work in Oxford

Kurrein, Viktor Prof. Dr.

Born 1881
In Linz, Austria
Died 1974
In London
Affiliation Agudah
Rabbinic Education ITL, Vienna
Smicha ITL, Vienna
Doctoral Degree Vienna
Congregations Meran, Austria
Salzburg, Austria
Karlsruhe, Germany
Linz, Austria
Amstetten, Austria
Academic work in Britain

Margules, David Samuel

Born 1884
In Lemberg
Died 1951
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>ITL, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>ITL, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Tachau, Czechoslovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salzburg, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Taglicht, Israel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Linz, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Agudah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Education</td>
<td>ITL, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smicha</td>
<td>ITL, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregations</td>
<td>Meran, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salzburg, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karlsruhe, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linz, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amstetten, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic work in Britain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B CRREC Financial Support

The support of the refugee rabbis and scholars can be reconstructed with the lists created by the administrative offices of the CRREC. This refugee sub-group was initially divided into five categories: Rabbis who had been rescued through the fund but were in the mean time able to maintain themselves; Rabbis who needed to be fully maintained and those who were only partly maintained. Additionally, aged rabbis were listed and subdivided by those who needed to be fully maintained and those who only needed to be partly maintained. Rabbis were also categorized by the number of their dependents. The first list below is an overview detailing these five categories and additionally provides the total number of individuals who needed to be maintained.

**Table 18 Rabbinic Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance through CRREC</th>
<th>Rabbis</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>av. amount**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Maintaining*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Maintained</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>£9.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Maintained</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>£5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Rabbis Fully Maintained</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>£13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Rabbis Partly Maintained</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* of self-maintaining rabbis and scholars transited to the US, 3 to Palestine
** one £ in 1940 is around £40 today

The category with the largest number of individuals was that of ‘Self Maintaining’. Theirs was the success story of rabbinic emigration with the help of the CRREC. The rabbis in this category had been provided with a visa through the CRREC but were not or no longer its financial responsibility. In this category were overall eighty-two rabbis and scholars, which including their dependents amounted to 226 persons. No longer dependent on the fund, they had either been able to obtain funding through relatives and friends or other refugee organizations. Some rabbis had been able to secure employment and were thus effectively maintaining themselves. Onward migration had also taken rabbis out of the financial responsibility of the fund. Fourteen rabbis had received their papers for the United States and left Britain. Ernst Jacob, the son of Benno Jacob who had passed away in 1940 was one of them. Another was Emil Schorsch who left Britain with his family for the US. He was the father of famous rabbi Ismar Schorsch. Likewise, three rabbis had managed to obtain papers and emigrate to Palestine. Among the rabbis who could maintain themselves in England was Bruno Italiener, famous rabbi of the

---

7 LBIA ME 575 MM 67 Emil Schorsch Collection. He left for the United States in May 1940.
8 HL MS 183 977 F1, List “Self- Maintaining” (undated).
‘Neuer Israelitischer Tempelverband’, a reform congregation in Hamburg.\(^9\) He had arrived in the summer of 1939 and was obtained a position at St. George’s Settlement Synagogue in London’s East End. Another rabbi, Arthur Loewenstamm of Spandau near Berlin was supported by his daughter and her husband. He supplemented the support of his family by earning a small income with private tuition for young men aspiring to the rabbinate. Among his students was Jakob Petuchowski, one of the children on the Kindertransports, who would later become an important rabbi and leadership figure in the Reform Movement in the United States.\(^{10}\)

Another list included rabbis categorized as ‘Aged Rabbis Fully or Partly Maintained’. Depicted below, it separated those who received full maintenance and those who were partly maintained or subsidized. All rabbis on this list were at or above retirement age, no longer able to obtain a position and who would not become wholly self-supporting through their work. These ‘Aged Rabbis’ would create a permanent, lifelong expense to the fund. Before leaving Germany, they had anticipated pension payments and had arranged for their remittance to Britain. With the political events and the entry into war payments never arrived rendering these retired rabbis destitute as most other refugees. Among them were Austrian rabbis Bauer, Giberman, Herzog and the Viennese Chief Rabbi Dr. Taglicht. Famous rabbis such as Prof Samson Weisse and Benno Jacob were also supported as were Julius Galliner from Berlin and his brother Siegfried from Gelsenkirchen. Included were Wilde from Magdeburg and Manes from Schwabach, a small town near Nuremberg. These once highly regarded rabbis and representatives of their communities had been rendered wholly dependent on the fund for their livelihood. They were supported at the combined cost of £121 per month.\(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully Maintained</th>
<th>Partly Maintained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. M. Bauer</td>
<td>Dr. Benno Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D. Friedman</td>
<td>A. Giberman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saja Fürst</td>
<td>Dr. S. Manes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Julius Galliner</td>
<td>Jonas Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Siegfried Galliner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Herzog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Israel Taglicht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Samson Weisse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Georg Wilde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further and most extensive list which incurred the highest expenditure was that of ‘Rabbis and Teachers we fully maintain’. The rabbis and teachers on this list, in contrast to the previous list, had the potential of eventually becoming self-supporting, if brought into employment. This


\(^{10}\) Petuchowski became a famous American rabbi in the post-war years. Jakob Petuchowski, Mein Judesein: Wege und Erfahrungen eines deutschen Rabbiners (Freiburg: Herder, 1992), 50.

\(^{11}\) HL MS 183 977 F1 List “Rabbis and Teachers, single, whom we fully maintain”, n.d.
list gives the names of twenty-one rabbis and teachers, their spouses and the number of children which the fund fully maintained. Overall ninety-two persons depended on monthly payments of overall £214 as their main source of income. Among them familiar names which speak of the destitution of these formerly famous rabbis. Jakobovits of Koenigsberg, Katten of Bamberg, Holzer of Hamburg, and Austrian rabbi Margules. The family Maybaum from Berlin and that of Eliezer Berkovits were also receiving maintenance through the fund. Again, several rabbis initially included on this list managed to emigrate onward to the US; among them rabbi and historian Adolf Kober of Berlin and Leo Trepp of Oldenburg.

Table 20 Full Maintenance by the Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully Maintained Rabbis and Teachers*</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jakobovits, Julius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>£15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Holzer, Paul</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Katten, Max</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kober, Adolf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Köhler, Max</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Margules, S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maybaum, Ignaz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Trepp, Leo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Berkovits, L.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bamberger, Moses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsch, David</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldschmidt, Max</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowitz, Eugen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jacobsen, Josef</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeruchem, Aron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baumgarten, S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornstein, Jacob</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoblewitz, M.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumpfer, M.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolff, Jos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgenstern, B.M.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td><strong>£214</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MS 183/977/F1 University of Southampton Library

A further list was maintained by the fund - that of ‘Rabbis and Teachers, Single whom we maintain’ which is depicted below. Six single rabbis were supported at the overall cost of £25,10 per month. While closer analysis of the names on any of the lists reveals the homogeneity among the rabbis, as they had been selected by religious leaning and educational background. The fund was reluctant to support graduates or students of the ‘Hochschule’ seminar in Berlin.

---

12 Berkovits first name was falsely abbreviated with L.
Rabbi Erich Bienheim who graduated from the ‘Hochschule’ and Konrad Sawady, a former student are the only exceptions and were both maintained by the fund.\textsuperscript{13}

### Table 21 Single Rabbis and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnfeld, Curt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bienheim, E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmann, Otto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawady, E. K.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Zimmels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Elias, M.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>£4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>£25,10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MS 183/977/F1 University of Southampton Library*

The fund did not only wholly maintain rabbis and their families but also subsidized rabbis and teachers. These payments were tracked on a separate list under the heading of ‘Partly maintained rabbis and teachers’. These payments supplemented the family income generated elsewhere or added to financial support obtained from other aid organizations. This partial maintenance supported eighty-eight adults and forty-seven children, overall 135 people.

The above details show only the partial obligation of the fund applying to the rabbis. But with all of the financial responsibility of the fund, by 1940 it found itself depleting its reserves. Transit visas had been issued in anticipation that rabbis would only temporarily sojourn in Britain and migrate to the US or elsewhere. This had been made nearly impossible by the war. Equally it had been anticipated for rabbis to obtain positions throughout Britain and the Commonwealth for which an employment bureau at the CRREC had been created. Reality however proved that neither of these options could be realized by the majority of rabbis. Most were unable to maintain themselves, as no work in British congregations or institutions was available. Several rabbis however did obtain employment most of which was on a temporary and part-time basis. In order to supplement family income many of the rabbis wives obtained work. But these incomes needed to be subsidized through the fund.\textsuperscript{14} All of these obligations and the lack of viable alternative funding burdened the liquidity of the fund - potentially bankrupting it. With this financially difficult situation, the fund looked to ways of securing its future liquidity and created an extensive list of guarantors in order to evenly distribute the obligation for the refugees.\textsuperscript{15} Should the fund have run out of financial means, the guarantors were to be called upon to finance the individually guaranteed refugees. For 115 rabbis and teachers, overall 273 persons, the fund had secured visas.\textsuperscript{16} It had also provided the guarantees for fifty-two rabbis and their families. A guarantee was the obligation to financially maintain a refugee. This extensive list of

\textsuperscript{13}HL MS 183 977 F1 List “Rabbis and Teachers, single, whom we fully maintain” (undated).

\textsuperscript{14}“Association of London Rabbis” JC, 10. January, 1940, 27.

\textsuperscript{15}HL MS 183 2 F2, List “Refugee-Guarantor-Address” (undated).

\textsuperscript{16}HL MS 183 2 F2, List “On Our Guarantees” (undated).
guarantees is not reproduced here but an interesting detail on that list warrants closer examination. Sixteen rabbis on this list had been granted visas by paying their own guarantee and had placed a deposit with the fund. For their maintenance, they did not receive money from the fund itself but instead their deposits were being drawn down over time. In these cases, the CRREC acted as a bank. However, eventually these deposits would be depleted and the rabbis then would become the financial responsibility of the fund.\footnote{HL MS 183 977 F1 no title.} Attempting to counteract potential bankruptcy the ‘Needy Clergy Fund’ was established in 1942. This was to provide additional means for the maintenance of refugee rabbis and scholars unable to maintain themselves - fully or partially.\footnote{“United Jewish Charities” JC, 30. January, 1942, 17.} Public appeals in the Jewish Chronicle emphasized how all Jews in Britain had benefited from the influx of clergy from the continent and should show their support through financial contributions.\footnote{“Chief Rabbi’s Chanukah Appeal” JC, 24. December, 1943, 7.}

The overall maintenance of the refugees was a massive financial burden, all of it initially borne by Anglo-Jewry. The government supported the agencies with around 50% of their funding by 1939. Aware of circumstances such as the inability to migrate onward and the issue around ‘Enemy Aliens’ the British government eventually stepped in. The depletion of the fund would eventually make all those dependent on its payments burdens of the state. The British government steadily increased its funding and became the sole contributor in 1945.\footnote{Bob Moore, “Reception in the United Kingdom,” in Second Chance: 2 Centuries of German-speaking Jews in the United Kingdom ed. Werner E. Mosse, (Tübingen: Mohr, 1991), 77.} During that period of time, the number of refugees receiving funds however had constantly decreased, as refugees eventually were able to establish themselves in Britain.\footnote{Ibid.}
Appendix C Rotating Pulpits

The intensity of the involvement of German rabbis in the British pulpits becomes apparent from the details published in the Jewish Chronicle. Detailed here are some of the rabbis and their work. Interestingly, many liberal rabbis were able to speak in orthodox synagogues, and several orthodox rabbis joined the liberal services.

The United Synagogue invited by Max Nussbaum\textsuperscript{22}, Hampstead Dennington Park hosted Maybaum\textsuperscript{23}, Freier was invited to Finchley District Kinloss Gardens.\textsuperscript{24} Bauer held services at St. John’s Wood and Carlebach at Hampstead Garden Suburb.\textsuperscript{25} Van der Zyl took services in German at the Liberal Jewish Synagogue\textsuperscript{26} and at St. John’s Wood\textsuperscript{27} where Swarsensky also spoke and Brasch took services at North London Liberal.\textsuperscript{28} Particularly high demand for rabbis was created during the High Holy Days of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. In 1939 the usual services in the established synagogues were held, but due to the large inflow of refugees, ‘overflow’ services needed to be organized. These services provided additional opportunities for rabbis to return to work. Salzberger took services at Wigmore Hall with Cantor Naumof-Fleischmann, Van Der Zyl and Lemle were at St. Pancras Town Hall, Gelles took services in German at Bayswater and Freier at Hampstead Dennington Park Synagogue.\textsuperscript{29} Maybaum held services at Unity Hall in North London and gave two sermons entitled ‘The Jews of Tomorrow’ and ‘Jews in Transition’.\textsuperscript{30} Eschelbacher and Rosenthal held services in Oxford,\textsuperscript{31} Trepp held services at Stoke Newington,\textsuperscript{32} and Warschauer worked for the refugee community in Woking.\textsuperscript{33} Additionally, in Cambridge, Eschelbacher and Margules, the former orthodox district rabbi of Salzburg together held services for the local refugee community. They also held memorial services for the November pogrom that year.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23} “This Week’s Pulpit” JC, 26. May, 1939, 9.
\textsuperscript{24} “This Week’s Pulpit” JC, 23. June, 1939, 11.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26} “This Week’s Pulpit” JC, 31. May, 1939, 21.
\textsuperscript{27} “This Week’s Pulpit” JC, 26. May, 1939, 9.
\textsuperscript{28} “This Week’s Pulpit” JC, 23. June, 1939, 11.
\textsuperscript{30} “This week’s pulpit” JC, 15. September, 1939, 8.
\textsuperscript{32} “This week’s pulpit” JC, 15. December, 1939, 17.
\textsuperscript{33} Warschauer, Leben, 1995, 121.
\textsuperscript{34} “The Late Mr. Dagut” JC, 5. January, 1945, 13.