

Chapter 1

THE PURSUIT OF SELF-PROTECTION

In December 2014 I visited the Manchester Jewish Museum, which inhabits a deconsecrated Sephardi synagogue in the area that was formerly the Jewish Quarter. Sara, a volunteer guide, articulated the complexities and difficulties of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries for émigré Jews, and she told me that the vast majority of them were destitute and settled in the area stretching off Manchester Victoria railway station. Émigré Jewish neighbourhoods sat in the shadows of the city and formed a significant part of the slum areas of Red Bank and lower Strangeways.¹ The main reason for moving to the slums was poverty and the proximity to the station, for the émigré Jews would have been travelling ‘a long way, [when] you left God knows what behind you in horror or poor circumstances’ (Sara). Whilst many of the émigré Jews were escaping pogroms and penury on the European continent, Sara emphasised how many also came ‘not in need, but in preference, because tradings were good and Manchester was *the* area to be in the world, rivalling London’.

With such close proximity to Manchester Victoria, continuous immigration meant the slum areas of Red Bank and Strangeways became ‘absolutely saturated with Jews and Jewish culture’ (Sara). This Jewish Quarter, she went on to say, sat ‘cheek by jowl’ with the wider émigré and ‘indigenous’ populations that were just as financially marginalised, often leading to tense and hostile relations. The aspiration for many Jewish families at this point was to climb from the areas within and surrounding ‘the slums’ and move well in to,

and north of, Cheetham Hill and Hightown. These areas, according to Sara, were home to what people called the ‘alrightniks’, because by then ‘you’d made it, you’d done alright for yourself [whereas] down there you had a community of people who needed food and shelter’.

Only a remnant of this ‘illustrious Jewish past’ (as Sara put it) remains, since families began to gradually move northwards into leafier and often more affluent districts – the Jewish Manchester I came to know. Traces of the bygone Jewish Quarter can still be seen in the convenience and grocery shops now owned by émigré families originating from South Asia, alluding to an enduring narrative of immigration and integration for diverse ethnic groups in this corner of England (Figures 1.1 and 1.2).

Jewish Manchester has changed considerably in size, diversity and intensity over generations, and is now home to among the fastest growing Haredi populations in the UK. Mrs Kushner, a (Litvish) Haredi local in her sixties, told me that Jewish Manchester used to be smaller and tightly woven, resembling ‘an area in Jerusalem called *bayit v’gan*.² It was just a garden in between the neighbours. Manchester was a little bit like that, everybody knew everybody’. Relations between Haredim and the broader Jewish and non-Jewish populations are nowadays marked by a mutual gap in understanding, and Sara claimed the former are ‘terribly *defensive*, so what secular people – and lets get this right – what secular people regard as hostility, is fear’ (emphasis added). Sara clearly had a stake in re-presenting a particular view of Jewish Manchester as a Museum guide, and she was careful to put across the correct image. Yet her comment signposts how the image of a garden in between the neighbours has, to paraphrase the epigraph of this book, come to resemble vineyards surrounded by (de)fences to separate what is seen to be kosher from what is not.

This ethnographic vignette offers a stepping-stone to explore the shifting social dynamics that occur over time among the Jews of Manchester, and in this chapter I look closely at how a historically self-sufficient Jewish settlement has become increasingly protective against internal diversities as well as the external world. Unravelling the socio-religious composition of Jewish Manchester illuminates how Haredim have nuanced health and wellbeing needs as well as expectations, which are often obscured by the term ‘community’ (Chapter Two).

Economic, socio-religious and ethnic multiplicity in the historic Jewish Quarter manifested in a gradation of internal marginalities

that is continuous with the present day topography of Jewish Manchester. In what follows I first narrate the implications of consecutive flows of immigration during a period of heightened social and medical racism, and the consequent attempts to incorporate émigré Jews into the established Jewish social body and integrate them into the body of the nation. I then discuss how internal dissonance in the present-day Haredi settlement rests on differences in worldviews or religious outlooks (vernacularly termed *hashkofos*),³ the coming together of which can be viewed as dangerous to local moral orders. The representation of a homogenous ‘ultra-Orthodox Jewish community’ can be understood as an imagined and amalgamated category that does not reflect the realities of Jewish Manchester.

The ways in which Manchester’s Haredi settlement attempts to meet its own socioeconomic and material needs has the effect of maintaining a degree of collective autonomy, and a reduced reliance on external services and the state. Rather than Jewish Manchester being a self-sustaining settlement per se, I argue that it has become increasingly self-protective – enabling the careful negotiation of encounters with the non-Jewish and non-Haredi worlds, and the avoidance of socially constructed contagions. Perceived threats to



FIGURE 1.1 Formerly the New Synagogue (consecrated 1889), now a South Asian enterprise. Photograph by the author.



FIGURE 1.2 Torah Street, the former Jewish Quarter. Photograph by the author.

the Haredi lifeworld requires a continuous process of response: self-protection emerges as a strategy of social *immunity* among different Haredi groups, and between the inside against the outside – thus creating a graded relation to the UK state.

The Jewish ‘Community’

Changing social dynamics in Jewish Manchester are most clearly associated with notably higher total fertility rates among Haredi families, and it is estimated that Haredi children will account for fifty per cent of all Jewish children in the UK by 2031 (Staetsky and Boyd 2015). Broader influences include inward Jewish migration from London as well as internationally, a number of ‘nouveau *frum*’ families,⁴ and those who move to Manchester to become Jewish through *giyur*.⁵ The growing prominence of the Haredim in Jewish Manchester (and England) reflects the wider demographic changes that are currently underway in Jewish populations of the United States and Israel (Staetsky and Boyd 2015; Valins 2003; Malach et al. 2016; Cohen 2016).

Shifting demographics and internal fragmentations in Manchester were already developing by the late 1970s, which was, according to Mrs Levy, ‘too awful for words’ in what she described as an era of ‘religious mania’.⁶ Mrs Kahn, a Haredi mother of nine, observed how Jewish Manchester has become more polarised as a result of the settlement’s unprecedented growth over the last twenty-five years. The rise in the number and plurality of Hassidish groups in the settlement is a noticeable example of socio-religious changes in the Jewish social body over time, as many locals told me. Mrs Kushner recalled how ‘there were very, very, few Hassidim in Manchester years ago when my mother was a little girl’, but now, ‘even people who were not brought up Hassidish have taken on their ways and their garb for some reason’. Remarks such as these indicate how Haredi Judaism is a socio-religious *movement* that responds to broader social processes, rather than being a static construction of religious ‘extremism’ or ‘fundamentalism’ (Introduction). Mrs Gellner, a *frum* neighbour of mine, made this clear by discussing how the settlement has become:

More Haredi than it was twenty to thirty years ago and that’s a *protection*. But I think we’ve probably gone more right⁷ than we were because the world out there has gone much more to the left; the

world out there is much more permissive. Society and morals have all gone downhill and to *protect* yourself and your family, you've built up more *protective* shelter and the way to do that has gone to the right. (Emphasis added)

Similarly, Mr Dror described how:

The community has moved very much to the right over the last fifteen to twenty years, increasingly so, much more insular and much more *protective*, feeling much more threatened by the advent of the internet, by changes in society and the world outside. (Emphasis added)

The perceived need for 'protection' – or social *immunity* from external contagion – has therefore been driving the gradual push to the 'right' that Jewish Manchester has experienced. It can be inferred from Mr Dror's and Mrs Gellner's claim that changes in the standard of religious observance is an antonymic shift in response to increasingly dangerous strides that the non-Haredi world and national culture has taken towards the 'left,' requiring protection. Thus Haredi Judaism should be understood as sitting relationally (and as a continuous response) to broader political, socio-religious and technological changes in the outside world.

The flux in which *from* Jews have become more Haredi and protective against the external world over time differs from what is described as 'denominational switching' from one conceptualisation of Judaism to another.⁸ Mr Emet (a pious Sephardi father) told me, 'I've said it once, and I'll say it again: The community here in Manchester can be more *extreme* than the Taliban' (emphasis added). For Mr Emet, the Haredi expression of Judaism in Manchester and the vernacular construction of religious authenticity is then perceived to surpass the 'extreme' of what public and media discourse otherwise regards as 'religious fundamentalism'.

The Jewish settlement in Manchester that Mr Dror and Mrs Gellner described can be understood as a protective refuge and form of dissimulation, which is the intentional pursuit of cultural (and perhaps physical) distance by upholding and maintaining conducts that constitute markers of difference in relation to the mainstream (see Scott 2009: 173–174). It forms part of a deliberate strategy and 'art of not being governed' (Scott 2009), and this form of resistance or 'counter-conduct' can then be perceived as threatening to the state's authority, integrity and perhaps even its continuity. The preference for self-protection and social *immunity* among the Haredim illustrates how minority groups can indeed choose to dissimilate or

insulate themselves (cf. Ecks and Sax 2006), but it would equally be inaccurate to represent them as living in isolation or detachment from the body of the nation.

Scott (2009) uses the example of minority groups in the Zomia region of Southeast Asia to analyse and frame minority–state relations, and remarks how such groups still exist ‘relationally and positionally’ to the state, despite dissimilating. His argument is that these quasi-autonomous bands seek to evade what he terms a ‘subject status’, rather than a relationship with the state altogether, an argument which I here use to frame the experience of Haredi Jews in Manchester.⁹ The immuno-protective stance of the Haredim then illustrates how the concept of citizenship and a subject status can be negotiated. Thus the status of an ‘ultra-Orthodox Jewish community’ as being ‘hard to reach’ (the focus of Chapter Two) can be grounded in a broader anthropological discourse of minority identity and positioning in relation to the state.

The historical quest for autonomy and self-reliance in Jewish Manchester (and increasing strides towards self-protection currently underway) should not be misconstrued as constituting a utopian ‘community’. Intra- and inter-group prejudices that have historically existed between Manchester’s Jewish and non-Jewish populations are part of the fortification that constructs an ethnic boundary, as ‘ethnic identities function as categories of inclusion/exclusion and of interaction’ (Barth 1969: 132). However, perceptions of inclusivity and exclusivity in Jewish Manchester run *within* the settlement, as much as *between* the minority and majority populations. Ethnic identities and ascriptions are not inborn or given but are socio-historically contingent, with the boundaries of ethnic contestation – both within and between groups – being a response to external events (Alexander and Alexander 2002).

The historical flows of immigration as well as the current diversity in Manchester bring a constellation of Jewish sub-groups together – with some continuing to have their legitimacy and belonging contested (such as the Sephardim, as I go on to discuss). Other Jewish groups and modalities are resisted because of the potential danger they can pose to the socio-religious and moral order of Haredi and Hassidish Judaism. The splintered composition of Jewish Manchester therefore warrants critical engagement with the term ‘community’, and echoes broader calls to ‘to stop talking of the community as a unitary subject and to analyse axes of contestation within it’ (Benjamin 2002: 8).¹⁰

The term ‘community’ is often used to describe the Jewish social body and is generally regarded in a positive light: imagined as being a place of comfort, unity and safety. A ‘community’ is, as Bauman describes, bound up in the imagination and ‘is nowadays another name for paradise lost – but one to which we dearly hope to return’ (2001: 3). The widely discussed idea of a ‘community’ in the Jewish context is therefore an ideal and idealised construction that does not reflect the lived realities of exclusivity and exclusion in Jewish Manchester, neither past nor present. References to ‘community’ as a conceptual category of intra-group relations have been problematised because of its ‘mythic value’, which can – and do – give rise to a ‘misplaced belief in “community” and the “participation” that goes with it’ (Cannon et al. 2014: 93). Thus communities ‘are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are *imagined*’ (Anderson 2006: 6 [emphasis added]). It then becomes clear that the idea of a cohesive Jewish ‘community’ in Manchester, from its historical inception, is a romanticised figment of the imagination. Disentangling the internal fragmentations within the Haredi social body is a crucial wing of this book, and informs my broader argument that the category of an ‘ultra-Orthodox Jewish community’ is constructed in the imagination of public (health) discourse and its production of authoritative knowledge.

Implications of Immigration

The increasing numbers of émigré Jews arriving in Manchester and England in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries meant that antisemitism became more pronounced across social, political, and medical domains. I was told by Sara, ‘there was a lot of prejudice against immigrants [in Manchester], and it wasn’t the fact that they were Jewish so much, but the place was poor’. Antisemitism was, however, a lived reality for the Jews of Manchester regardless of economic status. Sissie Laski recalled how she had first experienced antisemitism when, after marriage, she moved from London to the highly affluent area of Didsbury (South Manchester) in 1914, and was shocked to find that Jews were barred from joining social clubs.¹¹ Louis Rich, who grew up in the Jewish Quarter, also said antisemitism was rife during the first half of the twentieth century, ‘and they used to treat these immigrants – these Jewish immigrants – like *we* treat the Pakistanis now and the Hindus, with contempt, disdain’.¹² Reflections such as this indicate how prejudice towards minority

groups persists with flows of immigration over time both at the local and state level.

With the establishment of science as a dominant culture of knowledge in nineteenth century Europe, the body of the Jew was constructed as fundamentally different and pathological in medical discourse, and thus 'unworthy of being completely integrated into the social fabric of the modern state' (Gilman 1992: 223). Medical racialism and anti-'alien' discourse were mutually reinforcing: stereotypes of Jews being weaker, sicklier, or predisposed to diseases that were constructed in the medical imagination influenced political opposition towards Jewish immigration to Britain and vice versa (Reuter 2016; also Tananbaum 2015).¹³ Hostility towards the growing 'alien' Jewish minority in England tended towards articulating the implications of immigration for the body of the nation, and racialised representations featured prominently in twentieth century concerns of 'national eugenics'.

In 1926, an article published in the *Annals of Eugenics* claimed that 'alien Jewish' children in London's East End often fared worse in terms of intellectual, medical, physical and hygienic standards when compared with 'the general Gentile population', and these racialised allegations were consequently used to challenge the flow of 'alien' immigration to Britain (Pearson and Moul 1926: 51). These critics of Jewish immigration seemed to mobilise a conception of the value of intermarriage to assimilate 'difference', insinuating how *halachic* prohibitions against intermarriage might act as an indicator of the degree to which the émigré Jewish population could fully integrate into the UK – which was arguably presented as an expectation of a citizen:

From the standpoint of the immigrant racial purity may be a dominating belief, [but] from the standpoint of the national statesman the suitability of the immigrant must depend not only on what he brings to the nation, mentally and physically, but also on the possibility of his assimilation. Many of the old stock of English Jews have fully recognised this; they have intermarried ... For them Jewry is a religious faith and is something apart from the question of nationality and racial purity. From the standpoint of the host-nation, this is undoubtedly the better attitude and might very reasonably be made a criterion of the fitness of a race for immigration into a settled country. It is from this aspect of the matter that stress must be laid on the question of racial purity – the defect in racial purity may be a measure of the immigrant's capacity or willingness to amalgamate. (Pearson and Moul 1926: 18)

Claims that Jews were inferior compared with the 'native standard of fitness' were challenged, however, in articles submitted to the *British Medical Journal* by a Jewish physician, apparently on the basis that 'the expectation of life at all ages is higher among Jews than among Gentiles' (Feldman 1926: 167).¹⁴ While chronic poverty was a shared experience among Jewish émigrés and non-Jews in London's East End, the former actually had lower rates of infant mortality by the turn of the twentieth century (Marks 1990). Representations of Jews as being biologically inferior to the 'general Gentile population' were therefore contested, and such stereotypical and intangible portrayals might instead reflect the reality of life as a marginalised and evidently racialised minority. Stereotyping claims were not limited to the Jewish body being physically 'stunted' or deficient, and also portrayed Jews as having high birth rates (and thus a growing and racialised 'Other') – a claim which can be understood as being continuous over time when levied upon the Haredi minority in England.

Social and Medical Racism in Modernising Maternity Care

The interaction between social and medical hostility meant that antisemitism was a lived reality for émigré and Manchester-born Jewish women when accessing local maternity care in the 1920s and 1930s. The total medicalisation of pregnancy was consolidated over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and brought irreversible changes to childbearing cultures, whilst also enabling medical racism to be practiced over the bodies of Jewish women and their newborns. Incorporating pregnancy and childbirth into biomedical jurisdiction signalled a transition from what was an area of women's lived experience and practical expertise to what gradually became an area of medical authoritative knowledge (that was dominated and constructed by men) – one that can be read as an intimate strategy of biopolitics. Through medicalisation, the biomedical control of childbirth – and thus women's bodies – emerged as a key strategy of the state to manage the body of the nation and reproduce a population of quality in an era of British imperial ambitions and anxieties.¹⁵ Cultures and identities of childbirth had dramatically changed over the course of the twentieth century as midwifery became professionalised and hospital-based births overseen by physicians were established as the norm, heralding an unprecedented level of medical involvement, innovation and intervention.¹⁶ Childbearing women 'made the transition from mothers to patients' (Beier 2004: 379), and Jewish women subsequently encountered intersectional forms of bodily domination.

The numbers of Jewish women opting to birth at Manchester's main maternity hospital (Saint Mary's) had increased by the 1920s, and English-born Jews in particular had a preference for biomedical maternity care at the time.¹⁷ The shift towards hospital births in Jewish Manchester, however, occurred alongside fraught encounters between Jews and medical professionals at Saint Mary's over the *brit milah* (circumcision) of male infants.¹⁸ During the early decades of the twentieth century it was a fairly routine maternity experience for women to remain in hospital for one week to ten days postpartum.¹⁹ The *brit milah*, undertaken on the eighth day of an infant's life, would have fallen during this period of maternal convalescence. Medical professionals in 1921 had objected to the circumcision being performed in the hospital and some boys consequently had to have their *brit milah* delayed, which was contrary to the Judaic cultivation of the male infant body.²⁰ It was later claimed that the authorities at Saint Mary's did not object to the performance of the circumcision per se, but according to archival records, it was the 'crowding together on the occasion of a large number of Jews and making themselves merry'²¹ – which can be inferred as the gathering of a *minyan* for the ceremony.²² Even when taking this justification at face value the medical objections still disrupted a defining process of social reproduction, as preventing the bodily covenant of circumcision withheld a male body from being marked and sanctified as Jewish.

It is, however, in circumstances like these that we can appreciate the limitations accompanying attempts to engage with historical material from an anthropological perspective. The archival record that is available offers limited scope to grasp the lived experience of encountering the state through maternity services, and the reflections of local women. The record, for instance, describes that a conflict occurred when physicians objected to the circumcision being performed in the local hospital, but not *how* émigré or English-born Jewish mothers experienced the contest over Jewish bodies in a foreign healthcare environment and when convalescing outside the familiarity of the Jewish Quarter. The pain and difficulties of childbirth would have been intensified for émigré Jewish women in England if birthing without the support of kin relations, who may have remained in their countries of origin, and when alienated by the disciplinary and discriminatory practices of care providers (Marks 1994: 7). Opposition to the *brit milah* being performed would have been a serious issue for émigré women as they recovered on maternity wards. Such early twentieth century conflicts in maternity

care reflect the broader struggles of assimilation and integration experienced by émigré Jews in Manchester, and demonstrate how the attempt to assimilate minority populations at the margins is an example of how 'sovereign power exercised by the state is not only about territories; it is also about bodies' (Das and Poole 2004: 10). Biomedicine, when deployed as part of a process of 'internal colonialism', becomes an indispensable part of the state's attempt to reassert its authority and extend its reach from the 'centre' over the physical and conceptual 'margins' of the state – where challenges to prevailing norms are reproduced.

Louis Rich, a Manchester born Jewish doctor, recalled how emergency obstetric care was institutionally underfunded and fraught with danger in the early 1930s when he completed his medical training, indicating the relatively low status of maternal health and mortality in the scale of concerns during the modernising framework of biomedicine. This was, he recalled, an era when caesarean sections were performed without access to blood transfusion services and when physicians received limited obstetric training.²³ One tragic incident of maternal mortality to affect the Jewish settlement was the death of nineteen-year-old Molly Taylor on 12 May 1934. Sydney Taylor attributed the death of his wife to systematic failings and neglect in maternity care, and described how the event was the source of much discontent between the Jewish settlement and the local health authority at the time.²⁴ He recalled how Molly had elected and paid in advance to labour in Saint Mary's Hospital, which, as mentioned, was then known for being a specialist maternity unit in Manchester. When Molly arrived at hospital following the onset of labour she was apparently dismissed by the healthcare professionals on duty. Upon leaving she promptly gave birth on the hospital steps but, due to a shortage of beds, was redirected to Crumpsall Hospital in a 'jerky' ambulance,²⁵ characteristic of medical transport in the formative years of twentieth century Manchester.²⁶ The next day Molly died from delayed 'obstetrical shock' following a catalogue of insufficiencies in care, as Rich recalled, 'I'm guessing that by the time she got to Crumpsall she had lost so much blood, she couldn't possibly have recovered'.²⁷

Molly's death was unusual because her pregnancy and birth were not problematic, and the incident provoked staunch criticism from both the Jewish population and local women's advocacy groups (Emanuel 1982). A public inquiry was inconclusive, but the case resulted in a group of women creating a committee for the surveillance of maternity services in Manchester, as they 'were not

satisfied to delegate responsibility for their lives to what they saw as a self-interested medical profession' (Oakley 1984: 67). Sidney Taylor regarded his wife's death as a case of medical negligence. Dr Rich, who lived on the same street as the Taylors, reflected on the insufficiencies in care as an issue of entrenched racism and claimed that the reaction of the hospital authorities at the time was, 'what can you expect from these bloody Jews?' He considered this response to be symptomatic of the British medical authority at the time:

It was a very difficult atmosphere in the 1930s. The amount of anti-semitism was enormous. The British Medical Association [BMA] was the most antisemitic organisation you could possibly imagine. First of all, they objected to Jewish doctors who were trying to escape from Germany and once they got here they wouldn't let them practice. The whole atmosphere against Jews was awful. (Louis Rich)²⁸

The perceived entrenchment of antisemitism in the British medical establishment that Dr Rich remarked on ought to be seen as an extension of the prevailing socio-political climate during the early 1930s: a time when members of the British monarchy and governing elite were initially sympathetic, and in some cases appeasing, towards the rise of National Socialism in Germany.²⁹ Molly Taylor's tragic death elucidates how the medicalisation of pregnancy and childbirth during the early twentieth century intersected with prevailing norms of antisemitism for Jewish women in Manchester, causing them to encounter nuanced forms of bodily domination and discrimination.

Incorporation and Integration

Increasing social and medical expressions of antisemitism prompted a regime of assimilation and anglicisation by the established Jewish elite in the major English settlements, targetting the 'foreign' customs of the émigré Jews. The intention was to forge a syncretic Jewish and British identity, whilst being cautious of 'marrying out' and dissolving completely (see Heggie 2005; also Dee 2012b; Tananbaum 1993, 2004, 2015). Here, assimilation means to be incorporated into the established Jewish social body and dilute the degrees of difference with the non-Jewish population through anglicisation, rather than assimilate and become non-Jewish through intermarriage.

Jewish Manchester was no exception to having a pro-anglicisation agenda for 'foreign' poor Jews. The already established and integrated Jewish minority in Manchester were indeed concerned

with the consequences of representation and how the influx of émigré and ‘foreign Jewish poor’ could affect their own positioning and public image, who themselves sought to emulate the British middle classes (see Burman 1982: 36). Interventions were therefore seen as necessary to maintain the standing of the English Jews, who sought to project an image of a respectable and caring ‘community’ where the poor were supported without needing to rely on public funds (see Williams 1979). Importantly, the responsibility of self-care was also a condition of belonging for Jews as a minority ‘Other’ in the UK (Reuter 2016: 6). Organised Jewish welfare bodies in London and Manchester developed out of the inability and inflexibility of the Poor Law Amendment Act (1834) to meet the needs of this ethno-religious minority group (or any other) and to liaise with statutory authorities accordingly,³⁰ who feared that the provision of special arrangements might attract more poor Jewish émigrés to the country (Jones 2001: 91; see also Marks 1994; Williams 1976). The establishment of Manchester’s Jewish Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor³¹ in 1867 (henceforth ‘the Board’) exemplified this, and aimed to prevent the poor appearing as a cost to the state whilst also seizing the opportunity to integrate and anglicise émigré Jews and their children.³²

The Board not only gave rise to an authoritative and representational communal body to provide welfare services and relief, but also created a degree of Jewish autonomy that limited and buffered the interaction between the Jewish population and the local authority. On the other hand, the fact that the anglicised Jewish elite had instituted the Board reinforced power relations between the earlier-established and ‘foreign’ Jews. The Board, for instance, worked with allied surveillance programmes that sought to improve health outcomes among Jewish neighbourhoods and maintain a positive public (health) image of the Jewish minority (Chapter Two).³³ Moreover, the Board’s assimilatory strategy also traversed the broader settlement, such as Jewish schools, to enforce blanket vaccination policies (Chapter Four).

It is important to note that Manchester at this time was an industrial powerhouse but also home to some of the country’s most overcrowded, squalid and insanitary living conditions.³⁴ Cyclical epidemics and outbreaks of infectious disease affected the region’s working poor, and cholera continued to sweep through the city during the nineteenth century (Museum of Science and Industry n.d.), inflicting high levels of morbidity and mortality – particularly during infancy. Services and ‘interventions’ were instituted by

both the local authority and Jewish elite to improve, or at the very least manage, health in Manchester's most insalubrious areas – the slums which were home to a significant number of 'foreign' and marginalised Jewish poor.

By 1873–1875, up to ninety-five per cent of Jews requesting financial relief from the settled Jewish constituency and its welfare infrastructure were described as 'Foreigners', with the remaining five per cent being the 'Native Jewish Population'.³⁵ Using the term 'native' to re-present Jews (and their descendants) of the founding settlement makes clear how they positioned and defined themselves hierarchically – in relation to their 'foreign' co-religionists – as being, or having become, definitively English. Despite the influx of immigration to Manchester, the Board was keen to offset the image of the 'foreign Jewish poor'. The Board, for instance, had sought to discourage émigrés from settling in the area³⁶ yet attempted to re-present Jewish immigration positively by claiming it 'has not injuriously, but on the contrary, has beneficially affected Manchester'.³⁷ Thus émigré Jews had to navigate a multiplicity of aspirations as well as expectations pertaining to citizenship and positioning, which were held by both the broader Jewish social body and critics of (Jewish) immigration concerned with reproducing the body of the nation.

Responding to Assimilatory Pressures

Jewish piety during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was not characterised by greater authenticity and uniformity; denominational, ideological, or social differences were as much a feature of life for Jews in the North West as elsewhere. Jewish Manchester has historically experienced great diversity and plurality, including the controversial establishment of a Reform synagogue in 1856 and the emergence of Zionism at the end of the nineteenth century. Attempts to assimilate the 'foreign' Haredi Jews were not always met submissively because of diverse and opposing constructions of Judaism and religious observance.

Many of the émigrés during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were indeed strictly observant (Williams 1979), or 'Haredi' by today's conceptual definition. Intra-group differences regarding standards and customs of religious observance had led some émigré Jews to form their own *shtiebel*s³⁸ and *chevrot*,³⁹ which were viewed as pursuits of 'semi-autonomy' and 'cultural isolation' by English Jews (Williams 1976: 273).⁴⁰ The smaller and exclusive *chevrot* formed by pious émigré Jews also provided material and

economic support to strictly-religious arrivals in order to counter the assimilatory pressures and hostility of the Jewish elite (Williams 2011: 218–219; also Wise 2007; Dobkin 1994). Interestingly some developed their own relief and welfare programmes, such as the Russian–Jewish Benevolent Society (established in 1905), as a conscious strategy to ‘free new immigrants from reliance on the investigative methods and anglicising objectives of the Jewish Board of Guardians’ (Williams 2011: 218–219).

The reluctance of these émigré Jews and the working poor to submit to the assimilatory dictates of the Jewish establishment can be interpreted as a tactic of evasion conducted as part of a process of dissimulation from both the state and the wider Jewish social body. The historical pursuit of dissimulation among émigrés is continuous with the Haredi context of present day Manchester (discussed later in this chapter), and exemplifies the recurrence of internal fragmentation and the preference for some Jews to maintain degrees of autonomy and social *immunity* from the broader Jewish social body as well as the external world.

Internal Marginalities and Multiplicity

Marginality is not a singular construction but manifests in many forms, each having a different relation to health (Ecks and Sax 2006). The multiple experiences and positions of marginality – or the concurrent existence of *marginalities* – is marked by intra-group gradations in socioeconomic, religious, ethnic and gender statuses. Attention to marginalities as an analytical category illustrates the historical continuities and discontinuities of internal difference and fragmentation that have emerged in Jewish Manchester over time.

The former Jewish Quarter was ordered and mapped according to a graded topography, demonstrating how marginality ensnared multiple layers of the social body rather than being defined by a singular experience as a minority group:

The social structure of Manchester Jewry resembled a pyramid: cotton traders, professionals, and solid retailers were located at the top, below them came modest shopkeepers, and at the bottom was a poor eastern European working class, mostly itinerant traders and semi-skilled manual workers. ... this class structure soon exhibited a geographical dimension. The poorest Jews inhabited the slums of Red Bank, north of Old Town. The wealthier elements had for some

twenty years been moving into middle-class suburbs mainly to the north of the city, at Cheetham Hill. (Alderman 1992: 28)

The Jewish settlement was clearly defined by implicit and explicit socio-religious and economic differences as opposed to a defined dichotomy between Jewish and non-Jewish 'communities'. The social gradient created predictable inequalities in health, with the working poor being the subject of intense surveillance mainly because of concerns that the insalubrious housing of the slums could incubate infections (Chapter Two).

Times of economic depression were recurring and 'brought the horrors of unemployment to thousands of working class homes',⁴¹ with the situation exacerbated by Manchester's 'cruel' autumnal and winter climate. Economic insecurity over the course of the nineteenth century had led to begging amongst the Jewish poor, despite the attempts of the Board to bring an end to 'indiscriminate almsgiving' and 'street mendicancy' through its relief.⁴² Begging was often seen as a cause of anxiety for the Jewish elite. Minutes belonging to the 'Society for the Relief of *Really* Deserving Distressed Foreigners' (emphasis added) in 1875 regarded the majority of foreign people living on alms as 'idle and worthless'.⁴³ Portrayals of destitute émigré Jews as 'idle and worthless' by 'natives' is comparable to representations of populations during colonial domination as lazy, primitive and repulsive by occupying authorities (cf. Comaroff and Comaroff 1992; Lock and Farquhar 2007: 307).⁴⁴ In such contexts, the 'really' deserving might be inferred to be those responding with compliance to the imposed or dominant order.

Nineteenth century Jewish Manchester was described as a 'self-sufficient community', where businesses and factories owned by the Jewish elite – such as the waterproofing industry and cap trade – provided (often seasonal) employment to the Jewish working poor living in the slums (Dobkin 1986: 36). Émigré Jews rarely sought work outside of the Jewish settlement and instead remained in Jewish-owned trades, 'preferring to labor among their own kind, in trades they already knew well, for masters who, however harsh, at least spoke their language and were sometimes willing to accommodate their religious requirements' (Endelman 2002: 134). Whilst taking employment within the Jewish Quarter enabled cultural distance with non-Jews to be maintained, accommodating religious requirements was not always the case as many Jewish locals had to sacrifice *Shabbat* observance – however difficult this may have been – in order to work and earn a living (discussed later in this chapter).

In being largely restricted to the local garment making and seasonal waterproofing trades, Margaret Langdon recalled how men at the time could be in a situation where one is 'very busy all winter, and idle, or what was rather pitifully called "you played all summer."' ⁴⁵ Moreover, it was not uncommon for Jewish workers in the cap or raincoat factories to return home without employment or compensation after being informed that there was 'no more work'. ⁴⁶ The most destitute would then request material relief from the Board. ⁴⁷ The cyclical nature of 'boom and bust' in the local trading continued to affect health right through to the twentieth century, as, for instance, reported levels of illness and disease in Jewish Manchester almost doubled between 1903–1904 and 1904–1905. ⁴⁸ Married Jewish women in Manchester usually worked and became the breadwinner only when their husbands fell ill, as a married woman in employment would indicate low social status and a man's limited ability to provide for his family (Burman 1982). ⁴⁹

Despite the realities of destitution, the slums generally offered a sense of camaraderie for the émigré Jews and were, in some cases, a preferable place to live compared with the suburbs – perhaps because of the majority Jewish population and the potential security this could have offered. ⁵⁰ Many émigrés from Tsarist Russia could attest to the lived experience of pogroms and traumatic memories of persecutory violence – such as the whipping of Jewish children by Cossacks as they rode through *shtetls* or violent antisemitic attacks by Christians, ⁵¹ so a preference for living in a densely populated Jewish area is not surprising.

Dina McCormick recounted her childhood in the slums. When she complained of famishment, her mother would retort 'I don't wonder you're hungry ... I was hungry the whole nine months I carried you. There wasn't any food and hundreds lived like me'. ⁵² A Jewish soup kitchen sat on Southall Street nourishing the destitute Jews and non-Jews of the area during Manchester's relentless wet winters that were 'a by-word of wretchedness'. ⁵³ However, the sustenance it provided to the Jewish poor also, in some cases, isolated them from people *within* the slums as well as their relatively wealthier co-religionists.

The stigma attached to using a Jewish soup kitchen owing to the particular under-class it sustained, was, for some, a lasting marker of socio-economic difference. Dina recalled how her mother would forbid the family from using the soup kitchen, and 'would sooner we died of starvation on the street than we should do such a thing'. ⁵⁴ As an elder, Dina reflected on the intra-group

differences and marginalities that characterised her childhood in the formative decades of the twentieth century and remarked how, at the age of seventy-two, she would continue to position Jews of the former slums. In her words, 'I still meet women that I went to school with and [who] went to that soup kitchen, and I still look down on them. Wouldn't you think I would forget it?'⁵⁵ Socioeconomic gradations were therefore not an issue of polarity between 'slum and the suburb, but within the slum itself' (Williams 1979: 48).

The slums of Red Bank and Strangeways were generally disregarded as 'a horrible, dirty, miserable place'⁵⁶ by the socially mobile and relatively wealthier Jews 'who had made it' and only encountered the slums when travelling to the town centre. The proximity of the Jewish slums to the 'centre' of Manchester affirms how marginality is relational, inferring not just a geographical position but a product of 'power relations *between* social groups' (Ecks and Sax 2006: 209).⁵⁷

Sara at the Manchester Jewish Museum informed me that 'on the Sabbath, no matter how poorly off you were, you made your meal on a Friday and you didn't cook, you didn't work you didn't do anything that disturbed the Sabbath'. *Shabbat* was, however, a working day for many Jews employed in trades because of the necessity to earn a living. Dina McCormick recalled how most, if not all, Jewish firms in the clothing trade opened on Saturdays and Jewish employees worked or were only paid for five days of labour, and it was the norm to take Jewish religious holidays off unpaid.⁵⁸ Some individuals took it upon themselves to act as 'defenders of the faith' by reprimanding those who did not, or could not, uphold the obligation to keep *Shabbat*.⁵⁹ Rather than being positioned as apostates, the conditions and pressures facing families in the slums meant that Sabbath observance took less precedence.

Dina, for instance, described how her mother would say 'God understands I'm poor, and when I'm rich, I'll keep *Shabbos* like the rich do, but when I got to work all week, I've got to do my cooking on *Shabbos* morning'.⁶⁰ The limitations on observing the Sabbath were therefore an accepted cost and reality of the time that marked the experience of marginality for the 'foreign Jewish poor', who did not have the same socio-economic leverage as their wealthier and anglicised co-religionists to refrain from labouring on the day of rest. The need to work on the Sabbath testified to the pressure of integration at the time, and for many Jews was 'a painful concession to the necessity of survival in England' (Williams 1979: 46).

The internal multiplicity and marginalities that manifested within the slums (also between it and the wealthier Jewish class) were not confined to the history of Jewish Manchester, but are recurring in the present day settlement. Adoniyahu, an unmarried modern Orthodox man in his early twenties, described how there was ‘fifty shades of grey here’, which indicated how the Haredi settlement today has much more diversity than the black and white garments that are worn uniformly by Haredi men. Manchester therefore reflects previous studies of Jewish topographies, which have been described as typically consisting of ‘religious microspaces’, where ‘what looks like a single “suburban Orthodox Jewish community” is in fact a much more complex agglomeration of many communities’ (Diamond 2008: 120). These ‘microspaces’ within Orthodox Jewish topographies tend to be exclusive as well as encompassing of intra-group diversity – and Jewish Manchester was no exception. In fact, a previous study of a Haredi Jewish neighbourhood in Manchester referred to the intra-group diversity as a situation where ‘clearly there are communities within communities, but the imagination of an idealistic overall community remains’ (Valins 2003: 167).⁶¹ The ‘ultra-Orthodox Jewish community’ should then be understood as an imagined category that obscures internal dynamics and fragmentations.

Haredi locals would tell me how Jewish Manchester is a ‘friendly community’ – and the fabric of society appeared rich and tightly woven (for those positioned as being on the ‘inside’). This image was contrasted against an outside world perceived as inhospitable to Jews, with one *frum* woman asking ‘Where does a Jew go? Where does an Orthodox Jew go? Who would want them?’

Religious events certainly brought different facets of the population together, forming a principal – but not habitual – area of interaction. The festival of *Purim* was one vibrant example of this, as the settlement transformed into a carnival with homes and institutions open to passers-by and with gifts of food (*mishloach manot*),⁶² alcohol and donations flowing across the settlement. Children attending particular schools would be in costumes to identify their collective: boys from one institution were dressed in red and white stripes from the iconic book ‘Where’s Wally?’, those from another dressed as penguins, and another dressed as musketeers adorned with *fleurs de lis* – illustrating how Haredi youths and children can incorporate external cultural histories and artefacts into their protective zones.

The festival of *Purim*, however, occurs just once a year and locals would allude to subtle threads of distinction and distinguishment.

Rather than a 'community' – as the Jewish population in the UK refers to itself as, and is referred to as⁶³ – I found that the field-site consisted of overlapping and multi-layered groups who sat side by side, and often in tension, with each other. Moving between Jewish groups exposed the internal dissent and dissonance, and the gradations of separation that were perceived to be necessary for the protection of the Haredi and especially the Hassidish cosmologies.

Diversity within the 'community' manifests in intricate differences in outlooks or worldviews, as I go on to discuss in this chapter, and brings a struggle of differentiating what makes somebody 'Orthodox' from being 'Haredi'. Rather than having clearly demarcated boundaries within the social body, the Haredim could be differentiated by prevailing attitudes and established norms that were not seen amongst Orthodox families (Mr Emet).⁶⁴

Mrs Gellner, who married into an established Manchester family, described the basic standard of being an Orthodox Jew as observing the laws of *kashrut* and *Shabbat*. However, there was a considerable difference between this reference-point and the chief indicator of being Haredi, at least by the standards set in Jewish Manchester. According to Mr Emet, this centred on the 'shunning of secular education. It's a big issue here, for some reason it's a massive issue'. Despite the gap between what Mrs Gellner described as the basic standard of Orthodoxy and the prevailing identifiers of being Haredi, the relatively small geography of Jewish Manchester meant that a gradation of observant families sat 'cheek by jowl', therefore distinguishing the area from the geographical breadth of Jewish and Haredi neighbourhoods in London.

The Sephardim

Dina McCormick made clear that there were obvious socio-economic differences in early twentieth century Jewish Manchester between the anglicised Jews and the 'slum Jews that we were', but also that there was an ethno-religious gradient amongst its diverse population. She said, 'there were the German Jews that looked down on everybody – and the Austrian Jews – they looked down on the Russian Jews and the Roumanian Jews and the Polish Jews'.⁶⁵ Similarly, Louis Rich recalled how Jewish Manchester was divided into 'clans', but that there was also a common 'Other' and point of difference, as he said, 'then there were the outsiders: the Sephardic Jews'.⁶⁶

The Sephardim had generally settled in Manchester from as early as 1845, arriving mostly from present-day Syria, Iraq and Turkey,

and prospered through the import and export of goods. The importance of Manchester's industrial and economic opportunities for the Jews of Aleppo during the nineteenth century is made explicit by them making reference to 'next year in Manchester' in place of Jerusalem at the *Seder* meal during Passover (Rollins 2016).⁶⁷ Some Sephardi Jews did live in proximity to the slums and factories (evidenced by the former Sephardi synagogue in Cheetham Hill), but most were cotton merchants rather than being the 'foreign poor'.⁶⁸ By virtue of their relatively privileged marginality,⁶⁹ one could argue that Sephardi Jews were just as 'alien' to the Eastern European émigrés as the local non-Jewish population. Rachel Black claimed that the ethnic marginality and socioeconomic status of Sephardim meant they were not, and could not be 'native' Jews:

They don't eat the same kind of food like we do, they have a different kind of cooking, they have a different language – and they were all rich, of course. How could they mix with the Manchester Jews? They couldn't – you know perfectly well rich people cannot mix with poor people.⁷⁰

There was more or less a 'complete and absolute separation' of Sephardim and Ashkenazim, an animosity manifested in a general resistance to mixed-marriage (though it did occasionally happen), and the maintenance of separate synagogues.⁷¹ However, the Sephardim themselves did not comprise a monolithic block and the large constituency of Jews from Aleppo were later accused of heresy and expelled from the Sephardi synagogue on Cheetham Hill Road. They went on to establish a separate settlement in a relatively more affluent area of South Manchester (Halliday 1992). The Sephardi Jews, who, whilst generally being a wealthier sub-group during the formative years of Jewish Manchester, were (and remain to this day) marginalised by Ashkenazi Haredim.

Internal prejudices continue to be directed towards the Sephardim in the present day, which illustrates the entrenched differences and internal prejudices that are harboured within the term 'community'. Local Sephardi Jews tend to be divided between the area's Moroccan and Iberian synagogues, or, as was more commonly the case amongst Haredi circles, Sephardi families assimilated into the dominant Ashkenazi and Litvish population.⁷² Mr Emet asserted that 'there's no Sephardic community, as such, let's be clear about it. There are plenty of Sephardim around, but as such, there's no identity'. Part of this issue is apparently because Jewish Manchester leans much more towards Haredi Litvish cultural dominance. For

Sephardi Jews to be accepted amongst the *frum* circles, Mr Emet told me there is a perceived feeling of needing to be ‘more Haredi than the average Ashkenazi: you have to pretend you’re not Sephardi.’ Thus local conceptions of what constitutes religious authenticity continue to be determined by the cultural dominance of Ashkenazi (Litvish) Jews, as the Sephardim are positioned ‘outside’ the Jewish social body in ways that are historically recurrent.

The dietary laws which ‘keeping kosher’ involves were, according to Sara at the Manchester Jewish Museum, historically ‘there to keep the community together’. However, the diversity in standards and stringencies applied to *kashrut* in Jewish Manchester, I later found, ran contrary to Sara’s claim that *kashrut* was a means of binding the *kehillah* (community). Local *frum* Jewish families would hold themselves to the dictates of different *kashrut* (and thus rabbinical) authorities, which supposedly vary in stringencies, creating a situation where some *hechsherim* were perceived to be more kosher and authoritative than others.⁷³

Whereas *Kedassiah* was viewed as an acceptable *hechsher* amongst Hassidish circles,⁷⁴ there were local and London-based *kashrut* authorities serving the majority of the Haredi population. However, the *hechsher* of the Sephardi *Bet Din* was generally not viewed as stringent enough for many (Litvish) Haredi mothers. In the words of one *frum* woman from France, the Sephardim are regarded as ‘not religious enough’. Kosher was then something of a relative term as families aligned to different origins or worldviews might not eat or ‘break bread’ together – thus fortifying intra-group boundaries and divisions.

A Protective ‘World within a World’

Jewish Manchester has a range of Haredi-led institutions, enterprises and services that are designed to support and sustain its growing settlement and demographic. The social infrastructure in Jewish Manchester crafts its reputation as an affordable alternative to London’s Jewish neighbourhoods. Some families rooted in Manchester considered it an ‘easier’ place to live, although those who had relocated from London would often describe Manchester as ‘provincial’. With the social infrastructure catering extensively to the needs of the Jewish settlement, dependence on broader Jewish or non-Jewish services are – with the exception of healthcare – significantly reduced. Rabbi Kaplan, for instance, explained how

Jewish Manchester sought to be a 'self-sustaining community' where locals could easily go their 'whole life' without resorting to non-Jewish shops for groceries and goods.

The internal services help to create the 'self-sustaining' settlement described by Rabbi Kaplan, yet this also has the result of *protecting* Haredi Jews from the need to encounter the outside world in areas of quotidian life. The Haredi pursuit of autonomy was made clear during a discussion with Sara, who told me how 'it wants to be self-sufficient, self-contained, and ideally for the Haredi community, its *ideal* aspiration is to live separately in peace' (emphasis added). The fortification of the settlement alluded to by Sara can be read as a conscious strategy of resilience, but is also an aspiration and vision that has not been fully achieved.

Social conducts that the non-Haredi world incorrectly interpret as being offensive are, I was frequently told, in fact defensiveness on the part of the Haredim. *Rebbetzin* Yad, who is a prominent figure in her Hassidish circle, made clear to me that, 'I'm talking about communities trying to cope but on the other hand, it's a community that is vulnerable'. Thus we see how the social body attempts to cope, but also how self-protection from external pressures can consequently leave it vulnerable to internal pressures (see Chapter Two).

The extent to which Jewish Manchester is self-containing and protective, Mrs Shaked told me, means that being Haredi is akin to living in 'a world within a world. You don't have to always go *outside*, you can run your existence *within* this *closed world*' (emphasis added). Thus the aspiration to be as autonomous as possible means that Haredi Jews can negotiate the extent to which they engage with the external world. The stringent interpretations of *halachic* observance that defines the Haredi cosmology (which was regularly criticised in public media during the period of my research) is, on the one hand, 'oppressive, but the care is immense' (Mrs Shaked). Mrs Shaked, originally from Iraq, described how Jewish Manchester is 'a very closed community that really takes care, so even if somebody is ill then food is left at their doorstep. Cooked food, given food, clothing, children are taken off their hands, looked after'. Intra-group care is described as forming part of the religious obligations of *gemilut hasadim* (acts of loving kindness) and *tzedokoh* (vernacular),⁷⁵ and is an enormous material advantage to Haredim, which also increases the autonomy of the settlement.

Mrs Shaked went on to claim that the internal systems of support apparently buffer socioeconomic deprivation in Jewish Manchester,

to the extent that it cannot be compared with the experience of deprivation in the broader non-Jewish population. The internal and informal economy is used in conjunction with welfare funds from the local authority (and central government) in order to mitigate deprivation caused by 'religious poverty' and the higher cost of *frum* living. Internal strategies to alleviate socioeconomic stress then create a position where the Haredi minority can also be called 'privileged marginals' (cf. Faubion 1993: 191) when viewed in relation to the socioeconomically deprived and minority groups in the area, which overlap with Jewish Manchester.

Intra-group provisions were not necessarily designed to replace state welfare and NHS services in an attempt to create a self-sufficient and autonomous enclave, but rather to meet the limitations of state provisions and to materialise the *mitzvah* (commandment) of *gemilut hasadim*. These took the form of remarkable intra-group charities, services as well as *gemachim*,⁷⁶ which are made available to any Jewish person in the settlement cutting across internal divisions. Certain charities would, for instance, collect money to deliver weekly food supplies and parcels to needy families in order to prepare meals for *Shabbat*. The services perform a unique role in catering to the needs of the religious constituency for whom outside agencies that are positioned as non-Jewish or not *frum* would be considered as inappropriate by many of the Haredi locals I met. The services available include a library, swimming pool, mental health counsellors and therapists, educational needs facilities, family and children's centre, financial advisor, legal advisor, service to absorb new arrivals, hospital visitation groups, burial carers and birth supporters (Chapter Three). Moreover, certain Haredi organisations perform a key role in lobbying local authorities for resources, as well as acting as gatekeepers of the social body.

The *gemachim* consist of a continuously growing portfolio of resources that are freely available, or for a nominal charge to cover the expenditures incurred. These include baby clothes and equipment, laundry services, wedding dresses, foods and supplements which are considered to be health promoting and medicines, to name a few. Whilst these services are available to all Jews in the area, I was told they are mainly managed by Haredi Jews. The extensive range of services and *gemachim* highlights the immense investment in care and *chesed* (compassion) to support vulnerable and deprived Jewish locals. According to *Rebbetzin* Yad, 'the amount of good, of care, that is built into our community lifestyle is actually a tremendous assistance to the health service'.⁷⁷ Similarly Haredim

in the London Borough of Hackney can draw on a particularly significant and abundant range of *gemachim* for infant and children's provisions, and parallels the staggering number of Jewish families receiving government child benefits in the area (Abramson, Graham and Boyd 2011). Intra-group and government welfare provisions are therefore synthesised as a combined strategy to alleviate the specific experience of 'religious poverty'.

The *gemachim* can also alleviate the higher cost of *frum* living that growing Haredi families face. Mrs Shaked surmised that 'what is declared is certainly not income that is actually earned in one year'. She based her judgment on the reasoning that welfare benefits alone could not meet the challenges and demands that a religious cost of living entails, especially with a larger than average family. These additional costs include the imperative of subsidising the religious studies programme for (multiple) children attending state-aided Orthodox schools or private Haredi school fees, *yeshivah* and seminary fees, synagogue membership fees, donating ten percent of a monthly income to *tzedokoh*, the inflated price of kosher food, and the string of religious events in the Jewish calendar. The higher cost of Haredi living then gives rise to what she called a 'black market economy', where cash transactions underlie the buying, renting and selling of goods and property, which are 'very difficult to trace'. The redistributive and informal economy described by Mrs Shaked supports a situation where 'people in learning are subsidised hugely by people who are earning'.

An authoritative and dedicated body in Jewish Manchester was instituted to support Haredi locals to navigate the British welfare system, similar to the case of Haredi constituencies in London (Gonen 2006). Some non-Haredi locals were quick to portray the Haredim as 'frummies' who fraudulently abuse welfare benefits,⁷⁸ but government support was conversely described as being an imperative medium through which Haredi women could fulfil the expectations of being a Haredi wife and mother and meeting the demands of the domestic domain. As *Rebbetzin* Yad claimed, welfare benefits were an essential 'need [for women] to be able to serve *Hashem* by running their homes'.⁷⁹

Indicators of poverty that are applied to the non-Jewish population do not fully reflect the Haredi Jewish context as economic circuits are redistributive. A ring of the Haredi elite subsidises the more deprived families, which ensures that nobody is left without food, shelter and economic resources. For these reasons, as Mrs Shaked told me, 'I think there is nowhere that you can find a true

indicator of the level of poverty or the level of need because so much is patched up’.

‘Hashkofic Contamination’

Protection from social contagions was not only pursued against the external world, but also within the settlement. When I joined Mrs Birenbaum (a Haredi Litvish mother) and her children for dinner one evening, she privately recounted to me an incident that occurred in the secondary school that her twelve-year old son attends, which serves many Haredi families. She expressed her horror that a pupil had defaced a classroom locker with ‘Rabbi Fleischman wanked here’, as onanism constitutes a grave *aveirah* (transgression) in the Judaic cosmology. Mrs Birenbaum viewed her son’s exposure to this language and illicit act as a consequence of the secondary school bringing together children from two very different Orthodox Jewish primary schools: one being viewed as more Haredi (where ‘that kind of thing would never happen’), but the other positioned as less religiously stringent, where it apparently would happen. When I asked why her son could not attend a local Haredi independent school, Mrs Birenbaum remarked that the family were not religiously stringent enough to meet its requirements, partly because, she felt, they owned a television in the family home and the children were allowed to watch DVDs.

The danger of mixing children from different religious families was a fear for Mrs Birenbaum and many other *frum* mothers whom I encountered. Jewish youth services that were marketed as being ‘cross-community’ but not Haredi-led were seen as deeply problematic – if not dangerous – because bringing different Jewish children together meant bringing their worldviews into contact, which could consequently threaten standards of religious observance (or interpretations of religious authenticity).

Mrs Birenbaum actually preferred her boys to engage in sport and exercise activities organised by non-Jewish clubs because then a clear contrast could be made between Jewish and non-Jewish children, whereas it was harder to make a moral distinction between ‘Jewish and Jewish’. The issue of ‘*hashkofic* contamination’ – as Adoniyahu put it – is much greater because modern Orthodox Jews still define themselves as observant of *halachah* yet conform to different stringencies than their *frum* or Haredi counterparts, so the boundaries effectively become more blurred. Thus the difference

was one of *hashkofos*: the nuanced worldviews of modern Orthodox or Haredi Jews and how each situates themselves within Jewish Manchester. In this instance, boundaries serve to protect particular groups from differences (or perceived threats) that are internal or inherent rather than external (cf. Esposito 2008).

Mr Dror was one participant who had transitioned his children from a 'black' Haredi private school to a state-aided Jewish school that was more modern Orthodox and Zionist in its outlook.⁸⁰ He remarked how intra-group differences can be demarcated by outlook and observance:

There are significant worries that if you speak to other children, the kid might hear things that are not quite appropriate for them – or ideas that are not [of the] 'correct' *hashkofoh* which might influence their children to take a non-Haredi lifestyle and they want to protect them against it.

The fear of '*hashfokic* contamination' ran across the continuum of *frum* families in Jewish Manchester, rather than being an issue at the 'extremities'. Describing herself as modern Orthodox (but with children attending schools that were widely regarded as being more Haredi), one mother elucidated her concerns about differences in outlooks or worldviews:

Mrs Harris: It's more to do with people coming from very different homes. It's hard to stop your kids being friends with people whose homes I'm not so keen on them going to. So either watching *stuff* that you don't want them to be watching, or wearing *stuff* that you don't want them to be wearing, or eating *stuff* that you don't want them to be eating. (Emphasis added)

When interviewing a *Satmar*⁸¹ mother, she commented that a defining principle of being Hassidish is what she described as a 'very insular outlook, and we do an awful lot of *protecting* ourselves from anything that might not be appropriate' (emphasis added). Protection extended to avoiding the use of a local organisation that claims to be 'cross-community', also serving the local non-Jewish population, and has an agenda to bridge sports and social activities with education about Israel. When I asked if her children would use the service for physical activity and recreation, she replied:

Mrs Burshtein: Our children definitely not, other [*Satmar*] children presumably also not. This is going to sound extremely snobbish and I don't mean it the way it sounds, we try to be careful about who they mix with, and if it's going to be children who might introduce them

to *stuff* that we're not very excited for them to know about, we'd like it to be with strict supervision and very carefully controlled. It sounds very snobbish and elitist, but we don't mean it like that, it's being exposed to the outside world. (Emphasis added)

In these instances the issue at play is less about physical space (such as 'different homes' or the physical 'outside world'), and more related to the worldviews that underpin different interpretations of the Judaic cosmology and the unwelcome, unanticipated, or disruptive exposure this could bring to what are viewed as less stringent modalities of Judaism. The 'stuff' that Mrs Harris and Mrs Burshtein refer to is non-descript and un-defined, but remains a threat to the moral order that they try to inculcate as Haredi mothers and 'God-fearing' women. Stuff, however intangible it is represented to be, is a medium and a marker in which purity can encounter *potential* danger – for 'where the lines of abominability are drawn heavy stakes are at issue' (Douglas 2002: 196). It is in these zones, that demarcate internal from external, where possible contamination or contagion can occur, warranting the deployment of 'immunitary reactions' in order to preserve collective life (cf. Esposito 2015).⁸²

Jewish and Non-Jewish Encounters

Historical and contemporary relations between Jews and non-Jews in Manchester illuminate the complex ways in which connections with the outside world are negotiated – but are also telling of the precariousness and internal anxieties surrounding self-protection. Whilst implicit and explicit prejudice was certainly mutual between Jews and non-Jews in the historical slum areas, I would argue that inter-group relations during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries should not be reduced to a homogenous experience.⁸³ Louise Dawson lived around the former Jewish Quarter as a child and remembered how her mother would not welcome Jewish children in the house, so they would often instead play together in the street.⁸⁴ The same could be said in reverse, especially in cases of intermarriage, as Jewish neighbours would remark to Mrs Glantz, 'fancy letting a Christian into the house'.⁸⁵ Manchester Jews would look down upon their non-Jewish neighbours and vice-versa.⁸⁶ Despite the fact that Jewish and non-Jewish neighbours were apparently cordial to each other they actually 'mixed very little'.⁸⁷ The Jewish slums can be understood as sharing a frontier

area with non-Jews – rather than a complete separation or ‘ghetto’. The overlapping nature of the area meant that hostilities certainly did occur, and Raymond Levine recalled slurs of ‘you killed Christ’ being hurled by non-Jews, particularly around the landmark of Saint Chad’s Church, which still sits amidst the bygone Jewish Quarter to this day.⁸⁸

Many Jewish welfare organisations of the time had committed themselves to supporting non-Jewish neighbours, again demonstrating the potential for encounters in the shared area. In some instances, serving the local non-Jewish population was intended to elevate the status of the Jewish minority and aid its integration into society, as was the case for the Jewish hospital in Manchester (Chapter Two). Archival records also expose how the Jewish settlement supported non-Jews in broader areas of life, such as the aforementioned Jewish soup kitchen but also maternity and infant care provisions.⁸⁹ However, the inclination for mutual support on the part of the Jewish settlement now seems confined to the archives, as some Haredi-led support groups in present-day Manchester are explicit in not making their services available to non-Jews (Chapter Three).⁹⁰

The contemporary relations with, and regard for, the non-Jewish population is further indicative of the Haredi preference for self-insulation and protection, but also attests to how the settlement cannot be completely self-contained and cut-off from the external world. Haredi Jews in Israel have been described as living voluntarily in ‘ghettos’ (Aran, Stadler and Ben-Ari 2008: 32), which is a conceptual and topographic reference that should be viewed with caution if not avoided outright, in the case of Jewish Manchester at least. The term ‘ghetto’ is bound up with historically-situated tactics of isolation imposed *upon* Jews, yet conceals the porous, fluid and relational character of Jewish Manchester vis-à-vis non-Jews and non-Jewish cosmologies.⁹¹

The local non-Jewish population are typically regarded under the collective term ‘*goyim*’, which I often found was used pejoratively and itself glosses over immense social and ethnic diversity formed of ‘born and bred’ Mancunians, Eastern European émigrés, as well as religious minorities of South Asian and Middle Eastern origin. Mancunian and especially Eastern European women often service the needs of *balabotish* (middle class)⁹² *frum* families in the form of domestic work,⁹³ demonstrating how some regular Jewish and non-Jewish encounters do occur. Muslims, as I go on to discuss, are generally viewed with suspicion and avoided.⁹⁴ The preference for

frum Jews to be 'self-contained' (as Sara put it) amidst the area's non-Jewish diversity reflects the Haredi lifeworld in ethnically diverse boroughs of London. The absence of encounters and lack of public participation on the part of Haredim in Hackney is perceived as 'not *wanting* to mix' by other locals, which can, in turn, give rise to limited understandings and subsequently 'enhance prejudice' (Wessendorf 2013: 410 [emphasis in original]).

Antisemitism is widely seen to be on the rise in the UK, and residents of Jewish Manchester had complained that 'you do feel it is more acceptable to be antisemitic than it used to be' (Mrs Gellner). Such concerns can be understood when cast against the backdrop of targeted and murderous attacks against Jews in Europe and the United States that occurred consistently during my time in Jewish Manchester and afterwards, as mentioned in the Introduction. The rise in antisemitism experienced over the summer of 2014 (following the Israel–Gaza conflict) and proceeding years was threatening for many *frum* Jews I met, not least because Haredim are visibly identifiable as a Jewish minority. Many anxieties related to Muslims due to a fear of being 'outnumbered'. In the words of one *frum* woman, 'the Muslims are everywhere. They're very strong and I don't think we're immune at all' (Mrs Dreer). What is striking is how she deploys the language and imagery of *immunity* when discussing protection of the social body against the perceived threats of neighbouring minority populations, assimilating contemporary media stirs of demographic anxiety. Jewish–Muslim relations at the local level should, however, be viewed in a deeper context of how minority groups are constructed and (re)presented as threats to the body of the nation in historical, social, and political debates in the UK (Egorova and Ahmed 2016).

On another occasion I met Mrs Glassberg, who described herself as an Orthodox Jewish woman, for coffee in an area that was once in the heart of the former Jewish Quarter, but is now largely populated by South Asian émigré and Muslim families. She walked towards me and announced, 'it's like Gaza City in here', before sitting down to our interview. Mrs Glassberg made this reference to the Muslim (but not Middle Eastern) social body that surrounded us rather than the physical structure of the non-kosher café or the environment, and in relation to political tensions occurring in Israel and Gaza at the time. However, my interpretation is that the ethno-religious separation and disdain that is marked through her comment – as well as the spatial distance between Jewish Manchester and the predominantly Muslim neighbourhoods (in what was the former

Jewish Quarter) – evokes Mrs Glassberg’s comparison with Gaza. The prominent shopping area in question, with a large Tesco supermarket, sits a short walk away from Jewish neighbourhoods, but I was told by Mrs Gellner that a lot of *frum* and Haredi people ‘would not visit full stop, even to Tesco’ despite its array of competitively priced kosher produce.

Rather than an issue of cultural-distinctiveness between Jewish and non-Jewish groups in Manchester, ethnicity becomes a marker of difference when there is a point of contact between the two; ‘differences are made relevant through interaction’ (Eriksen 2010 [1993]: 263).⁹⁵ Mrs Glassberg likened the café as ‘Gaza City’ by pointing out the Muslim regulars and thus making the ethnic difference relevant. By doing this, her comment demonstrates how ‘the context of interaction is constituted prior to the interaction itself and must therefore form part of the explanation of interpersonal processes’ (Eriksen 1991: 129 [emphasis added]). Barth has argued that it is ‘the ethnic boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff it encloses’ (1969: 15). However, rather than being demarcated by a boundary, there has evidently been a *zona franca* in the Jewish Quarters of Manchester where encounters – and thus the possibility for either inter-group and also intra-group interactions (however dangerous they might be) – can take place.

Discussion

The development of organised services and a system of mutual support has been a historical feature of Jewish Manchester, which has enabled the former émigré and now Haredi Jewish settlements to establish varying degrees of self-sufficiency, dissimulation and, increasingly, protection. However, this does not mean that the Jews of Manchester constitute a homogenous ‘community’ – an *imagined* category that bears little relation to the lived realities of internal marginality experienced by some émigré and Haredi Jews.⁹⁶ Recurring constructions of internal fragmentation, social gradations, and relational positioning have historically been at play, demonstrating how protection is a graded strategy that is sought *within* the Jewish settlement – and also between it and the outside world.

The aspiration for self-sufficiency and self-protection from the external world illustrates how minority groups can negotiate citizenship or ‘subject status’⁹⁷ as well challenge the ways in which they are incorporated within the body of the nation. McCargo (2011)

has argued how gradations or ‘graduated’ positionalities in relation to the state occur where citizenship is conveyed by degrees of (in) formal belonging along a socio-politically constructed continuum, rather than as a given or equally-bestowed category. The Malay Muslim minority in Thailand are exemplary of this, as holding Thai nationality is only one grade, but subscribing to ideals of ‘Thai-ness’ (as expressed by loyalties to the social order) is another (McCargo 2011). A paradox of marginality then exists, especially for some minorities, who ‘can neither escape the nation-state nor be full-status participants in its programme’ (Tsing 1994: 289).

Viewing citizenship as a graded – but also relational status – reflects how the Jewish elite positioned themselves as ‘natives’ and their co-religionists as ‘foreign’ during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, attempts to narrow this gap and convert the ‘alien’ Jews into English Jews (and thus relationally closer to the body of the nation) provoked resistance to assimilation on the part of Haredim, indicating how graduated statuses were intentionally sought as a form of protection. The historical relation between anglicised and émigré Jews is recurrent with present day dynamics in Jewish Manchester, and reflects the anxieties felt by the broader and mainstream Jewish social body towards the Haredim and the extents to which they do or do not integrate into UK society (cf. Staetsky and Boyd 2015). Services that are instituted by the broader Jewish population in Manchester can bring exposure to ‘stuff’ that is viewed as dangerous and threatening to authoritative interpretations of the Judaic cosmology.

Haredi Judaism should be understood as sitting ‘relationally and positionally’⁹⁸ to the outside world, and continuously responding to political and socio-religious shifts in the state and national culture. Maintaining a graded relation to both the broader Jewish social body and the state enables Haredi Jews to maintain autonomy over their lifeworld. Exposure to external influences can then be avoided, or, at best negotiated, which demonstrates the complex ways in which social *immunity* is pursued against worldviews or pressures that are perceived as contaminating. The relationship between dissimulation, graded protection and *immunity* in the Haredi context serves as the point of departure for Chapter Two, where I critique the ‘hard to reach’ label that routinely appears in public health discourse when portraying the so-called ‘ultra-Orthodox Jewish community’.

The ‘hard to reach’ margins are not only about territories, but also ‘an analytic placement that makes evident both the constraining, oppressive quality of cultural exclusion and the creative potential of

rearticulating, enlivening, and rearranging the very social categories that peripheralize a group's existence' (Tsing 1994: 279). Health is subject to the 'constraint and creativity'⁹⁹ associated with the lived reality of marginality (and life at the margins), and I go on to argue how this is particularly acute in the Haredi context as it is one of the few points in which the state and minority encounter each other. Not only does this mean that healthcare and how it is used demonstrates that Haredi Jews evade a 'subject status' rather than the state (and its institutions) per se, but more specifically the way in which a relationship with the state is carefully mediated and managed. The next chapter addresses how responses to healthcare services can be most appropriately framed.

Notes

1. According to Dobkin (1994) the slum areas of Red Bank and Strangeways (parts of which are now known as Cheetham Hill) had been the 'centre of Jewish life' in Manchester before the periods of mass Jewish immigration.
2. Hebrew, meaning 'house and garden'.
3. Also *hashkafot*, pl. *Hashkofah* (also *hashkafah*), sing.
4. Term introduced by a local (who described herself as Orthodox) in reference to Jews who have become more *halachically* observant than they were raised (*Ba'al teshuvah*, literally master of repentance).
5. *Giyur* is taken from the root *l'ger*, meaning 'to sojourn' ('conversion' in English).
6. See MANJM J162. Mrs Levy was born in 1893 and interviewed in 1977 (making her eighty-four at the time of her oral history recording), which would indicate that internal divisions were already occurring by the later decades of the twentieth century.
7. A (relative) term that is used to describe and position Jews along a gradient of observance rather than fixed categories of 'Orthodox' or 'Haredi'. See also Valins (2000) who makes reference to the 'religious "right"' or 'the right of the religious spectrum'.
8. Staetsky and Boyd (2015: 2) describe 'denominational switching' as moving from one Jewish denomination to another, by way of moving to a more or less *halachically* observant form of Judaism.
9. Whilst the context of Scott's (2009) argument is the physical relation between a mountainous refuge and plains of economic activity, I apply it to the protective strategies taken by Haredi Jews (and also authoritative interpretations of the Judaic cosmology) vis-à-vis the encroachment of the external world.

10. Benjamin (2002) critiques the concept of community in relation to the immensely diverse but amalgamated 'Malay world'.
11. MANJM J144. Phina Emily (Sissie) Laski was the daughter of Rabbi Dr Moses Gaster (former *Haham* or Head of the Spanish and Portuguese Head of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews), and wife of Judge Neville Laski, who was among Jewish Manchester's social elite.
12. MANJM J273. Dr Rich was born in 1910 and interviewed in 1980 (making him seventy at the time of his oral history recording). I emphasise 'we' to signpost the broader prejudices held by some Jews towards Muslims in Manchester, an issue that I return to later in this chapter.
13. Reuter (2016) offers an excellent discussion of medical racialism and anti-'alien' politics in relation to Tay-Sachs disease, which was historically considered exclusive to Ashkenazi Jews despite the fact that it is not and never has been. Tay-Sachs Disease is an autosomal recessive disorder that is always fatal in affected infants. As Reuter (2016: 15) argues, Tay-Sachs is 'exemplary of a disease idea that has long served to delimit a notion of racial difference'.
14. William Moses Feldman was a leading Jewish physician of Russian Jewish origin (See Rubinstein, Jolles and Rubinstein 2011: 271).
15. Attempts to reduce maternal and infant mortality in England over the course of the twentieth century were accompanied by the less positive side-effect that women and their bodies have become intensely vulnerable to control and technological supervision and management. The early twentieth century brought a previously unseen focus on motherhood as a strategy to improve infant survival and child health, bound up in ideas of a healthy and numerous population being a 'national resource' (Davin 1978). The combination of high infant mortality rates and a falling birth rate was viewed as an issue of national security and was central to British imperial ambitions because 'population was power' (Davin 1978: 10). Infant mortality, for example, accounted for twenty-five per cent of all deaths recorded in 1901 (Griffiths and Brock 2003). Calls were made at this time to provide poor birthing women with skilled maternity care free-of-charge as a public health priority (Donnison 1988: 161), exemplifying how individual women and motherhood became entangled in the concerns of the nation's welfare. Maternal mortality rates in England began to rise by the First World War, inflaming national anxieties around population quality (Loudon 2001 [1992]). Maternal mortality rates remained elevated until 1935, with one in every two hundred women dying in childbirth (Drife 2002).
16. Midwifery in the UK was subject to increasing regulation from the turn of the twentieth century. The 1902 Midwives Act marked the beginning of a series of political interventions to regulate, professionalise and supervise midwifery practice in England, see Donnison (1988)

and Loudon (2001) for an in depth discussion. Beier (2004: 379) notes how ‘the management of birth shifted from informal, working-class, female, neighbourhood authorities to formally trained and licensed midwives, health visitors, nurses, and physicians’. See Oakley (1984) for an in depth historical discussion of the medicalisation of pregnancy, women’s bodies and infant care.

17. GB127.M443: 1921. Reflecting on the early 1930s, Sidney Taylor (MANJM J294) regarded Saint Mary’s as the ‘best’ local hospital and ‘being under their care from the beginning to the birth’ was highly desirable.
18. GB127.M443: 1921.
19. MANJM J273.
20. GB127.M443. A *brit milah* (also *bris milah*) can only be delayed for medical reasons, such as neonatal jaundice.
21. GB127.M443.
22. A quorum of ten Jewish men, who perform the recitation of certain prayers required at a *brit milah*. It was explained to hospital authorities that it was not ‘absolutely necessary’ to have a celebration at a *brit milah*, if this was the primary concern of the hospital authorities (GB127.M443). This position presents historical discontinuities with the contemporary conducts of Haredi Jews that are presented as normative by rabbinical authorities. At the time of my research, information distributed by *rabbonim* to *frum* women in Manchester and London notes that if a *brit milah* occurs while a woman is still under hospital care, then ‘arrangements should be made with the Hospital Administration to perform this short ceremony in a room away from the ward, in order not to disturb general routine, as this entails having a “*minyán*” present’. The agency in which Haredi religious authorities attempt to negotiate the performance of the *brit milah* on maternity wards (when relevant) is then discontinuous with the historical need of a minority to submit to the demands of the medical establishment.
23. MANJM J273. Rich’s oral history indicates that the conditions in which obstetric procedures were practiced, such as the reduced ability to deal with blood loss, may have been an important factor in making emergency obstetric care less safe.
24. MANJM J294.
25. Crumpsall Hospital (North Manchester) is approximately six miles in distance from Saint Mary’s Hospital.
26. MANJM J273.
27. MANJM J273.
28. MANJM J273.
29. Articles had featured in prominent medical journals before political events in the 1930s, which, by contemporary standards, would be construed as circulating, manipulating, or perpetuating (or being written in response to) stereotypical and racialised representations of Jews

- (see, for example, *The Lancet* 1884; Pearson and Moul 1926; Feldman 1926; James 1928).
30. The Poor Law Amendment Act (1834) was introduced with the intention of making care for the poor more cost-effective, which was an expenditure that had, until then, been met by taxing the middle and upper classes, who claimed that the poor could afford to avoid work and 'be lazy'. Through the institution of the Poor Law, relief to the unemployed, sick and old was typically granted by entering the punitive environment of a 'workhouse', where basic accommodation was available in exchange for manual mundane labour (National Archives n.d.). Each parish was responsible for the poor in its bounds, and groups of parishes were managed by a 'Board of Guardians', each with a designated medical officer (Davey Smith, Dorling and Shaw 2001).
 31. Modelled on London's Jewish Board of Guardians (established 1859).
 32. This is not to say that the Jewish poor did not enter the workhouse at all. Cases considered by the Board to be 'underserving' after thorough investigations were referred to local workhouses. The Board also negotiated the terms through which Jews entered workhouses, such as not working on *Shabbat* and, in some instances, Jewish orphans and 'deserted children' could instead attend a Jewish residential school (Williams 1976: 288–289). Marks (1994) notes how London's Jewish Board of Guardians was among England's most progressive philanthropic bodies at the time, but also deployed disciplinary practices and went as far as repatriating émigré Jews to Eastern Europe who were unable to maintain themselves, and also used the workhouse system as a form of coercion (particularly in the case of 'deserted wives' to force husbands into acting on marital responsibilities).
 33. As was the case in London (see Reuter 2016: 74). Prior to the establishment of the Board and allied services, synagogues were responsible for the poor of their congregations (Dobkin 1994), as well as other Jewish social welfare organisations.
 34. The German philosopher Friedrich Engels reflected on his experience and observations of Victorian Manchester's insalubrious living and working conditions when writing 'The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844'.
 35. See GB127.M182/3/1: 1873–1874, 1874–1875.
 36. GB127.M182/3/1: 1869–1870.
 37. GB127.M182/3/3: 1890–1891.
 38. Small room used for prayer. These were usually comprised of ethnic sub-groups, such as Polish or Russian Jews.
 39. Society, *chevra* (sing.), *chevrot* (pl.).
 40. These émigré Jews preferred to avoid what they viewed as the 'English *shul*' (synagogue), which was primarily used by the anglicised and integrated Jewish classes. Resistance to the anglicised Jews did not only manifest because of religious oppositions but also gradations in

- socioeconomic status between the émigré (as well as upwardly mobile) with the elite Jews (see Heggie 2011).
41. GB127.M151/4/12: 1895.
 42. GB127.M182/3/1: 1871–1872.
 43. GB127.M294/2. See also Williams (1985: 156), who notes that the Society for the Relief of Really Deserving Distressed Foreigners was instituted by non-Jewish German merchants but had a considerable Jewish membership providing financial donations. Whereas the charitable body could select who was ‘deserving’ of financial and material help, synagogues would tend not to refuse ‘the kind of temporary financial assistance which the Society “avoided [giving] as much as possible”’ (Williams 1985: 157).
 44. See Lock and Farquhar (2007: 307) who note that colonised bodies were portrayed as the ‘symbolic inversions’ of Europeans, which needed saving through colonial endeavours that were often portrayed as ‘humanistic’.
 45. MANJM J143. Margaret Langdon was a prominent philanthropist in Jewish Manchester, born in 1891 and interviewed in 1978 (making her eighty-seven at the time of her oral history recording).
 46. MANJM J279. Dina McCormick (née Glantz) was born in 1907 and interviewed in 1980 (making her seventy-three at the time of her oral history recording).
 47. See, for example, GB127.M182/3/4: 1904–1905; GB127.M151/4/2.
 48. See GB127.M182/3/4: 1904–1905. In contrast, non-communicable diseases such as diabetes were noted, at the same time, to be more prevalent ‘among the better classes’ of Jews who lived in the more affluent districts (GB127.M182/3/4: 1905–1906).
 49. Burman’s (1982) notes that Jewish women in Manchester would tend to give up employment immediately before marriage, whereas non-Jewish women would continue working. Her fascinating study compares Jewish women’s increased working patterns in the *shtetls* of Eastern and Central Europe where men earned social status through religious study and knowledge, and in Manchester, where social status was earned through men’s employment to emulate as much as possible the Jewish and English middle classes. In both cases, Burman argues that Jewish women were typically excluded from the processes through which ‘social recognition was acquired’ (1982: 37).
 50. See MANJM J279.
 51. MANJM J279; GB127.G25/3/6/8: 1909.
 52. MANJM J279.
 53. GB127.M151/4/2: circa 1910.
 54. MANJM J279.
 55. MANJM J279. Similarly, some émigré and Manchester-raised Jewish women claimed how they would rather starve than be compelled to take employment against local norms (Burman 1982: 31–32).

56. See MANJM J162.
57. Emphasis in original. Ecks and Sax (2006: 208) argue that that marginality is a construction of society and social hierarchy, and a practice that 'people do to each other'.
58. MANJM J279.
59. See MANJM J279; MANJM J229; Golding 1932.
60. MANJM J279.
61. Whilst Valins (2003) notes that the imagination of a 'community' remains from an emic perspective, I argue in this chapter that the term 'community' obscures the internal divisions and fragmentations in Jewish Manchester.
62. Gifts of food that are given to friends and family on *Purim*, *mishloach manos* was the vernacular among Ashkenazi Haredim.
63. See Kahn-Harris and Gidley 2010: 7, who make a distinction between 'Anglo Jewry' (the collective population of Jews in the UK) and the 'Jewish community', 'in order to emphasise how not all British Jews are involved in institutional life or even see themselves as Jewish and as having anything in common with other Jews in the UK'.
64. Mr Emet's distinction between Haredi and Orthodox Jews reflects the historical process in which the term 'Haredi' initially began to circulate as a conceptual separation of Jews who held different standards of religious observance to mainstream Orthodoxy (also instituting separate lines of religious authority), see Introduction.
65. MANJM J279.
66. MANJM J273.
67. Central to Passover (*Pessah*) is the *Seder* meal, which recounts the journey of exodus taken by the ancient Hebrews out of Egypt, which concludes by reciting the phrase 'next year in Jerusalem'.
68. MANJM J144.
69. I borrow and adapt the concept of privileged marginality from Faubion (1993: 191), who describes 'distinguished women, distinguished "homosexuals", distinguished "provincials" who belong to the Greek intelligentsia' as 'privileged marginal'. I describe the Sephardim in the UK during this period as 'privileged marginals', as they formed their own Jewish minority yet had relatively more social capital and resources than émigré Ashkenazi Jews in Manchester.
70. MANJM J153. Rachel Black (pseudonym) was interviewed in 1977. No record of her date of birth available.
71. MANJM J144.
72. Inter-marriage between Ashkenazi and Sephardi Jews in Manchester did occur. It is customary for a woman to follow the *minhagim* of the man she marries, so a Sephardi woman marrying an Ashkenazi man would take on his *minhagim*. That being said, it was not uncommon for Haredi Sephardi men to instead attend Ashkenazi synagogues. One boy with mixed Ashkenazi and Sephardi parents told me how his

- (Ashkenazi) mother preferred him to attend an Ashkenazi synagogue so that he 'would have Ashkenazi friends'.
73. A stamp or certificate to reassure consumers that a product has been subjected to rabbinical supervision under the auspice of a particular *Beit Din* and can be consumed.
 74. *Kedassiah*, managed by the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations (UOHC), was viewed as the most stringent *hechsher*.
 75. Although commonly translated into English as 'charity', the root meaning of *tzedakah* or *tzedokoh* is justice or righteousness. It is an aspect of *halachic* law that requires all Jews to donate a tenth of their earnings to charitable causes.
 76. Hebrew; an abbreviation of *gemilut chassadim*, acts of kindness.
 77. See also Chapter Three, where I discuss how a Haredi culture of maternity care attempts to meet the limitations of NHS maternity services rather than replace them altogether.
 78. 'Frummies' (also frummers) is a pejorative play on the word '*frum*' (pious), and was used by non-Haredi Jews to describe Haredim.
 79. Hebrew, the name. Used by pious Jews in place of 'God' or more formal references such as '*Adonai*'.
 80. 'Black' was commonly used in the field-site as being Haredi, religiously right-wing, or '*shtark*' (strict).
 81. According to some estimates, *Satmar* are one of the largest Hassidish groups. *Satmar* religious leaders are known to hold 'anti-Zionist' views, but generally not to the extent that *Neturei Karta* take a publically 'anti-Zionist' position.
 82. Hakak (2009) has described how, in the context of *yeshiva* students in Israel, the Haredi body is an artefact in which any slight change in appearance or conduct is scrutinised as being indicative of (or at risk of) religious transgressions. Institutional resistance to exercise, a 'gentile custom' (Hakak 2009), positions the body as a margin that must be fortified. It must be noted that Haredi men in Israel are cast against a large (non-Haredi) Jewish population and a social expectation to join the Israeli Defense Forces, an institution which cultivates a specific corporeal ideal of the 'chosen body' (Weiss 2002).
 83. One notable testimony to Jewish and non-Jewish relations during the early twentieth century is the literary masterpiece '*Magnolia Street*', written by Louis Golding (1932) and inspired by his formative years in Jewish Manchester.
 84. MANJM J76. Louise was born in 1892. No available record of interview date.
 85. MANJM J279. Dina married Jack McCormick, a non-Jewish man who did not practice a religion yet and was positioned as a Christian by Jewish neighbours, probably by virtue of belonging to the dominant majority population.
 86. MANJM J279.

87. MANJM J74. Leslie Davies (Jewish) was born in 1912. No available record of interview date.
88. MANJM J160. Raymond was born in 1919 and interviewed in 1975 (making him 56 at the time of his oral history recording).
89. M151/4/2; M790/2/6(2): 6 January 1904; 1 February 1904; 31 October 1904; 22 November 1905. Annual report for the Jewish Soup Kitchen notes 'resolved that assistance be given to Christian parents, if considered deserving'. Coupons designated for 'Christian' neighbours (a broad category essentially meaning non-Jewish) were handed to the superintendent of police for distribution, and donations made to the Jewish Soup Kitchen often came with a prerequisite that a certain number of coupons be allocated for non-Jews.
90. The current preference to provide maternity care only to Jewish women, as I discuss in Chapter Three, is arguably part of a broader strategy of self-protection and dissimulation that breaks with the historical course of integration taken by the Jewish establishment in England, and is a point I return to in the discussion of this chapter.
91. The notion of a Jewish 'ghetto' draws upon a historical tactic of separation imposed upon Jews by the external Venetian social order as a 'spatial solution to deal with its impure but necessary Jewish bodies' (Sennett 1994: 227).
92. Yiddish: middle-class, respectable, good-standing.
93. Women domestic workers were referred to in the Yiddish-derivative of *goytah* amongst Hassidish circles.
94. It is important to note that there is a prominent group for Jewish and Muslim interreligious dialogue in Manchester formed mainly of non-Haredim, so the concerns of these locals may not reflect those of the broader Jewish population.
95. Eriksen's claim also underlies my argument (see introduction) against referring to Haredi Jews as 'ultra-Orthodox', a label that is only made relevant through interaction or discourse with non-Haredi Jewish modalities.
96. See Anderson (2006).
97. Scott (2009).
98. Cf. Scott (2009: 32) who, in the context of the Zomia region of Southeast Asia, has argued that 'hill peoples cannot be understood in isolation ... but only relationally and positionally vis-à-vis valley kingdoms'.
99. See Tsing 1993: 18, who describes marginality as both a 'source of both constraint and creativity'.

References

Abramson, S., D. Graham and J. Boyd. 2011. 'Key Trends in the British Jewish Community', Institute for Jewish Policy Research. Retrieved 19

- February 2016 from <http://www.jpr.org.uk/publication?id=84#.Vl2vgLTA7EY>.
- Alexander, J. and P. Alexander. 2002. 'Gender and Ethnic Identity among the Lahanas of Sarawak', in G. Benjamin and C. Chou (eds), *Tribal Communities in the Malay World: Historical, Cultural and Social Perspectives*. Leiden: International Institute for Asian Studies, pp. 457–74.
- Alderman, G. 1992. *Modern British Jewry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Anderson, B. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised edn. London: Verso.
- Aran, G., N. Stadler and E. Ben-Ari. 2008. 'Fundamentalism and the Masculine Body: The Case of Jewish Ultra-Orthodox Men in Israel', *Religion* 38(1): 25–53.
- Barth, F. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organisation of Culture Difference*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Bauman, Z. 2001. *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Beier, L.M. 2004. 'Expertise and Control: Childbearing in Three Twentieth Century Working-Class Lancashire Communities', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78(2): 379–409.
- Benjamin, G. 2002. 'On Being Tribal in the Malay World', in G. Benjamin and C. Chou (eds), *Tribal Communities in the Malay World: Historical, Cultural and Social Perspectives*. Leiden: International Institute for Asian Studies, pp. 7–76.
- Burman, R. 1982. 'The Jewish Woman as Breadwinner: The Changing Value of Women's Work in a Manchester Immigrant Community', *Oral History*, 10(2): 27–39.
- Cannon, T., A. Titz and F. Krüger. 2014. 'The Myth of Community?' In *World Disaster Report 2014: Focus on Culture and Risk*. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, pp. 93–119. Retrieved 1 July 2015 from <http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Documents/Secretariat/201410/WDR%202014.pdf>.
- Cohen, S.M. 2016. 'Dramatic Orthodox Growth Is Transforming the American Jewish Community', *Forward*. Retrieved 10 December 2017 from <https://forward.com/opinion/357517/dramatic-orthodox-growth-is-transforming-the-american-jewish-community/>.
- Comaroff, J. and J. Comaroff. 1992. *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Das, V. and D. Poole. 2004. *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*. Sante Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Davey Smith, G., D. Dorling and M. Shaw. 2001. *Poverty, Inequality and Health in Britain. 1800–2000: A Reader*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.
- Davin, A. 1978. 'Imperialism and Motherhood', *History Workshop* 5: 9–65.
- Dee, D. 2012. 'Sport or "Shul"? Physical Recreation, Anglo-Jewry and the Jewish Sabbath, c1880–1945', *Jewish Historical Studies* 44: 7–26.

- Diamond, E. 2008. 'Religious Microspaces in a Suburban Environment: The Orthodox Jews of Thornhill, Ontario', in J. Brauch, A. Lipphardt and A. Nocke (eds), *Jewish Topographies: Visions of Space, Traditions of Place*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, pp. 119–38.
- Dobkin, M. 1986. *Tales of Manchester Jewry and Manchester in the Thirties: Commemorative Issue*. Manchester, UK: Neil Richardson.
- . 1994. *More Tales of Manchester Jewry: Commemorative Issue*. Manchester, UK: Neil Richardson.
- Donnison, J. 1988. *Midwives and Medical Men: A History of the Struggle for the Control of Childbirth*, second edition. London: Historical Publications Ltd.
- Douglas, M. 2002. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, Routledge Classics Edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Drife, J. 'The Start of Life: A History of Obstetrics', *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, 78(919): 311–15.
- Ecks, S., and W. Sax. 2005. 'The Ills of Marginality: New Perspectives on Health in South Asia', *Anthropology & Medicine* 12(3): 199–210.
- Egorova, Y., and F. Ahmed. 2016. 'The Impact of Antisemitism and Islamophobia on Jewish-Muslim Relations in the UK: Memory, Experience, Context', in J. Renton and B. Gidley (eds), *Antisemitism and Islamophobia in Europe: Shared Story? Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 283–301*.
- Emanuel, J. 1982. 'The Politics of Maternity in Manchester (1919–1939): A Study from within a Continuing Campaign', MSc dissertation. Manchester: Manchester University (TH4353).
- Endelman, T. 2002. *The Jews of Britain, 1656–2000*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Eriksen, T.H. 1991. 'The Cultural Contexts of Ethnic Differences', *Man* 26(1): 127–44.
- . 2010 [1993]. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.
- Esposito, R. 2008. *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, trans. T. Campbell. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2015. *Immunitas: The Protection and Negation of Life*, trans. Z. Hanafi. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Faubion, J.D. 1993. *Modern Greek Lessons: A Primer in Historical Constructivism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Feldman, W. M. 1926. 'Alien Immigration into Great Britain', *The British Medical Journal* 1(3395): 166–67.
- Gilman, S.L. 1992. 'The Jewish Body: A Foot-Note', in H. Eilberg-Schwartz (ed), *People of the Body: Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective*. Albany: State University of New York Press, pp. 223–41.
- Golding, L. 2006 [1932]. *Magnolia Street*. Nottingham, UK: Five Leaves Publications.
- Gonen, A. 2006. 'Between Torah Learning and Wage Earning: The London Experience and Lessons for Israel', The Floersheimer Institute for Policy

- Studies, 4/23e. Retrieved 1 December 2015 from <http://archive.jpr.org.uk/download?id=2294>.
- Griffiths, C., and A. Brock. 2003. 'Twentieth Century Mortality Trends in England and Wales'. Office for National Statistics. Retrieved 21 October 2017 from <https://visual.ons.gov.uk/birthsanddeaths/>.
- Hakak, Y. 2009. 'Haredi Male Bodies in the Public Sphere: Negotiating with the Religious Text and Secular Israeli Men', *Journal of Men, Masculinities, and Spirituality* 3(2): 100–22.
- Halliday, F. 1992. 'The Millet of Manchester: Arab Merchants and Cotton Trade', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 19(2): 159–76.
- Heggie, V. 2005. 'Jewish Medical Charity in Manchester: Reforming Alien Bodies', *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 87(1): 111–32.
- James, R. R. 1928. 'The Arrival of the Jews in England', *British Medical Journal* 1 (3518): 993.
- Jones, C. 2001. *Immigration and Social Policy in Britain*, reprinted. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kahn-Harris, K., and B. Gidley. 2010. *Turbulent Times: The British Jewish Community Today*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Lock, M., and J. Farquhar. 2007. *Beyond the Body Proper: Reading the Anthropology of Material Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Loudon, I. 2001. *Death in Childbirth: An International Study of Maternal Care and Maternal Mortality 1800–1950*, reprinted. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Malach, G., M. Choshen and L. Cahaner. 2016. 'Statistical Report on Ultra-Orthodox Society in Israel', Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies and The Israel Democracy Institute. Retrieved 10 December 2017 from https://en.idi.org.il/media/4240/shnaton-e_8-9-16_web.pdf.
- Marks, L.V. 1990. "'Dear Old Mother Levy's": The Jewish Maternity Home and Sick Room Helps Society 1895–1939', *The Society for the Social History of Medicine* 3(1): 61–88.
- . 1994. *Model Mothers: Jewish Mothers and Maternity Provision in East London, 1870–1939*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McCargo, D. 2011. 'Informal Citizens: Graduated Citizenship in Southern Thailand', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(5): 833–49.
- Museum of Science and Industry. No date. *How Manchester Invented the Modern World*. London: Carlton Books.
- National Archives. No date. '1834 Poor Law', United Kingdom Government Web Archive. Retrieved 22 October 2016 from <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/1834-poor-law/>
- Oakley, A. 1984. *The Captured Womb: A History of Medical Care of Pregnant Women*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- Pearson, K., and M. Moul. 1926. 'The Problem of Alien Immigration into Great Britain', *Annals of Eugenics* 3: 1–76. Retrieved 1 July 2016 from <http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqSearch=RefNo==PEARSON/3/14/21/2'&dsqDb=Catalog>.

- Reuter, S.Z. 2016. *Testing Fate: Tay-Sachs Disease and the Right to be Responsible*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rollins, T. 2016. 'The Disappearing Migration Routes that Brought Aleppo's Jews to Manchester', *Middle East Eye*. Retrieved 1 June 2016 from <http://www.middleeasteye.net/news/disappearing-migration-routes-brought-aleppo-jews-manchester-1199438840>.
- Rubinstein, W.D., M.A. Jolles and H.L. Rubinstein. 2011. *The Palgrave Dictionary of Anglo-Jewish History*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scott, J.C. 2009. *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sennett, R. 1994. *Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Staetsky, L.D., and J. Boyd. 2015. 'Strictly Orthodox Rising: What the Demography tells us about the Future of the Community', *Institute for Jewish Policy Research*. Retrieved 1 November 2015 from <http://archive.jpr.org.uk/object-uk285>.
- Tananbaum, S.L. 1993. 'Making Good Little English Children: Infant Welfare and Anglicization in London, 1880–1939', *Immigrants and Minorities* 12: 176–99.
- . 1994. 'Biology and Community: The Duality of Jewish Mothering in East London, 1880–1939', in E.N. Glenn, G. Chang and L.R. Forcey (eds), *Mothering: Ideology, Experience, and Agency*. New York: Routledge, pp. 311–32.
- . 2004. 'Ironing out the Ghetto Bend: Sports, Character and Acculturation among Jewish Immigrants in Britain', *Journal of Sport History* 31 (1): 53–75.
- . 2015. *Jewish Immigrants in London, 1880–1939*. London: Routledge.
- The Lancet. 1884. 'Report of the Lancet Special Sanitary Commission on the Polish colony of Jew tailors', 123(3166): 817–18.
- Tsing, A.L. 1993. *In the Realm of the Diamond Queen: Marginality in an out-of-the-way Place*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1994. 'From the Margins', *Cultural Anthropology* 9(3): 279–97.
- Valins, O. 2000. 'Institutionalised Religion: Sacred Texts and Jewish Spatial Practice', *Geoforum* 31(4): 575–86.
- . 2003. 'Stubborn Identities and the Construction of Socio-Spatial Boundaries: Ultra-Orthodox Jews Living in Contemporary Britain', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28: 158–75.
- Wessendorf, S. 2013. 'Commonplace Diversity and the "Ethos of Mixing": Perceptions of Difference in a London Neighbourhood', *Identities* 20(4): 407–22.
- Williams, B. 1976. *The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740–1875*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 1979. 'The Jewish Immigrant in Manchester: The Contribution of Oral History', *Oral History* 7 (1): 43–53.

- . 1989. ‘“East and West”: Class and Culture in Manchester Jewry, 1850–1920’, *Studia Rosenthaliana* 23: 88–106.
- . 2011. *Jews and Other Foreigners: Manchester and the Rescue of the Victims of European fascism, 1933–1940*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Weiss, M. 2002. *The Chosen Body: The Politics of the Body in Israeli Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Wise, Y. 2007. ‘The Establishment of ultra-Orthodoxy in Manchester’, *Melilah: Manchester Journal of Jewish Studies* 7:2. Retrieved 9 May 2016 from <http://www.manchesterjewishstudies.org/storage/melilah/2010/2.pdf>.

List of Archival Material and Oral Histories

Oral Histories, Manchester Jewish Museum (MANJM)

- J74: Leslie Davies. Date of interview not recorded, by B. Williams.
- J76: Louise Dawson. Date of interview not recorded, by B. Williams.
- J143: Margaret Langdon. Date of interview: 1978, by R. Livshin, R. Burman and P. Roberts.
- J144: Phina Emily (Sissie) Laski. Interview date not recorded, by B. Williams.
- J153: Rachel Black (pseudonym). Date of interview: 9 March 1977, by R. Livshin.
- J160: Raymond Levine. Date of interview: 6 February 1975, by P. Games.
- J162: Esther Levy. Interview date: 26 January 1977, by P. Games.
- J229: Marjorie Smith. Date of interview: 22 December 1976, by R. Livshin.
- J273: Louis Rich. Interview date: 7 November 1979 and 17 July 1980, by R. Burman and J. Emanuel.
- J279: Dina McCormick. Date of interview: 2 January 1980, by R. Burman.
- J294: Sidney Taylor. Date of interview: 14 July 1980 by J. Emanuel.

Archives & Local History, Manchester (GB127)

- M151/4/2: Manchester Jewish Soup Kitchen
- M790/2/6(2): Manchester Jewish Soup Kitchen
- M182/3/1–4: Manchester Jewish Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor
- M294/2: Society for the Relief of Really Deserving Distressed Foreigners
- M443: Manchester Hebrew Visitation Board for Religious Ministration in the Manchester Regional Hospital Area.
- G25/3/6/1–8: Manchester Medical Mission and Dispensary (Red Bank Working Men’s Christian Institute).