CH. 2: Migrations, Settlement, Population

The population history of medieval European Jews has been treated extensively though unevenly. While origins and the ensuing streams of migration have always greatly exercised scholarship (as well as popular imagination), numbers and vital statistics were usually given a wide berth, even though all suffer equally from a dearth of reliable information. For some regions, the state of research allows only perfunctory remarks, while others have been investigated in a much more thorough manner. Based on what facts can be established or reasonably surmised, this chapter will address origins, expulsions, migrations, numbers, and family structures of the different European Jewries.

The Jewish nuclei of medieval Europe defined themselves religiously, culturally and linguistically as parts of the broader entity of a Jewish people historically anchored in the Middle East. Indeed, most of them can be followed back to the mid-Eastern Jewish populations of Antiquity, although nowhere by direct evidence for actual migration but rather by tenuous traces of ritual and literary traditions that must have been carried abroad by migrants and were often reworked into myth. Against this mainstream approach, a persistent strain in scholarship is still postulating non-Jewish origins for both Sephardic and Ashkenazic Jews, claiming that communities consist mostly of converts from other faiths, most onotably the Khazars.

A similar assertion has been made for central and northern France, where converts of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages were thought to have been numerous enough to produce the substantial Jewish population emerging there in the 11th century. There is little probability

and no evidence at all to support such notions. To the contrary, recent genetic studies have significantly strengthened the traditional view of a Jewish Diaspora derived from an ancestral homeland. One found the paternal gene pools of Jewish communities in Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East to have descended from a common Middle Eastern ancestral population. Another study observed an extremely close affinity of Diaspora Jews and non-Jewish Middle Eastern populations. Yet another study asserts for Ashkenazic Jewry a significant female founder ancestry deriving again from the Middle East. Incidentally, this would seem to invalidate a widespread notion that females generally "were taken" from Gentile populations.

A critical examination of both the sources and previous scholarship on the early medieval settlement of Jews in Europe will distinguish between two spheres, south and north, and two periods, from Late Antiquity to ca. 800, and afterwards until ca. 1050/1100. Such examination will make short thrift of myths of origin disseminated by medieval Jews from Spain to Poland, usually of an arrival early enough to clear their ancestors of the responsibility for deicide. It will also relinquish the idea of an unbroken Jewish presence from classical times in many of Europe's regions. Continuity, in clearly declining numbers, is evident only around the Mediterranean seaboard: in Byzantium, in Italy from Rome southwards, in a few places in southern France, more doubtful on the eastern Spanish shore, possibly also in the Black Sea region. This finding can be seen to fit a recent intriguing hypothesis on a linguistic-cultural separation that developed in Late Antiquity between Eastern Rabbinical and Western Biblical Judaism. In the process, the Western Diaspora was left without ties to the new centers of Judaism, and might as a consequence have largely assimilated into the Christian community. Whether by identity

loss or forcibly by the upheavals of the "Barbarian Migrations", an early medieval demographic low is unmistakable. In contrast, by the 9th/10th century new growth, slow at first and then accelerating, becomes visible everywhere. It is part of a general population increase apparent in most parts of Europe, which in turn reflects more stable conditions attained after the turmoil of the first medieval centuries, the restoration of political order, a revival of trade, and also a more productive agrarian regime. This central medieval growth phase was to be terminated by a late medieval low which again parallels general demographic trends.

In the High Middle Ages Jewish populations came to be concentrated in a number of regions: *Sefarad*, that is Muslim and Christian Iberia; *Provincia*, the French south with a northwards extension along the Rhone axis; the realm of *Ashkenaz* initially encompassing north-eastern France, Germany, Bohemia and Hungary, then extending westwards into the Low Countries, Normandy and England, and in the Later Middle Ages into northern Italy and Poland-Lithuania; central and northern Italian Jewry; a south-eastern *Romaniot* zone of Byzantium, the Balkans, and parts of southern Italy; and an elusive domain in and to the south of Kiev Russia. Significant numbers of Jews in Europe lived for centuries under Arab rule, until these regions – Sicily and the greater part of Iberia - came again under Christian dominion from the 11th century onwards. There were great variances in numbers, with Spain, *Ashkenaz*, southern France, the Italian south and possibly also Byzantium leading and Eastern Europe lagging far behind. Such hierarchy was however very unstable and would be overturned by whole-sale or partial expulsions: from a range of northern-French principalities in the course of the 13th century; from England (1290); from the Kingdom of France (1306/1394) and from the Provence after its incorporation into France (1481); from

Spain/Sicily/Portugal (1492/1497) and the Kingdom of Naples (1510); as well as from many towns and principalities in Germany and Italy in the course of the 15th and early 16th centuries. Further to effect population numbers were recurrent bouts of mass conversion, most prominently in the early medieval Byzantine Empire, in the Rhineland in 1096, in southern Italy 1290-93, in Iberia after 1391 and during the entire course of the 15th century. It was only after the end of the Middle Ages that the center of gravity, in population as in intellectual activity, shifted to the Ashkenazic realm of Eastern Europe.

Compared to the extensive documentation in the late antique Eastern Empire, in Byzantium of the first medieval centuries evidence diminishes sharply, in numbers and in intelligibility. The hitherto abundant inscriptional evidence dwindles to almost nothing. It is tempting to read this dearth as a demographic low fitting the general trend in the Byzantine Empire. In contrast, population seems to have picked up again from the mid-10th century onwards, paralleling the Byzantine state's military and political resurgence. From the vantage point of Benjamin of Tudela's travel report of around 1168, a denser pattern of Jewish settlement than previously becomes apparent, but one still much below the late antique high point. The traveler witnessed communities in Corfu, Arta, Aphilon (Achelous), Patras, Naupaktos, Corinth, Thebes, Chalcis, Salonika, Drama, and other localities, and on the Greek islands of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, Rhodes, and Cyprus. He found the largest ones in Thebes with 2,000 Jews, in Salonika 500, and in other towns from 20 to 400. His numbers can in all probability be understood to designate heads of households, and should therefore be multiplied by a household coefficient of between 5 and 10.

As in Antiquity, this settlement structure was still oriented towards the Mediterranean littoral by a road-system, albeit now much-reduced, connecting the coastal cities to inland towns. From this pattern a far-reaching though not self-evident demographic conclusion has been drawn: “It is therefore legitimate to presuppose, even though no additional documents are as yet available, the existence of Jewish groupings in many more ports and commercial cities of Asia Minor at different periods of Byzantine history and, especially, following the Empire’s territorial expansion in the late 10th century.” Something similar had already been stated by a medieval contemporary, Abraham ibn Daud of Toledo (1161), who remarked on the presence of Jews *on all the islands of the Greek sea from the land of Venice and Genoa as far as Constantinople and Byzantium*. There was thus a clear continuity of the Jewish presence in the Eastern Empire from late antiquity until the High Middle Ages, ebbing and surging at a pace apparently attuned to that of population at large. Secondly, there was geographical dissemination and a migratory flow throughout the Byzantine space and into southern Italy and the Muslim Middle East and North Africa. We have no information on demographic changes during the troubled times from the 13th to the 15th centuries, except for the arrival, at the very end of the period, of significant numbers of Jews fleeing Spain and Portugal for the much more benign regime of the Ottoman state.

In Italy of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, our review of the sources has found a clear preponderance of the south, with sixteen places of Jewish habitation in evidence as compared to the north and center (excluding Rome) with a mere seven. In only a small minority of locations, Rome and some towns in the south, is there a continued presence from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages. A similar numeral

disparity, somewhat less pronounced, holds for the more numerous places where Jews settled first during the Middle Ages, 18 in the south as against 11 in the north and center. There is also a difference, in favor of the south, in the extent and quality of documentation. Documents on real Jewish people, chiefly notaries' records, are extant only from the south and from Lucca in Tuscany, even though such documents were written and preserved in many more northern places. In contrast, in many towns of the north one typically has no more than a single hagiographic reference, burdened with a huge question mark of reliability inherent in such type of sources. Compared to Byzantium, the low rate of continuity indicates a considerable difference in the stability of a Jewish presence. Altogether, the number of communities everywhere in Italy is small, much smaller than in Byzantium. The church reformer Petrus Damiani (1007-1072), who spent all his life in Italy, remarked in the prologue to his treatise "Against the Jews" (1040-1041) that writing such a polemic is barely worth the effort, as *the Jews are now almost deleted from the face of the earth*. This might have been somewhat exaggerated, as witnessed by Benjamin of Tudela's Italian itinerary a century later. In geographical order of his journey, he noted the following places and numbers: Genoa 2, Pisa 20, Lucca 40, Rome 200, Capua 300, Naples 500, Salerno 600, Amalfi 20, Benevento 200, Melfi 200, Ascoli 40, Trani 200, Taranto 300, Brindisi 10, Otranto 500, Messina 200, Palermo 1500. The list can be supplemented for Catania, where a document of the year 1145 lists 24 Jewish families belonging to the local church, all bearing Arabic names. Thus, for population numbers too the north and Rome are clearly eclipsed by the south. This does not mean that the southern communities were uniformly large. Palermo is clearly outstanding, a result of its particular bloom in Muslim Sicily. Benjamin numbers add up to altogether 4832. Taking into account a few places not visited by him in the north and on

the eastern seaboard, opting for his numbers to mean families rather than individuals, and assuming a high ratio of ten persons per family, his total can reasonably be rounded up and translated to about fifty to sixty thousand individuals. Such numbers attained for a period when the Jewish population, as indeed the general one, was clearly on the rise again. In the 13th century Italy shows no change in the distribution of the Jewish population, which remained mainly concentrated in the south of the peninsula. Towards the end of the century, a violent drive to baptize the Jews in the Kingdom of Naples reduced numbers significantly, possibly by as much as half. Rome too appears to have lost some of its Jewish inhabitants when the Holy See relocated to Avignon slightly later. From Rome or Southern Italy Jewish moneylenders moved north and settled in numerous places in the north and center of the peninsula. There they were to meet, somewhat later, a similar immigration of credit experts coming from Germany. These were the beginnings of a unique Italian feature, the mosaic of Romaniot, Ashkenazic and eventually also Sephardic and Portuguese congregations, often within the confined space of a single town as still visible today in Venice. For the mid-15th century, a total of possibly 300 or more places of Jewish residence has been suggested, however usually with a very small number of families each. The one significant exception was still Sicily. When the expulsion of Jews from Spain was applied to the island, a total of 6,300 Jewish-owned houses were confiscated, which has been seen to represent almost 40 000 souls. In relation to surface and general population numbers, this would make the Sicilian community the most densely populated one in all of medieval Europe. In the south of Italy, a family structure in step with Mediterranean patterns can be made out. Families were large and extended over generations, as witnessed by a document of 1041 from Capua. It lists two groups of adult male Jews united by parenthood and

common property. One was made up of eight descendants of the same ancestor, *Judas*, divided over three generations and regrouped as a father and his cousins, the sons of brothers. The other group consists of four descendents of an ancestor called *Dunissus*, grouped in two generations of parallel patrilineal cousins. Amongst the first was also, as in so many places, the son of a certain Jonas *who has become a Christian*, which begs again the question of the demographic impact of apostasy, both individual and collective.

On the Iberian Peninsula, the sparse Jewish population of Roman Late Antiquity seems by all indications barely to have persisted in subsequent Visigothic times. There is indeed a spate of documentation setting in immediately with the Visigoths' conversion to Catholicism (589) and running up to the Arab conquest of 711. This derives almost entirely from ecclesiastical and royal legislation, with one clearly influencing the other in a rising spiral of missionary zeal. The sheer bulk and fervor of these writings are unlike anything else encountered in early medieval Europe. Scholarship has usually understood this outpour as a response to a tangible challenge, of proselytizing, economic or social domination, or other manifestations of Jewish expansionism. Only a substantial Jewry, a force to be reckoned with, could have generated such a threat. From this premise a Jewish aristocracy of landholders, international merchants and slave traders has been constructed. However, outside polemics no evidence exists for this assumption and the inferences drawn from it. In contrast, the data available by the late 10th and early 11th century reflect a different order of magnitude, both in the count of places inhabited and in population numbers. This appears to parallel the general demographic curve in al-Andalus. Growth in Spain is thus clearly tied to a more favorable Arab regime, and quite possibly also to immigration from

North Africa. These together produced a Sephardic Jewry showing no visible similarity to and continuity with the few quite indistinctive Jews of the Roman and Visigothic periods.

How many people? Eliyahu Ashtor made a valiant attempt to compute the Jewish population of Muslim Spain according to the estimated surface of the Jewish quarters of the different towns. These numbers were to be multiplied by a coefficient of mean density per hectare which he derived from studies on overall town populations. Thus, Ashtor computed over 5000 souls for Granada and Sevilla, close to 4000 for Toledo, 2000 for Almeria, and over a thousand for Saragossa, Tudela and Huesca. His procedure has been severely criticized as inflating what David Wasserstein basically saw as "a small minority by their numbers and their distribution in the Iberian peninsula", whose "largest community in al-Andalus is unlikely to have counted more than eight or nine hundred individuals". Actually, Ashtor's totals are not that far removed from this estimate, except for the largest places. Counting together all his numbers and adding a few more hundred in places not included for some reason in his tally, one arrives at around 25000 souls in all of Muslim Iberia in the mid-11th century. Taking heed of Wasserstein's critique but disregarding his warning that "we do not know, and we cannot know how many Jews there were in al-Andalus", one might put the total somewhere in the dimension of 15000. Whether counting 25000 or 15000, the Jews of Muslim Iberia were but a small minority, despite their dazzling cultural achievements. In the course of the 11th century they were to become an even lesser one, as the political anarchy in the Taifa states drove sizable numbers of people to take refuge in the expanding Christian kingdoms to the north. Already by the early century there were Jews in far-away León who bore Arabicized names, as did almost all those appearing in the

sources in Tudela long after it passed in 1115 under Christian rule, or in Christian Toledo throughout the 12th and 13th centuries. In the 12th century the Almohad persecution put an end to the existence of numerous communities, of which the most famous was Lucena.

In the Christian north, the time line for the establishment of Jewish communities is quite clear. Barcelona and Gerona by the late 9th century were the earliest, doubtlessly due to the impetus given these parts by Carolingian colonization in Catalonia. Elsewhere in the north at this time, Jewish communities are only found in places under Muslim rule in the Ebro valley. In Leon-Castile, Jews came to be present in the capital during the 10th century, in other places in the course of the following one. In the Kingdoms of Aragon and Navarra, they appear not earlier than the 11th to early 12th century. The locales were first seats of political and military power, then in the course of time also road junctions along the Santiago route and, in the Ebro basin and between Burgos and León, medium and small towns functioning as service centers for the agricultural hinterland. There are faint indications for single Jews living or sojourning in the countryside. Altogether, the formation of a Jewish presence was part and parcel of the substantial demographic growth undergone by the Christian realms in the 10th and especially the early 11th century. One would greatly like to be able to quantify this growth, but the material at disposal simply does not provide for such a question. There is one sole indication for population numbers, from Barcelona of 17 May 1079. By a rough estimate, the town's Jewish households at this time were in the dimension of around 60, which would make a total of souls between 240 (coefficient of 4 per household) and 480 (coefficient of 8). Even given a large margin for error, these are very modest dimensions for

such an important city. Other places in Christian Spain were not likely to have had greater numbers.

The development of the Jewish population in Iberia did not follow a linear pattern of growth. For the longer part of the period under scrutiny, it was of very modest dimensions and confined to a small number of places. Under such adverse conditions, it is difficult to see an uninterrupted presence even in the most important locations. Expansion set in late, roughly a century after the Muslim conquest, in a few places including maybe two in the Christian north. The 10th and especially the 11th century saw further population growth, by now also in the developing Christian realms, apparently reaching its apogee towards the end of the 13th and in the early 14th century. By then, the Christian Reconquista of almost all parts of Muslim Iberia had opened manifold opportunities for the advancement of Jews in urban trades and crafts and in the administrations of the Christian states. This favorable state of affairs must have brought about considerable population growth and a proliferation of communities throughout the peninsula. It was roughly ended with the onset of persecution in 1391 and the tremendous pressure for conversion during the 15th century, which are estimated to have brought down Jewish population numbers by at least half. At the time of the expulsion of 1492, the already much depleted number of Jews has been estimated at around 100,000 people, while a larger number remained behind as Conversos. Thus from the 11th/12th to the late 13th century the Jewish population of Iberia grew at a fast pace to be the largest European one, only to shrink again in the Late Middle Ages by forced and voluntary conversion as well as by straightforward persecution.

In Gaul too, Jewish settlement followed an uneven course. Going by the archaeological record as well as by a critical examination of the written

CH. 3: The Tobacco Tax

NEW systems of taxation and the extension of old ones are the invariable accompaniments of great wars. By the Civil War in America an enormous strain was put on a fiscal system that for nearly half a century had been on a peace footing. The tariff was quickly increased, but a disturbed foreign trade proved to be a poor source from which to draw the sinews of war. Early in 1862, Congress entered upon the subject of laying internal taxes, but found itself in dangerous and unknown fields. Such taxes had always been unpopular. They had been a prime cause of the Revolution; and the memory of them gave only a short life to Hamilton's effort for an excise, and even a shorter life to the internal revenue of the war of 1812.

Thus there were no guides to the problem, what taxes were best adapted to American conditions of scattered population and aversion to restrictions, or what were most likely to meet public favor. The internal revenue act of July 1, 1862, was distinctly a war measure, drafted under the pressure of needs almost overwhelming. Everything was taxed, raw materials as well as finished products; labor and the tools of labor; the mediums of exchange, the processes of the manufacturer, and the returns of the professional man. In European governments, tobacco was already among the chief sources of revenue, being taxed both in the leaf and in the manufactured forms. Owing, however, to the wide area of its growth in America, the leaf was necessarily exempted from taxation until it reached the market in a manufactured form. Accordingly, in the first internal " manufacturers and leaders were taxed,* and low rates levied on cigars, chewing and smoking tobacco, and on snuff.

The internal revenue system then organized was placed in the hands of a Commissioner of Internal Revenue. He was aided in each revenue district by an assessor and a collector, to whom fell the preparation of the tax lists and the collecting of the taxes.t Errors of valuation and similar questions came before the assessor; but an appeal to the commissioner at Washington was allowed in important cases. Every person liable under the law was required to deliver to the assessor a detailed statement of the quantity and quality of his taxable property, and to pay the taxes computed from these lists. The regulations of the act applied alike to all articles taxed, and contained (no special rules for tobacco. Every tobacco manufacturer paid his license fee, like any other manufacturer. At regular

intervals he made returns of the number of pounds of tobacco sold and of its value, and was assessed accordingly.

The tax varied with the value, being fifteen cents a pound on tobacco valued at more than thirty cents, and tell cents on that valued at thirty cents or less. The tax, of course, was really present in the total amount of the sales returned.? It is evident that no price could be placed on tobacco until its removal and sale; and with its removal and sale it usually passed beyond the reach of the officers who were to verify and detect its value. Thus a way was opened Manufacturers of tobacco and cigars were not distinguished from other manufacturers.

for fraud and undervaluation. As the practice of branding was not yet in use, there was no evidence upon a pack- age that it had or had not been properly taxed. The inevitable result was that great quantities escaped taxation entirely, especially through a practice of removing goods from the district where they were made to another where they were treated as if the tax had been paid. This was the simplest way open to those who wished to avoid paying the tax; while even to the honest manufacturers and honest assessors the mixed specific and ad valorem rates were difficult to determine. In his report for 1863, the commissioner represented that a larger tax on tobacco would be cheerfully borne,* and could be collected easily, without diminishing the production; and he accordingly recommended a tax on tobacco in the leaf, believing that, with proper regulations for inspection, it would tend to defeat fraudulent prac- tices. This proposal recurred in several succeeding re- ports, and was based on the ease with which a corresponding hop tax was levied in England.

It never met the approval of Congress. and was dropped when other means of checking fraud were adopted. The proceeds of the tobacco tax were three millions and eight millions for the years 1863 and 1864 respectively. "Even that result," said the commissioner in his report of December, 1864, "did not represent the power of the then existing laws to produce revenue ": A system of national taxation so complicated in its details, and so unwieldy in its proportions, could not be made immediately productive throughout a continent.... [But now] the officers have become more expert, the taxes more strictly assessed, and the flow of revenue has steadily increased. While the commissioner was still busy organizing his forces, Congress early in 1863.

One change was the substitution of a specific tax of fifteen cents per pound for the earlier mixed rate on manufactured tobacco. But more

important, in some respects, was the power given to the commissioner to appoint inspectors of tobacco whenever needed. This was the first step towards a separate organization of the machinery and methods for collecting the tax. The inspector branded each package of tobacco, snuff, or cigars with the quality and weight, together with his own name and the date; and this expedient served to remedy the most glaring evils of the moment. The inspector's salary was paid by fees from manufacturers,-a practice continued until the office was abolished in 1886-t The great financial burdens of the closing year of the war led to the second important act of this first period, the internal revenue act of June 30, 1864.

This act attempted to double the returns from tobacco by doubling, in some cases tripling, the tax on it. Cigarettes were for the first time added to the tax list; but, in other respects, the classification remained unaltered. The act elaborated the machinery of collection, and added to it the new rule that the tax on tobacco and cigars should be collected in the district and place of manufacture. It was required that every manufacturer of tobacco, snuff, and cigars should furnish to the assessor, immediately, a sworn statement of the street and number of his factory, and of the proposed market for the product, and a general description of the kind and quality. On receipt of this, the assessor issued a "' permit" in addition to the regular "' license."

In addition to this report, every manufacturer was compelled, on the first day of the year, to send in an inventory of his tobacco, snuff, cigars, tin-foil, licorice, and stems, stating what part he had made and what part he had bought from others. From the moment of taking the inventory he must keep an accurate account of all purchases and sales of these articles, and send to the assessor on every Wednesday a true copy of the entries, whereupon he was assessed according to the returns he had made, and was required to pay his tax to the col- lector within five days.* Even these regulations were not thought sufficient. At the end of every month, the manufacturer must sign a declaration that no taxable form of tobacco had been re- moved from his factory other than that duly returned and assessed.

And, still further to increase his responsibility, it was provided by amendment that he should give heavy bonds for every machine and for every workman in his employ. Still other checks were devised in this act of 1864. Makers of tin-foil also were to render statements, on demand, of the quantity of their product sold to tobacco and cigar manufacturers. Inspectors were given the right to enter the premises of tobacco factories,

and besides were to attach a stamp indicating inspection, in such a way that it should be broken when the package was opened.t Together with these restrictive regulations, so necessary in dealing with a highly taxed commodity, the privilege of bonded warehouses was extended to the manufacturer of tobacco. Thus he could delay paying his tax until he withdrew his goods for sale. If sold for export, no tax was required. Such were the provisions of the act of 1864. They were slightly modified by amendments in the three sue.

Thus the inspector was to examine imported as well as domestic goods, and later was given power to question a manufacturer under oath in any case of suspected false valuation.* But no important changes were mate. The act seemed at the time strong enough to hold tobacco manufacturers strictly to their duty. But the in- crease in revenue from year to year was hardly more than that naturally to be expected under the old rates,- certainly in no proportion to the doubling of the rates.t This was in part due to the frequent changes in the tax, and the consequent great irregularity in the quantities manufactured. Whenever discussion pointed to a probable advance in the tax, manufacturers became correspond- inflictive in their efforts to make up a large stock under the existing rates. Consequently, the tobacco market and the revenues from tobacco could hardly reach a normal condition within a year after any new act went into effect. So frequently were these earlier rates modified or raised that it is impossible to form an opinion of their true worth as revenue-producing means. A curious conflict arose under the act of 1864 in assessing the taxes on cigars.

The act specified that cigars valued by the maker at less than $5 per thousand should pay $3 tax; if valued between $5 and $15, the tax should be $8. It will be recalled that the sales value returned by the maker to the assessor was the only basis on which to reckon the value of the cigars, and the selling price of necessity included the tax. If now a man returned a sale of a thousand cigars at $12 per thousand, what tax should he pay? If $8, then the actual value of the cigars was $4; but cigars valued below $5 were taxed at only $3. If he paid the tax of $3, then the actual value of the cigars -was $9; but the law taxed cigars valued between $5 and $15 at $8 per thousand.

Plainly, there had been an error in framing the schedule of rates, in leaving too great a gap between the lowest tax and the next higher; for the reasoning applied to the example cited was true of any sale of cigars at rates between $8 and $13 per thou- sand. Since Congress took no action when attention was called to the difficulty, it was left to the commissioner

for two years to levy such a tax as could be agreed upon with the manufacturers With the amendments and minor acts of 1865, 1866, an(l 1867, the end was reached of the first and what may rightly be called the experimental stage of the effort to make tobacco contribute to the support of government. By the end of the fiscal year 1868 it had yielded a total of seventy-eight millions. Its importance was growing, and it stood second only to distilled spirits as the largest single source of internal revenue.

The more noticeable features of these first six years were: first, the few objects that were taxed; second, the combination of specific and ad valorem tax; and, third, the rapid growth of a series of strict rules in regard to the manufacture of tobacco and cigars, apart from the more general laws which touched nearly all industries. The first of these points is made plain by the fact that only four separate items appear in the detailed reports down to 1868,- cigars, snuff, manufactured tobacco, and "Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, December, 18634. 1 This anomaly was remedied by the act of July 13, 1866, 14 Statutes at Large, the tax on dealers in manufactured tobacco.

Of these four sources, cigars and manufactured tobacco yielded seventy-six millions out of the total of seventy-eight mill- ions. Nearly this proportion has been maintained to the present time, although since 1868 ten new phases * of the trade have been placed under contribution. The reasons for this can be briefly stated. In spite of the small scale on which the bulk of the tobacco was manufactured, cigar and tobacco factories had a permanence not found in dealers in leaf, in pedlers, or in other retail dealers. This was well illustrated by the tax on retail dealers in manufactured tobacco, which even in the most successful years, 1867 and 1868, indicated the existence of no more than three or four thousand such in the United States. Be- sides, the comparative ease of inspecting factories enabled the government to watch the products, and made more certain that tobacco or cigars, once within its cognizance, could not escape taxation.

Second, the combined specific and ad valorem rate was early found too cumbersome for manufactured tobacco, and was done away with as early as March, 1863; but it clung to cigars until 1868. There is always present in such a system the temptation to undervalue goods, so as to bring them into a class less heavily taxed; and the difficulty in this case amounted to a serious disease. Third and last, the rapid growth of the tobacco tax as a separate branch of revenue, and the prominence it speed- ily attained, were perhaps the most important features of the period. Nevertheless, the returns for the first few years were disappointing. Direct

fraud and evasion do not seem to have been so much to blame as the inertia of so great a system. The rates under the first act were low, were slightly increased in 1863, more than doubled *Peddlers, dealers in leaf, large and small, wholesale and retail, and all the manufactures of tobacco not otherwise specified.

and retained at nearly that point until 1-868. With the increase in the rates the dangers from fraud increased in greater proportion,- a fact to which the restrictive laws bear sufficient witness. In his report of 1868,* Mr. Wells dwelt at some length upon the various methods of dishonest manufacturers. The chief mode of defrauding the revenue was from the connivance or incompetency of officials. When honesty was lacking, the check of inspection was worthless. An- other evil was the use of counterfeit inspection brands, or of brands belonging to inspectors no longer in the service, which was complicated by the fiat that each inspector furnished his own die, with whatever design he preferred. Other forms of fraud were the use for a second time of inspected packages; for example, the removal of smoking tobacco from an inspected package, and the substitution of chewing tobacco, which in the course of .time had come to be taxed at a higher rate. A more brazen method of avoiding the tax grew out of the long credit (sixty days) which could then be bad from the government.

A factory equipped with old machines would be started, the proprietor selling his product as fast as made, all properly branded by the inspector. Just before the sixty days' limit was reached, the proprietor quietly slipped away leaving to the government a valueless plant and a more or less valuable bond, in return for tax credits to the amount of perhaps $25,000. Under the act of 1864 it can safely be said that the twenty millions of yearly revenue did not represent more than half the amount really due to the government. Mr. Wells stated that " the books of some of time largest manu- facturers in this country show that their aggregate sales of smoking tobacco for the whole of the last year have not b)een in excess of the average of sales which, before the imposition of the tax, were effected in a single week.

further thought that the cause of the trouble lav in the method of appointing inspectors; but it is doubtful if any amount of strictness could have made the system effective so long as the goods, when they reached the consumer, did not bear about them the evidence of a tax paid. The fault evidently was in the system; for at that time in France tobacco was taxed much higher without affecting its use; while England was deriving a revenue of thirty-five millions from a total use of less than tarty million

pounds. Meanwhile, the United States was getting a revenue of but nineteen millions from sixty million pounds.

With these facts in view, it was obvious that a, much larger revenue could be collected by the government; but the method was a matter of doubt. The discovery of great frauds, and especially the unearthing of the "; Tobacco Ring," brought matters to a crisis and enacted the bill practically in the form submitted by Mr. Wells and the manufacturers. By the provisions of the new act all taxes became specific, and the rates were slightly lowered. The higher rate on chewing than on smoking tobacco -a distinction begun in 1864 - was unfortunately retained, and proved a cause of further mischief.t Dealers in leaf, retail dealers in cigars and tobacco, an(d cigar-makers (including work- men) were added to the tax list. This was an essential link in the new system, for tobacco stamps were sold only to those who had filed the required bonds and had paid the special tax. The stamps were sold by the collector, and were attached by the inspector at the face of manufacture. So strictly was this rule construed that it was held to be broken when cigars were removed unstamped from the back part of a room where they were made to the frontlet where they were sold.

This double check held both manufacturer and official closely to duty, for a discrepancy anywhere would be quickly revealed; while the public evidence of the stamp forbade evasion. It was at this time, too, that the familiar legend was first attached to packages of tobacco and cigars, "Notice! The manufacturer of this tobacco has complied with all requirements of law. Every person is cautioned under penalties of law not to use this package for tobacco again" Factories were numbered: and, as a necessary condition for the success of the stamp system, tobacco and snuff were to be packed in packages of fixed weight, and cigars in boxes containing the numbers determined by law. Imported goods were to conform to the same rules, but were provided with a separate stamp.

Such were the important changes made by the act of 1868. Their effect upon the revenue was immediate. The receipts for 1870 were 31.3 millions against 18.7 mill- ions in 1868, a gain of nearly 80 per cent. in spite of the reduction in the rates. As cigars showed a much greater increase (95 per cent.) than any other item, it may naturally be inferred that a greater proportion of them had previously escaped taxation. No better indication could be formed of the greater efficiency of the stamp system or of the amount of evasion in the years just before 1868. The new system seemed to reach nearly its full effect in the first complete year of

CH. 4: THE JEWISH POPULAJION OF GREAT BRITAIN'

QNE of the most significant things about Jews in Britain is that we do not know how many there are. It is usually supposed nowadays that they number something like 450,000 in a total population of about 53 millions, but the ways in which estimates of Anglo-Jewish numbers are arrived at involve a good deal of guesswork. (The *Jewish Year Book* gives figures for the Jewish population of various centres and a number of partial surveys have been made.2) Our ignorance of the precise dimensions of Anglo-Jewry springs from the very nature of the society of which it is a part. Nobody has counted the Jews in Britain because, neither as followers of a religion nor as members of an ethnic group, have they any specific relationship to the political system. I do not mean, of course, that the state does not recognize that Jews require special treatment in certain circumstances; the courts of law may support the Jewish religious authorities in the performance of their duties *vis-d-ois* the Jewish public; Jewish dietary needs were accommodated during food rationing; government offices may sometimes make use of Jewish communal organizations; and so on. But always in theory and largely in practice Jews in Britain are simply citizens without any special status such as would call for their separate enumeration. Nor, on the other hand, is there aJewry in Britain which is so differentiated from the rest of society and so organized internally S to make it possible for Jews to count themselves. The demography of Anglo-Jewry is vague precisely because Anglo-Jewry as a structural

entity is vague.

In such social circumstances as are given in Britain one would expect the rather tedious game of defining the Jew to flourish. And indeed it flourishes, bringing out very clearly how Jews see the ambiguitycin a term which can never embrace a discrete segment of the population of Britain. Even if there were ritually and ideologically oneJewish 'church' (which there is not), many people calling themselves Jews would slip through the net of a definition of Jewry by religious criteria. Religion apart, there is no such thing in Britain as a Jewish culture involving the greater part of the 450,000 individuals commonly accepted as being

Jews. There is no general Jewish language. Even among the immediate descendants of the immigrants from Eastern Europe Yiddish has largely disappeared as an unbroken language. Ladino speakers are numerically negligible. Hebrew as a modern tongue is sparsely known and used. Nor, except in a very limited sense, could one say that Jews have developed their own brand of English. Jewish cultural habits there are in plenty, but they are not integrated or widespread enough to constitute a specific way of life peculiar to all or most Jews.

I am not proposing here to play the game of defining the Jews. All that can usefully be said in a short paper is that Anglo-Jewry is a category of people in which every individual shares some Jewish characteristics with many other individuals but which is not uniform in its Jewish properties. In what follows I shall try to show very briefly how this category of the British population is distributed geographically and occupationally and how far its demographic and social circumstances are likely to ensure its survival.

Jews living in Britain are concentrated in the large urban centres.

All but about i 5 per cent of them are to be found in London, Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, Liverpool, and Birmingham, Greater London by itself accounting for about 65 per cent of Anglo-Jewry. Within the cities they inhabit Jews tend to congregate in certain areas and to create for themselves there conditions which are less than those of the 'ghetto' and more than those of the ordinary Gentile environment. The synagogues, Jewish voluntary associations, *k&zer* butcher shops, and Jewish groceries are not the centres of compactJewish sectors, but rather the nuclei of Jewish populations which live interspersed with non-Jewish neighbours. These areas of concentration may take on a decidedly Jewish flavour, but they are not large Jewish quarters in the same way as the East End of London and some districts of the provincial cities were once Jewish enclaves. The mass influx of Eastern European Jews into Britain in the last decades of the nineteenth century set up the East End and some provincial centres as replicas of the continental compact settlements. At the height of the immigration East London held about 90 per cent of metropolitan Jewry. But the English 'ghettoes' were not to last. As far as London is concerned, early in this century (and especially after the First World War) Jews flowed out of the East End along a northern route which marked various stages in the process of social as well as physical mobility. As they grew more prosperous they moved further north, not, as Dr. H. M. Brotz has correctly argued,3 because they were running away from their fellow-Jews, but because they were seeking a Jewish environment of a higher social standing. In bur own day Golden Green, Hendon, and Edgware have marked terminal points of the migratory route from the East End.

If I may linger for a moment more on the general London movement in search of a good address, I should like to stress that the northern

route does not show a procession of 'ghettoes' but a line of Jewish areas which are evaluated partly by their standing in the wider English world. The status of an area depends in large measure on what non-Jews think of it, and if an area becomes too wholly Jewish and loses value in non-Jewish eyes then it ceases to be completely desirable to Jews. One of Dr. Brotz's informants commented on Golders Green: 'Ha! This isn't such a marvellous place any more. You know what they're calling it now? Goldstein Green.'4 This is one index of the essential character of Jewish life in Britain: Jess like to be among Jews but not to the extent of cutting themselves off from the wider society, in which they wish to circulate freely and equally.

When the East European Jews arrived in large numbers in the i 88os they changed the complexion of the small Anglo-Jewry which had evolved since the Resettlement in the latter part of the seventeenth century. This long-established Jewry had become anglicized and made for itself many comfortable niches in the economy of the country. The new immigrants were not only exotic; they. furnished Anglo-Jewry with a sizeable poor class.5 Yet within a couple of generations this poor class had disintegrated along with the East End and provincial 'ghettoes'. Exploiting the business opportunities open to them and making good use of the public education freely available, many Eastern EuropeanJews rose to middle-class status and moved to the newJewish areas.

I do not, of course, mean that no Jewish working class remains; indeed it does; but Jewry in Britain has as a whole a decidedly middleclass complexion. Moreover, the occupations of working-class Jews

rarely fall within the range of those with the lowest income and prestige in society at large. I cannot offer to present a clear picture of Anglo-.. Jewish occupational structure, because the data are quite inadequate. But I can try to bring together a number of pointers which indicate how the economic life of Jews differs considerably. from that of their non-Jewish neighbours.

Jews in Britain are usually thought to be characteristically business men of one sort and another. The popular notion is of course exaggerated, but business, especially on a small or medium scale, certainly plays an important part in the economy of Anglo-Jewry. In the immediate post-War period there was some reason for thinking that between 15 and 20 per cent of gainfully occupied Jews were in trade and industry on their own account,6 while another estimate of 'Britain's Jewish traders and businessmen' made them account for about one-seventh of the Jewish male population over the age of I5. It may well be that these figures are considerable underestimates,8 and it is certain that in the smaller Jewish settlements the business men play a prominent role. Certainly, owing to the Jewish attachment to small-scale business, Jews working on their own account are proportionally several times more numerous than non-Jews working on their own account.

Jewish economic life tends to be specialized, failing largely within the field of the manufacturer and distribution of consumer goods. The role of the Jews as entrepreneurs and workers in the clothing industry, for example, is so well known as to need little stressing. In 1932 there were some 40,000 Jewish workers in the industry,9 although this number has declined in recent years.'°

Anglo-Jewry also reflects the tendency for Jews in the diaspora to

find their way into the professions when these occupations are open to them and opportunities for training are available. There appears to be a high proportion of Jews studying in the universities, and it is likely that the professionalization of Anglo-Jewry has not yet reached its peak. On the basis of an estimate made in 1954-5 it would seem that, while Jews form less than one per cent of the total population there was one Jew in about every thirty university students." Medicine, law, and accountancy attract Jews in considerable numbers, but some also engage in research and teaching in the sciences and humanities. In a paper published after the war, Redcliffe Salaman showed that Jews had gradually increased their proportion of the Fellows of the Royal Society until in 1948 five per cent of the Fellows were people of full Jewish parentage.**12**

I turn now to the demographic aspects of my subject. Up to the present the Jewish population has shown a steady rise in numbers and has managed to increase its proportion of the total population. During this century the percentage of Jews in the total population has doubled. But of course the numerical progress of Anglo-Jewry has been the product of immigration from Eastern and Central Europe. Now Anglo-Jewry can no longer look to a great accession from abroad, and even the few Jews who trickle in merely compensate for the few who leave the country. As the Jews have become a stabilized population without prospect of -large additions from abroad, people have begun to wonder whether they can maintain their numbers by natural increase. In her survey of population questions Dr. Neustatter has argued that at least during the last decades the natural increase of Jews has been negligible, 'if in fact there has been any at all'.1' Jews in Britain continue to set a high value on the married state (although they seem to marry later than both their forebears and their non-Jewish compatriots

in general), but they do not appear to bring up enough children to ensure that the future Jewish population will be able to stand at the same level. The pattern of fertility in Anglo-Jewry follows that prevalent in middle-class Britain in general, but it seems to exaggerate the tendency towards the deliberate restriction of child-bearing. Anglo-Jewry may be on the point of numerical decline. If this conclusion from admittedly'imperfect data is correct, then clearly we need some careful research to show us why Jews in Britain have become relatively infertile parents. The reason cannot be simply thatJews are highly urbanized

and middle class, because their urbanization is nothing new and it is possible that they are less fertile than the Gentile middle class. I shall merely mention, without implying that I have any supporting evidence, the possibility that the low replacement rate may be connected in some areas of Anglo-Jewry with a state of uncertainty and insecurity.

The threat of the low replacement rate is a demographer's preoccupation. From the public point of view the menace to Jewish numbers comes from mixed marriages, and there is sometimes lamentation about the extent to which Jews marry non-Jews in Britain. Owing to the emotional implications of intermarriage, people characteristically often confuse the issue of population loss which results, or may result; from marriage out of the faith, with the breach of group integrity which follows even from marriage with converts to Judaism. If intermarriage regularly occurred with converts Jewry would not be likely to suffer a loss. However, partly owing to the difficulties which are put in the way of the Christian who wishes to be converted to Judaism (at least in the orthodox congregations), mostJewish-Gentile marriages are outside the faith as well as outside the group.