JEWISH COMMUNITY EDUCATION: CONTINUITY AND RENEWAL INITIATIVES IN BRITISH JEWRY 1991-2000

ROY GRAHAM

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

HUDDERSFIELD UNIVERSITY

SUBMITTED MAY 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"First find yourself a teacher and only then go to the books." Talmud
The School of Education and Professional Development staff has been outstanding. Professors Cullingford and Halstead provided exemplary supervision, combining inspiration with expert professional support; Drs Oliver, Sanderson and Brady guided me through the course work and Dr Salter nudged me over the finishing line; and Suzanne Brown was always there to patiently lead me through the administration.

"Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people;" Vayikra (Leviticus) 19:16
"Report a thing in the name of who said it." Pirkei Avot (Ethics of the Sages) 6:6
I am hugely indebted to all of those who gave their time and so willingly agreed to be interviewed or engaged in discussion as they shared their recollections, insights and thoughts. I believe I have done all that was reasonably possible to guard against causing harm to anyone's good name or reputation by way of quotation or misrepresentation in my writing. Similarly, I have attempted to respect the obligation to appropriately credit the ideas and statements of others.
Wherever I thought there was a possibility of damage I either left out the relevant material, or made quotations non-attributable, or otherwise disguised the source.
If any offence has been inadvertently caused then I do apologise to those concerned.
I have also tried to rely on the data that has been collected as evidence in the presentation of my research and its findings, but any mistakes are entirely my own responsibility.

"Leading the Jewish people is not easy – we are a divided, obstinate, highly individualistic people who have cultivated faith, sharp-wittedness and polemics to a very high level." (Shimon Peres, President of Israel)
"Community Service is as valued as study of Torah." Mishnah Berurah
During the course of this research, I have been fortunate to study and meet many Jewish community lay and professional leaders and without exception I found them to be totally committed, dedicated, well-intentioned and driven by Jewish values.

"From all my teachers I gained understanding." Tehillim (Psalms) 119:99
So many friends, colleagues and students in Israel, Britain and around the Jewish world have also contributed immeasurably to my thinking on these topics and I am very grateful for having had the opportunity to spend time with all of them.

"Rabbi Tarfon taught: "It is not your responsibility to finish the work, but you are not free to desist from it either"." Pirkei Avot 2:16
I am indebted to the work of others who I have studied and quoted and leave further work to future researchers, particularly those who will be better placed to assess the long term impact of the initiatives studied here.
I would also like to express my thanks to the Jewish Agency for Israel and the UJIA who sponsored my research through a professional development grant and I confirm that they did not interfere with my research in any way.

"Rabbi Yehuda taught that forty days before a male child is born a voice from Heaven announces whose daughter he is going to marry" Talmud Sotah 2a (origin of Beshert – 'destined mate' (and roughly translated as 'soul mate')
Most importantly, with thanks and much love to Cazza!

Finally, to my parents – I hope they enjoyed the surprise.

COPYRIGHT

“Educate the child in accordance with its way, so that even when old the child will not depart from it.”

Mishlei (Proverbs) 22:6

“Children are not the people of tomorrow, but people today. They are entitled to be taken seriously. They have a right to be treated by adults with tenderness and respect, as equals. They should be allowed to grow into whoever they were meant to be. The unknown person inside each of them is our hope for the future.”

Janusz Korczak

“What we cannot yet achieve, our children or grandchildren may be able to. Education is the conversation across the generations, and no civilisation has cherished it more than Judaism.”

Chief Rabbi Lord Sacks (2005)

JEWISH COMMUNITY EDUCATION: CONTINUITY AND RENEWAL INITIATIVES IN BRITISH JEWRY 1991-2000

ROY GRAHAM

MAY 2011

ABSTRACT

In the 1990s, the leadership of organised, mainstream British Jewry was preoccupied with the challenge of Jewish continuity. Essentially, there were two narratives: a dominant one emphasising the dangers of assimilation and the decline of the community and a second, emerging narrative highlighting opportunities for, and indicators of, revival. During 1991-2000, attempts were made to establish a centrally-coordinated, national framework for mainstream Jewry: this inquiry focused upon Jewish Continuity (1993-98) and UJIA Jewish Renewal (1997-2000 – it continued to operate thereafter).

The context of British Jewry was examined for the purposes of the study. Thereafter, the research presented an analysis of the historiographical implications, addressing ontological and epistemological issues. Positivist and post-modernist approaches were contrasted and a qualified and cautious positivist approach was adopted, recognising the concerns of more relativist/interpretative perspectives. The methodologies of interviewing and documentary analysis were also examined in terms of hermeneutic issues and practical application. It also considered the research areas of triangulation, validity, reliability, reflexivity and ethical concerns. In addition, the data-gathering process was recorded and explained.

A documentary analysis was conducted with unrestricted access to the available primary organisational documents. A literature review revealed a limited body of writing specific to these events and developments. The purposive interview sample comprised thirty-five semi-structured interviews with lay and professional leaders from the organisations themselves and their partners; expert informants were also included in the sample.

The Findings emerged around the following themes: Vision and Planning; Organisation and Implementation; Leadership Roles and Personalities; and the Challenges of Cross-communalism, Relations with Communal Partner Organisations, Funding and Communications and Expectations.

Finally, the Conclusion was presented within the following framework: assessment of the current situation; presentation of an inspiring vision and purpose; clear articulation of compelling messages; motivate and mobilise key community leadership; develop a fundraising plan; assemble the right personnel and leadership in appropriate decision-making structures; negotiate obstacles and challenges; identify and address key stakeholders and partners; establish the educational model and operational approach; generate an implementation plan based on evidence-based strategic planning; create operational structures; encourage and enthuse people around the initiative.

The research has implications and insights for youth and community education and community development practitioners, as well as academic value.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW 9

2 BRITISH JEWRY IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS RESEARCH 15

2.1 Demographic Profile 15

2.2 A 'community of communities' 17

2.3 Jewish Community Frameworks and Activities 18

2.4 Jewish Identification, Affiliation and Engagement 20

2.5 Jewish Community Education 21

2.6 Additional Research on Jewish Education 23

2.7 Jewish Community Leadership – Individual and Institutional 25

2.8 The Condition of Contemporary British Jewry – Narratives and Challenges 30

3 EPISTEMOLOGICAL APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY 37

3.1 Introduction 37

3.2 Sources of Literature for this Research 38

3.3 Historiographical Research 42

3.4 Historiographical Implications for the Current Research 51

3.5 Interviews 55

3.6 Purposive Sample 65

3.7 Documentary Analysis 66

3.8 Data Analysis 70

3.9 Ethical Considerations 72

4 FINDINGS **79**

4.1 Vision and Planning **81**

4.2 Organisation and Implementation **105**

4.3 Leadership Roles and Personalities **133**

4.4 Challenges **154**

4.4.1 Cross-communalism **154**
4.4.2 Relations with Communal Partner Organisations **172**
4.4.3 Funding **178**
4.4.4 Communications and Expectations **186**

5 CONCLUSION **190**

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY **203**

7 APPENDICES **225**

7.1 Appendix 1: A Document-based Chronology **225**

7.2 Appendix 2: A Document-based Table of Key Features of Relevant Initiatives **246**

7.3 Appendix 3: Interview Schedule **269**

7.4 Appendix 4: Data Analysis Process **273**

7.5 Appendix 5: A List of Key Individuals from which the Interviewees were Chosen **280**

1 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW[1]

This is a study of British Jewry's attempts during the 1990s to create a central agency to develop and enhance Jewish community education and renewal as a priority for the majority mainstream[2] Jews. The purpose of these initiatives was to preserve and promote individual and collective Jewish identity and long term British Jewish communal survival and revival in a modern era characterised largely by free choice and voluntary engagement with Jewish life.

The principal aims of this research were:

- to examine the emergence and development of British Jewry's two central community educational initiatives[3] during the period 1991-2000 in pursuit of Jewish continuity and Jewish renewal;
- to analyse the major themes that emerged and offer a better understanding of planning, organisational evolution and implementation, the role of leadership and the impact of relevant Jewish communal issues and challenges;
- to develop a framework that both:
  - provides a structure for summarising the Conclusion of this research
  - proposes a template for planning and/or examining other similar or related initiatives.

The study utilised an extensive documentary analysis of primary material (including minutes of meetings of the two main central agencies, reports and presentations) and secondary sources such as newspaper coverage and other publications, and a thorough review of existing literature (including journal articles and other academic work), together with thirty-five semi-structured interviews. (Appendices One and Two capture the historical record.) The data was closely examined and triangulated to present the Findings and Conclusion in a

[1] See Appendix One for a Chronology and Appendix Two for details of the main features of each major initiative or development.

[2] For the purposes of this research, the 'mainstream community' is most easily defined in relation to those who are excluded from the category: therefore, the mainstream community refers to those Jews who are *not* Strictly Orthodox (i.e. leading a strictly observant, Orthodox Jewish lifestyle with very limited exposure to assimilatory pressures) (Valins (1999) – Doctorate not consulted; Holman and Holman (2002); Wise (2007) not consulted; Vulkan and Graham D (2008)); *nor* those who are so assimilated that they have no engagement with organised Jewry or on-going interaction with other Jews in a Jewish context (i.e. effectively assimilated or otherwise disengaged from the community). Therefore, the 'mainstream Jewish community' are those who identify with the community through synagogue or other affiliation and/or a minimum level of participation in Jewish communal life (or at least a readiness to consider the option) and comprise the majority middle ground.

[3] Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal.

historiographical examination of the processes and issues underlying these initiatives.[4] It is a worthwhile subject of academic research both for its historical importance and to gain a deeper insight into an attempt at communal renewal within an ethnic religious minority community. It remains highly relevant to contemporary Jewish Diaspora life, particularly in Britain. The major themes that emerged from the inquiry included:

- the challenge of crafting and promoting an educational vision and guiding principles, and translating it into planning and development;
- effecting an organisational and operational model for implementation with a clear strategic direction;
- leadership, personalities and decision-making;
- navigating sensitive and contentious issues within the British Jewish community, including cross-communal religious tensions, funding, partnership and stakeholder management and communications and expectation management.

Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits (in office 1967-1991) launched his initiative for Jewish education entitled 'Let my people know' (Jakobovits, 1971).[5] It was targeted at formal education in schools and prioritised a school-building programme, with supporting teacher training and resource development. During the early 1970s, the Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT) was established by his office and philanthropists were recruited to sponsor it. In September 1992, it published 'Securing Our Future' (JEDT, 1992), otherwise known as the 'Worms Report', which identified the need for a central Jewish education body to address the problems of fragmentation and for prioritising personnel development.

Chief Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks (in office 1991-to date) presented an inspirational vision for a major initiative to work across the mainstream community towards Jewish communal renewal and, in September 1993, launched a high profile community organisation called Jewish Continuity – the JEDT was subsequently wound down. Its mission statement was: "to secure the future of Anglo-Jewry by creating a vibrant community of proud, knowledgeable, and committed Jews" (Sacks, 1994, p 107). His question (and book title), 'Will We Have Jewish Grandchildren?' (Sacks, 1994), was well-received and resonated profoundly across the community.

[4] This is not an evaluation of educational impact but of the processes, machinations and issues behind the establishment of the agencies and their operation during 1991-2000.
[5] Jack Lehman assisted with the research (Bermant, 1990, p 195) and Mendelsson (2003) noted that it was written by Moshe Davis.

Clive Lawton, Jewish Continuity's Chief Executive, described its function: "Its mission is to intervene in the Jewish community by whatever means it deems most effective to engage the maximum number of Jews in experiences, contexts, programmes and activities which will increase their Jewish involvement, awareness and commitment and thus enhance the prospects of the continuity of Jewish life." (Jewish Continuity, 29th June 1994). It aimed to raise Jewish education[6] and community renewal to a higher level of priority within the organised British Jewish community, under circumstances of limited resources and competing priorities and perspectives. This endeavour was greeted with considerable communal excitement and anticipation. Its approach was characterised as 'letting a thousand flowers bloom' with the intention of bringing communal change.[7] It offered grants to partner organisations who were pursuing strategically aligned projects or were able to take on Jewish Continuity inspired projects, as well as a number of central Jewish Continuity initiatives which were planned or instigated. Its intervention areas evolved into the following Task Groups: Arts, Media & Culture; Community Development; Formal Education (Jewish schools); Informal Education (e.g. youth and student groups); Israel Experience (educational travel programmes to Israel); Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools (Non-Jewish Schools); Leadership Development; Outreach (religious-based outreach to the unaffiliated); Research For Planning; Students and Young Adults; Bursaries (for educator professional development) ('Continuity Connects' (Jewish Continuity Newsletter), February 1996).[8] Due to a number of factors, this vast array of intervention areas quickly led to over-promising and under-delivering – it appeared to be beyond the capacity and resource of even a best case fundraising scenario (and funding difficulties were soon to arise). It engaged new lay leaders[9] who were empowered to choose from amongst grant applicants in each of these fields and monitor their progress. However, the central office was later unable to provide sufficient management, support or funding to these groups and in some cases the lay leaders themselves lacked the ability to meaningfully impact in their field.

Cross-communal tensions grew. Sacks defined his approach and that of Jewish Continuity as 'inclusivist' – not 'pluralist' (Sacks, 1993). This distinction was important: under inclusivism, the Orthodox Chief Rabbi could justify working with all Jews without recognising or

[6] Lawton was certainly working to a wide definition of the term 'Jewish education' within the framework of Jewish Continuity, perhaps around 'Jewish growth' or 'Jewish development'.
[7] It's lay chair, Dr Michael Sinclair, referred to his approach as the deployment of 'disruptive technologies'.
[8] For more details, see Jewish Continuity, March, 1996, (the Wagner Review).
[9] 'Lay leaders' is a term used here to define voluntary community leaders who give time and effort to lead and actively engage in the community – they are also invariably expected to make a responsible financial donation.

legitimising non-Orthodox streams of Judaism – a pluralist approach would have required equal acceptance and treatment for all streams.[10] The non-Orthodox became increasingly resentful towards Jewish Continuity's approach; and on the other flank, the more right wing Orthodox leadership were wary and critical of any form of engagement with non-Orthodoxy. Jewish Continuity did not want to compromise the Chief Rabbi and created the Jewish Community Allocations Board (May 1994) as a vehicle to divert funds towards non-Orthodox and other projects.

In July 1994, Jewish Continuity entered into a fundraising agreement with the Joint Israel Appeal (JIA), the leading communal body for raising funds for Israel and its People and for Jews in distress around the world. (Jewish Continuity-JIA Press Release, 8th July 1994). The JIA was also facing its own fundraising challenges in a new reality of the launch of the Arab-Israeli peace process (September 1993), growing Israeli economic prosperity and the welcome reduction in the number of Diaspora Jews suffering persecution; as well as a new fundraising milieu within British Jewry. This decision was taken partly out of genuine support for the Jewish Continuity cause and partly as a defensive measure to retain the JIA's dominant position in communal fundraising and leadership. It was not unanimously supported within either organisation. The JIA was also very protective of its cross-communal role in working with all sections of the mainstream community and became increasingly nervous over Jewish Continuity's difficulties in that area. Moreover, the JIA fundraising did not meet expectations.

Jewish Continuity never managed to become fully and effectively functional. In addition to the cross-communal and funding difficulties, it was unable to achieve sufficient progress within the overly-compressed timescale generated by self-inflated expectations and the JIA's involvement; it was accused of operating a 'scatter-gun' approach; and, more significantly, it struggled to formulate a coherent strategic plan. Furthermore, it suffered leadership issues. As it faced growing difficulties, it was decided that a review would be conducted which reported in early 1996, identifying problems in the areas of its function and role, funding, religious complexion and governance and decision-making (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 20). The Review[11] triggered a merger process between the JIA and Jewish Continuity,[12] leading to

[10] 'Pluralism' as defined by the Chief Rabbi and others.
[11] Also known as the Wagner Review.

the creation of the United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA) (launched 1st January 1997). It also led to significant personnel changes and the withdrawal of the Chief Rabbi from direct involvement.

UJIA Jewish Renewal defined its work in the following way: "The concept of Jewish communal renewal can be understood in very broad terms. We recognise and understand that individual Jews will make their own connections with Judaism from a variety of different sources and in a variety of different ways. However, for us, the term "Jewish renewal" is fundamentally about Jewish opportunities. We believe that by improving the quality of Jewish educational opportunities throughout the community, British Jews will generate and promote effective Jewish communal renewal." (UJIA, 2001, p 10). It divided its work between its *rescue* programme (inherited from JIA) to assist Jews in distress and need in Israel and the Diaspora, and its *renewal* programme of Jewish education and communal renewal in Britain (replacing Jewish Continuity). UJIA Jewish Renewal succeeded Jewish Continuity and benefitted from the lessons of its predecessor's painful experiences. Its leadership adopted a more low key approach and attracted far less public controversy or impatience over its progress – indeed it adopted a deliberate management strategy to secure this outcome. It built partnerships across the mainstream community, effectively lowered the cross-communal tensions, invested heavily in planning and development and pursued a more restricted and focused strategy. It was less ambitious and far more cautious and limited in the scope of its narrower operations. The JIA fundraising apparatus was adapted for the new twin agenda of 'rescue and renewal', providing UJIA Jewish Renewal with sufficient funds to deliver its programme – though not meeting fundraising targets. It prioritised work with young people and its main intervention areas were educational travel programmes to Israel, informal Jewish education, educational leadership (predominantly focused upon Jewish schools and rabbis) and research and development. By the year 2000, UJIA Jewish Renewal was able to publish a clear strategy setting out its more manageable vision and goals in 'The Next Horizon' (UJIA, 2001) – though it was broadly in place by mid-1998.

The evolution and operation of Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal provided the main focus for this research and the Jewish continuity and renewal challenges remain highly relevant to contemporary British Jewry.

[12] Its author, Professor Leslie Wagner, maintained in the research interview that a merger was not his deliberate intention in presenting his Review.

2 BRITISH JEWRY IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS RESEARCH

2.1 Demographic Profile

The Board of Deputies of British Jews provides baseline demographic data[13] and its most recent estimate claimed that there were "300,000 or so" [14] British Jews (Vulkan and Graham D, June 2008).[15] Another Board report (Graham D and Vulkan, November 2008) recorded an annual rate of 911 marriages (continuing a flat trend over the past decade); 2,948 deaths (a five per cent decline); and births for 2006 at 3,314. Underlying the data is the significant growth amongst Strictly Orthodox Jews i.e. a growing proportion of the marriages and births and a lower proportion of the deaths – effectively compensating for decline in other sectors of the community.[16] Vulkan and Graham D (June 2008, pp 15-16) estimate 8-12 per cent of the total British Jewish population are Ultra-Orthodox Jews and 33 per cent of all those under eighteen.

The Board's baseline data has been supplemented by its data-gathering on Jewish school attendance and Chedarim (supplementary Jewish learning centres outside school).[17] The Board's data has some application for education policy planning purposes. For example, the quantitative data on numbers in Jewish schools measured against birth rates has animated a debate on future planning policy for Jewish faith schools and how many places will be needed given projected take up (not all parents choose a Jewish school). The Jewish Leadership Council's Commission on Jewish Schools (2006-8)[18] marked an important

[13] The Institute for Jewish Policy Research (IJPR or JPR) draws upon the Board's statistics in its own reports (as well as a limited number of its own data sets), of which IJPR (1996) and IJPR (2003) are the most significant. IJPR has also produced analysis of Census data (2001) and created a major research project for Census 2011.
[14] This took into account a revised figure for Ultra-Orthodox birth rates, addressing a previously under-counted number of Strictly Orthodox births (Graham D and Vulkan, February 2007).
[15] 2001 Census: Christians: 37,337,000; Muslims: 1,547,000; Hindus: 552,000; Sikhs: 329,000; Jews: 260,000. www.statistics.gov.uk/pdfdir/ethnicity0203.pdf. (There was a six per cent margin of error and some clearly demonstrable under-counts.)
300,000 British Jews out of a total world Jewish population of just over 13 million – making it the fifth largest (Pergola, 2010) – his ranking based on 292,000 Jews.
[16] The Board's figures are the subject of some debate so it is important to note how they approach the data-gathering: "Although they are indicative of actual demographic trends, they only represent those Jews who have chosen, or whose families have chosen to associate themselves with the Jewish community through a formal Jewish act, i.e. circumcision, marriage in a synagogue, dissolution of marriages by a *Beth Din* [Jewish religious Court], or Jewish burial or cremation. Consequently, Jews who have not chosen to identify in these ways do not appear in this report." (Graham D and Vulkan, November 2008, p 4)
[17] Broadly reliable, though data on Chedarim is not always easily accessible.
[18] They had two lead partners, the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the UJIA.

development in this area.[19]

The Institute for Jewish Policy Research (IJPR – also known as JPR) has generated more in-depth research. Its pivotal study, 'Social and Political Attitudes of British Jews: Some Key Findings of the JPR Survey' (IJPR, February 1996),[20] represents the most extensive survey[21] of its kind on British Jewry (the Census reached more Jews and discovered more about them but does not focus on attitudinal questions specifically relevant to Jewish identity and community). The UK Census (2001) was the first to include a voluntary question on religion and counted 266,740 self-identifying British Jews. However, there was a significant undercount in the Ultra-Orthodox Hackney communities (higher figures verified by other sources).[22] After allowing for these discrepancies and an acknowledged small margin of error, the Census broadly seemed to correlate with earlier Board of Deputies demographic assessments – 283,000 (Board of Deputies, 1998).

Graham D provided an interesting, and somewhat creative, interpretation of the Census data (Graham D, JPR, Spring, 2003).[23] He suggested that:

> The answer to the question 'How many Jews are there in the UK?' depends on who is asking the question and for what reason the figure is required. If, for example, it is in order to provide a care home or kosher food services, then a more conservative estimate of 296,000[24] Jews is probably sufficient. If it is to market Jewish books and plays, then the figure of 342,000 would be more appropriate. If, however, it is in order to protect the community from the threat of antisemitism, then the widest possible estimate of 438,000 is pertinent. However, the larger the adjustment, the less it can be scientifically justified, since the number of assumptions on which it is based increases.

[19] According to the Jewish Leadership Council (2007; 2008), it is most likely that, according to the current trajectory, there will be a surfeit of places at mainstream Jewish secondary schools in London by 2011/12. There is currently much discussion over whether or not it will be possible to encourage more Jewish parents to send their children to Jewish schools to fill this capacity.
[20] The Board of Deputies of British Jews was a key partner in this JPR study, as indicated by Schmool's co-authorship (Director of the Board's Demographic Unit).
[21] Sample size: 2,180.
[22] Graham D relied on Holman and Holman (2002) for a more accurate count of Ultra-Orthodox Jews.
[23] Graham D made adjustments to Census findings on the total number of Jews based upon an additional question only asked in the Scottish Census that asked both for 'religion' and the extra question of 'religion of upbringing' (the latter produced a higher figure and the additional increase he applied to the national number of recorded Jews); the Ultra-Orthodox under-count; and an allowance based upon the national estimate of those who declined to answer the voluntary question on religion.
[24] His lower estimate of 296,000 is in line with the Board of Deputies estimation (2006: 293,000).

Graham D, Spring JPR, 2003

The work of Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal was focused primarily upon affiliated and engaged Jews within the mainstream. Graham D's figure of 296,000 is the most relevant for communal, educational planning. It may also be the case that activities and programmes, as Graham D implied, could also reach further towards the 342,000 figure. However, there is no compelling evidence to show that significant numbers of the additional 46,000 would be reached to increase the overall figure – the 296,000 already includes a number of people who will never meaningfully engage with organised Jewry. However, this may change in the future as affiliation and engagement patterns evolve.

2.2 A 'community of communities'

References to the 'Jewish community' refer to the entire population of British Jewry. However, as Finestein observed: British Jewry is better described as 'a community of communities' (Finestein, 1999, p 255; Institute for Jewish Policy Research, 2000, p 3) – though the lines of division into different 'communities' are sometimes rather blurred both in terms of the borders between categories and the intermingling within different areas of communal life. There is a polarised religious spectrum comprising Strictly Orthodox Jews who lead meticulously observant, classically traditional Jewish lifestyles (including the Ultra-Orthodox Chareidi Jews) through Central/Modern Orthodox Jews (both Ashkenasi and Sephardi[25]), and then on to Conservative Jews and the more progressive Reform and Liberal Jews (and even 'post-denominational Jews').[26] Some Jews simply identify themselves as 'traditional'[27] and there is also a smaller but growing number of Jews who describe themselves as Cultural Jews or Secular Jews or 'Just Jewish' – these Jews tend to include Jewish cultural and social activities in their Jewish lifestyle choices or are simply Jewish

[25] Sephardi Jews are broadly of Eastern (and Iberian) ethno-cultural background, whose religious practices and cultural traditions have minor differences from those of the more Western Ashkenasi Jews.
[26] In the absence of a suitable collective term for the Conservative and Progressive (Reform and Liberal) Jews, the term 'Non-Orthodox' will be used.
[27] Generally, when Jews describe themselves as 'traditional', they are normally referring to a form of expression with less commitment to regular religious ritual and practice but a respect for certain key customs. Conservative Jews call themselves 'traditional' (*masorti*) but this is intended to relate to their style of religious practice – which is to the 'left' of Orthodoxy and the 'right' of the Progressives.

through their association with other Jews.[28] However, a wide cross-section (including religious Jews) also tends to enjoy much of this cultural and social activity available across the community. Furthermore, Jews are likely to engage with each other across religious divisions in the fields of welfare and Israel activity, as well as culturally and socially. There are divisions that impact across the community including geographic, country of origin, Sephardi-Ashkenasi, generational, secular-cultural-religious, socio-economic, ideological, organisational. However, the most critical community fault lines are with regard to aspects and interpretations of Jewish Law and practice. There are multiple divisions but for present purposes that between the Orthodox and the non-Orthodox (Conservative, Reform and Liberal) is most relevant.[29] Each grouping tends to organise around a central body of affiliated synagogues. The United Synagogue is the largest and is Central/Modern Orthodox. The Chief Rabbi is in fact the Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the Commonwealth – essentially embracing the United Synagogue and its associates.[30] However, he is widely seen as the leading representative of British Jewry. (Nonetheless, both the Chief Rabbi and his Religious Court (*Beit Din*) are themselves Strictly Orthodox in their own practice.)

2.3 Jewish Community Frameworks and Activities

Centres of prayer, learning, meeting and access to kosher provision and other services, have remained the essential components of Jewish communal life for centuries.[31] Regarding the present-day, the community is organised around various areas of communal life: religion (synagogues), education and culture, welfare provision, Israel-related involvement, community security and recreational and family and social life – all of which take place within a communal mosaic of overlapping activities. Fundraising activity also plays an important part. Schmool, Hart and Cohen (2003)[32] observed:

[28] In the face of modernity, globalisation, technological progress and growing social integration, increasing numbers of Jews often participate in multiple, wider non-Jewish communities rather than elevating and prioritising their Jewish affiliations.
[29] For example, there are also sharp divisions amongst different Ultra-Orthodox groupings over interpretation of fine points of Jewish Law.
[30] There is an ambiguous, ambivalent or antagonistic relationship between the Chief Rabbi and various other sections of British Jewry, but many respect his leadership – particularly in relations with the non-Jewish world.
[31] Together with the negative effects of antisemitism such as ghettoization.
[32] A Board of Deputies of British Jews paper.

> British Jewry is to a very large extent organised around those formal institutions which are the foundation of community. For example, synagogue, school and charity groups provide pivotal, structured, regulated settings in both large and small centres and are important focuses for Jewish identification. However, these institutions are not totally co-extensive with community although they express its existence, set the tone for communal life and provide its strength.
>
> Board of Deputies, 2003, p 8

Mainstream British Jewry has six leading synagogal umbrella bodies representing different streams of Judaism; they broadly divide between the Central/Modern Orthodox and the Progressive.[33] However, for an increasing number of Jews the synagogue and organised religion only feature in their lives on an occasional basis – though usually intensively so – mainly for significant life cycle events and the major religious high holy days, and otherwise infrequent and often somewhat shallow religious engagement and limited educational and cultural participation.[34] Nonetheless, the synagogue continues to retain a central role with a household affiliation rate of 73 per cent[35] (Graham D and Vulkan, 2010, p 4). There are growing numbers attending Jewish schools and they are becoming increasingly more significant. There is also a plethora of non-synagogue based community educational, cultural, fundraising, recreational and social organisations and activities, including a variety of additional smaller scale frameworks with less formal institutions and programmes (e.g. the initiative to set up a Jewish Community Centre in London (along the lines of the American Jewish community centre model) and the London Jewish Cultural Centre. There has also been a burgeoning in non-membership cultural and educational frameworks e.g. Jewish Book Week, the United Kingdom Jewish Film Festival, the Jewish Music Institute and Limmud.[36] Indeed the Limmud Jewish education conferences have proven to be one of British Jewry's few enterprising and energising international Jewish exports.[37] Another arena that has grown

[33] As previously noted, the Assembly of Masorti Synagogues (Conservative Jews) do not consider themselves to be Progressive and would prefer to see themselves more closely aligned with the Orthodox – even though the Orthodox entirely reject them. Also as noted, 'Progressive' would otherwise include Reform and Liberal Jews. The Strictly Orthodox have their own affiliation bodies.

[34] Furthermore, Miller S pointed out that "British Jews, unlike their American counterparts, are often found to belong to synagogues that bear very little relation to their personal religious stance." (Miller S, 1998, p 239).

[35] 75-80 per cent of British Jews are affiliated according to Cohen and Kahn-Harris (2004, p 17) (based on Board of Deputies of British Jews figures). "Approximately 30% of British Jewish adults *do not* have synagogue membership." (Schmool and Cohen, 1998, p 14).

[36] Limmud is an annual Jewish education conference attended by well over 2,000 participants; it also holds a number of satellite programmes.

[37] Chief Rabbi Lord Sacks would be regarded by many as another amongst the limited number of successful British Jews on the international Jewish stage.

considerably over the last fifteen to twenty years is the 'outreach' (*kiruv*) movement – a number of Orthodox-supporting philanthropists have raised significant funds for work aimed at attracting less observant young adults to become more intensely religious in their practice and to in-marry.[38] However, there are as yet no guarantees that any of these constructs will be more successful in safeguarding Jewish continuity in the face of the engagement with modernity.[39]

2.4 Jewish Identification, Affiliation and Engagement

Broadly, community educational initiatives seek to encourage Jews to identify with Judaism (as religious belief, practice, and learning), Israel, the Jewish People, Jewish Community and Jewish Living.[40] The measurement of how Jews associate and identify is often quite difficult and complex. Registered affiliation through membership of an organised body may be accurately measured. However, this alone does not define the quality of engagement nor indicate the degree of 'social capital' (Putnam, 2000; Schlesinger, 2003 (JPR)) or 'cultural capital' or 'religious capital'[41] that may be accumulated. It is also certainly possible to actively engage and participate in the community regardless of affiliation to any particular body – and that engagement is again difficult to measure accurately. Expressions of Jewish identity and peoplehood in general are also varied, involving multiple combinations of Jewish life cycle events, activities and interests (including those connected with Israel and Zionism and Jews around the world), religious, spiritual and lifestyle choices and associative gatherings in family, community and informal social settings; in addition, there are obviously complex psychological, religious, and attitudinal dimensions.[42] Furthermore, there are also

[38] In addition to Chabad, the leading organisation in this field is Aish (Ha'Torah) – a Strictly Orthodox organisation with a more accessible public face designed to reach its less engaged target population.
[39] The existing structures tend to rely on 'joiners' – people who sign up and pay fees committing themselves to membership (e.g. synagogue); whereas growing numbers of people typify what might be called 'connectors' – they want to connect to various frameworks as it suits their own needs and lifestyles but without necessarily joining.
[40] The community also has a long-established and sophisticated welfare infrastructure led by Jewish Care and Norwood, offering wide-ranging social provision, including geriatric care, children and families in need, and various forms of disability support. It also has a well-developed Jewish community protection network led by the Community Security Trust (CST) – established as an independent charity in 1994 (Gardner, 2011).
[41] 'Religious capital': defined here in the sense of engaging in religious communities of practice and belief – a subset of social capital.
[42] Though beyond the purview of this study, it is worth noting the substantial body of research and reports into Jewish identity worldwide (for example, E Cohen (2010) has presented a survey of the Jewish Identity field); and with particular reference to British Jewry: Miller S (1994; 1998; 2002); JPR (1996); amongst others. (For example, Miller S used psychology-based analysis to call "into question conventional Jewish continuity policies." Miller S, 2003, p 58).

intense bonds of interpersonal friendship and a powerful 'familism'.[43] Increasingly, alternative, non-traditional forms of Jewish engagement and identification are emerging. All of these expressions combine content and knowledge; rituals, practices and other actions; and attitudes, beliefs and faith. The wider society and communities offer attractive and sometimes competing opportunities which may complement or rival Jewish lifestyle choices. The external threat of antisemitism[44] also bonds Jews together. As a result, Jewish identity may be seen as ethnic (embracing 'peoplehood' and 'nation') and/or religious, in a fluid composite of thoughts, beliefs and actions.[45]

The layer upon layer of community programmes, activities and social gatherings provided the backdrop for the Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal community education efforts aimed at enhancing Jewish communal engagement and affiliation – they both prioritised young people.

2.5 Jewish Community Education[46]

Jewish Community Education is defined here in the broadest sense to include both formal and informal Jewish education and engagement, through a wide range of Jewish communal religious, educational, leadership development and cultural activities and experiences, often supported by a significant social and/or fundraising[47] component. It includes Jewish schools, Yeshivot and Seminaries (religious Jewish student study centres for males and females respectively), part-time religion schools (Chedarim), Jewish youth organisations, synagogue-based education, adult education programmes, cultural organisations and programmes and anything else that might enhance communal involvement and participation.

[43] Cohen and Kahn-Harris (2004): "Liebman and Cohen (1990: 17) introduce the notion of "familism, the tendency of Jews to see themselves as part of an extended family."
[44] 'Antisemitism': this spelling is preferred, emphasising its true etymological meaning as hatred and discrimination against Jews as opposed to 'Semites' in general (as in 'anti-Semitism') (Bauer, 1978, p 8). ('Judeophobia' would be a more accurate alternative but is a less familiar term.)
[45] Bernard Reisman offered a helpful (though arguably dated) guide to Jewish identity based on various combinations of the following elements: by 'association' with other Jews; by 'ethnicity' and engagement with Jewish culture; by 'religion' and religious practice; by Zionism as the 'national' movement of the Jewish people; by the external threat of 'antisemitism'. However, contemporary Western Jewish identity has become increasingly complex and interwoven with wider society.
[46] The term 'Community Development' is also relevant, addressing an agenda that is not limited to educational issues and with implications for this research. It relates to a wider concern to grow and strengthen the community across the full range of its activities and interests – including welfare and other aspects of community life.
[47] The Jewish concept of *tsedakah* drives a commitment to charitable giving; it is more accurately translated as 'justice, righteousness.'

On ‘Jewish Education’ specifically, Chazan offered helpful guidance:

> The phrase “Jewish education” is an ambiguous term, and in order to allow the discussion to proceed, I will note three common usages. First, in its most generic sense, Jewish education refers to the attempt of the Jews or the Jewish community to socialise its young in its values, customs, beliefs, and behaviors and to transmit its cultural legacy. Second, in its popular usage, *Jewish education* suggests a multitude of structural settings in which learning about Judaism is presented, for example, all-day schools, part-time supplementary schools; and one day a week Sunday schools, educational summer camps, educational travel, early childhood education programs, adult learning and Jewish education in Jewish community centers. Third, the phrase often is used to refer to diverse ideological visions of Judaism which are seen as the core and essential content of the act of teaching and educating (Fox, Seymour, Scheffler, Srael [sic], Marom, and [sic] Daniel, 2003).
>
> Chazan, 2005, pp 95-96

For the purposes of the current research, the first usage is the most applicable, and also referencing the second; it does not relate to the third.[48]

This research has analysed central agency organisations. A ‘central agency’ is one that is able to work across a reasonably wide cross-section of the community and apply centrally coordinated policies and strategic options to the challenges and problems it wishes to confront. The two central agency initiatives at the centre of this research focused upon community education (primarily within the mainstream) and are Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal; they constitute the key, over-arching units of analysis.

Finally, it is argued that much research and commentary has, understandably, fixated upon the Chief Rabbi’s role in Jewish Continuity and the cross-communal complications that

[48] Chazan (1978) is another useful piece in which he helpfully defined ‘ethnic’ Jewish Education; and is equally valuable in so far as it utilises the same problem definition language as that used over two decades later, for example, “At the same time, there would seem to be a new and more primary reason for the continued Jewish commitment to education: its over-riding concern for the decline of Jewish consciousness and identity. The confrontation with modernity has weakened, and in many cases destroyed, some of the important classical agencies of Jewish socialisation and identity-formation, e.g., [sic] the family, the neighbourhood, religious observance. The Jews have knowingly, and in some cases willingly, accepted these changes, since modernity and integration have been important to them. At the same time, they have firmly refused to opt for total acculturation and assimilation, and hence have looked to the agencies to serve as socialisers. The school, the youth club, and the youth movement have thus been thrust into centre stage and have been asked to ‘make our children Jewish’” (p 69).

arose. However, this has also served to distract attention away from the vitally important community education and development aspects of the Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal period of the 1990s. The current research examined the developments with a greater emphasis upon these community educational and developmental implications.

2.6 Additional Research on Jewish Education

Mainstream Jewish schools have become increasingly significant as vehicles to provide Jewish socialisation and education – once provided by the family, synagogue and the reinforcement of a wider Jewish community (and the effects of exclusion by an often hostile non-Jewish society) (Schmool, 2002/3, p 14). There is a growing body of data-gathering and research on Jewish schools in Britain. It is largely beyond the scope of this research but important works include: Miller S (1988)'s findings, in which he stated: "Jewish secondary schools have at best no impact, and at worst a negative impact, on religious behaviour, attitudes, and motivation." (Miller S, 1988, p 162) and which were reported as: "[he] argues that a Jewish education at a Jewish secondary school is, for many a pupil, by no means an enriching experience. Indeed, for some it is an alienating process rather than an educationally beneficial one." (Jewish Quarterly Editorial, Autumn 1988, p 3) or as Alderman reported him: "mainstream Jewish secondary schools reinforce the ritual dimensions of Judaism but appear to have a negative effect upon perceptions of faith and spirituality." (Alderman, 1998, p 369). A number of researchers and commentators have called for further research on the impact of a Jewish school education on Jewish identification.[49] Short (2005) queried whether or not there was compelling evidence that Jewish school education achieved what he described as 'Sacks's approach to Jewish continuity' – though his own evidence trail was weak (for example, his two main up-to-date sources are both non-academic reports).[50] Miller S also suggested that "it would be unrealistic to expect Jewish education alone to make significant inroads into current trends in assimilation." (Miller S 1990; Schmool and Miller S 1994). Explorations of why Jewish parents have increasingly opted for Jewish schools have included: Miller H (2001), providing a useful summary of the motivating factors for choosing a Jewish school: stemming assimilation, Jewish learning, "counteracting perceived influences

[49] A view supported by this researcher.
The new Jewish cross-communal secondary school (JCoSS, London) has planned longitudinal research which may also engage other Jewish secondary schools.

[50] Furthermore, Short's argument might have resonated more strongly with reference to Jakobovits. (Hart et al (2007) similarly (and wrongly) limited Sacks's purview to formal education i.e. schools – at pp 145-6.)

of wider society," and academic excellence; Mendelsson (2003)'s review of the period 1965-1979 argued convincingly that the pursuit of secular academic success in a secure and more conducive learning environment were the prime motivators (as does Valins (2003) amongst others). Leviton (2007) reviewed the overall impact of a Jewish primary school on the parents. The Jewish Leadership Council established a Schools Commission (led by Professor Leslie Wagner) which produced two reports which provided useful data and policy analysis and proposals (JLC 2007; 2008) to complement the JPR's Valins et al (2001).

Overall, whilst many factors are relevant, the overriding Jewish parental concerns for academic excellence and who their children are mixing with (Schmool 2002/3) are highly significant, more so than their pursuit of a Jewish education; and though community leaders' plans for school-building have been supportive, the government's role in building faith schools has been crucial (Mendelsson (2009).

In conclusion:

> The Jewish community in Britain has undertaken its own Jewish educational journey, aided considerably by the productive relationship that it has had with the state. The role of education in Jewish life has always been a central concern. The high value that it places on religious education is the community's assurance of continuity, from the biblical commandment to the present day. Full time Jewish schooling has emerged as key to the communal strategy to promote Jewish identity and ensure Jewish continuity.
>
> Miller H, 2001, p 512

However, as Miller H concluded: "The Jewish community of the future will reveal whether this has been the most effective strategy to achieve its aims." (Miller S, 2001, p 512). Though there is yet to emerge a serious commitment to researching the impact of a Jewish school education.[51]

It is important to note that both Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal took a far broader approach that was not limited to schools. Therefore, it is worth noting that in the field

[51] Taylor's claim regarding the success of Jakobovits's schools project is unsubstantiated rhetoric: "Those committed youngsters were the result of his Jewish schools policy and they form the bedrock on which the survival of the community depends today." (Taylor , 2007, p 423).

of informal Jewish education, Barry Chazan (2003) and his other work, has been particularly influential on senior British Jewish practitioners. Other works include the now dated but nonetheless valued Bunt (1975) survey of British Jewish youth provision,[52] three recent doctorates[53] and a range of youth work practitioner-led research projects.

2.7 Jewish Community Leadership – Individual and Institutional

The impact of communal philanthropy and leadership is central to the context of the current research. Jewish communal leadership (lay and professional) emanates from several sources:

- the communally active, wealthy philanthropists (including family foundations) are powerful and influential in whatever role they choose to engage;
- Rabbinic authority varies considerably but the Chief Rabbi is widely respected as a powerful leadership figure;
- elected or appointed heads of major communal organisations – they are not necessarily significant philanthropists and they may generally have somewhat less influence (exceptions would include the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews which carries significant recognition);
- other lay leaders take prominent roles, increasingly people with strong backgrounds in the professions, financial sector and the media (as compared to the dominance of entrepreneurial business leaders of previous generations);
- senior communal professionals have significant responsibility but are often answerable to their organisation's main philanthropic sponsors – only the most accomplished are truly able to claim leadership of their organisations;
- other sources of leadership (and opinion formers) may be found, for example, in the Jewish media and, to a lesser extent, academic and intellectual circles, as well as a new generation of activists to be found within organisations such as Limmud (amongst others).

The personalities and particular interests of individual key decision-makers may also be significant and influential – and relevant to this research.

The issue of where leadership and authority lies within British Jewry certainly deserves further, closer academic research and analysis, though beyond the scope of the current inquiry. However, it will assist to list the likely mobilising ideas, beliefs and concerns that

[52] Updating Bunt (1975) would be a valuable research exercise.
[53] Lisa Stock (2008) Manchester University; Belinda Copitch (2009) Manchester Metropolitan; Sarah Abramson (2010) London School of Economics – none have been directly consulted for this research.

appear to inspire and motivate key communal leaders. In addition to any personal ambition and enhancement, they are driven by various, overlapping factors, including:

- Jewish religious observance and responsibility
- the influence of Jewish culture, heritage and values[54]
- Jewish pride
- a commitment to caring for others
- the desire to maintain community through a plethora of community programmes and communal provision, particularly in the welfare field (not least for the benefit of their own family members and friends)
- opposition to antisemitism, and support for communal defence and political activity[55]
- Zionism and support for Israel
- the fight against assimilation, of which 'outreach' (*kiruv)* is a high profile example but extends to all forms of anti-assimilatory activities
- *tikkun olam* – a particular modern and liberal interpretation of the Jewish concept of 'to repair the world' (usually, though not always, working on global and local issues affecting non-Jews and the environment)[56]
- a commitment to inter-faith work and community relations and cohesion, ensuring that the Jewish community contributes to wider society on a local and national level.

Structurally, the Board of Deputies of British Jews[57] is the central representative body of the community, with a range of mainstream Jewish community organisation affiliates.[58] However, its authority is limited and arguably challenged or complemented by the Jewish Leadership Council (formed 2003).[59] (The Board's role in the field of education is primarily in dealing with agencies external to the community, for example, in lobbying government in matters that may affect Jewish education such as government policy on faith schools.[60])

[54] A number of Jewish values relate to responsibility for others (see Telushkin (1991)).

[55] There are those academics and commentators with liberal leanings who ascribe to many of the senior Jewish community leadership a pre-occupation with antisemitism and Israel and argue that these leaders use such issues as a mobilising vehicle to push their own ideological agendas – particularly from a Zionist perspective and a 'survivalist' orientation (Wasserstein, 1996, pp 281-2; Lerman, 2003, pp133-134).
Several academics have argued that this characterised the leadership behind Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal. However, this view is out-dated. Indeed, it is more likely to be the case that it was the perception that the physical threats to the community were receding that allowed for the emergence of the forces that drove these two educational initiatives. Furthermore, the Chief Rabbi's writings do not support this thesis. Finally, recent rises in antisemitism are yet to suggest that the community leadership is shifting to a different course of action.
Note also the recent statements of Mick Davis, the current Chair of UJIA, who has openly criticised the Israeli government (Jewish Chronicle 18th and 25th November 2010, and on-going).

[56] The term *tikun olam* also has deeper kabbalistic roots and significance.

[57] Often referred to as 'The Board'.

[58] Board of Deputies of British Jews: www.bod.org.uk.

[59] Jewish Leadership Council: www.thejlc.org

[60] UJIA Jewish Renewal (and to a lesser extent Jewish Continuity) recognised the Board's 'out-facing' role in dealing with government on education policy affecting the Jewish community, whilst seeking to assert their own roles as the 'in-facing' central agency for Jewish education within the Jewish community. The Board reluctantly

A former President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Israel Finestein, was well-placed to discuss the leadership challenge. He described the competition to the Board as emanating less around policy issues and more around "the exercise of influence". Writing in 1999, he insightfully described the following: "There is now a series of standing *de facto* power structures, each with its own sphere of authority, public recognition, and specialisation."[61] He claimed that: "The whole process is marked by enhanced professionalism in high-profile specialized areas of communal life, where major private funding and fund-raising are engaged in by the respective independent initiators. In such enterprises, "parliamentary" procedures and the elected representative character of the Board [of Deputies of British Jews] are not at a premium. Nor has it proved easy for the Board to muster comparable finances." (Finestein, 1999, p 277).

Finestein's more diplomatic observations concerning the Board reflect the power balance – essentially between philanthropists and elected or appointed communal leaders (political, religious and cultural) in which the activist and interventionist philanthropists are increasingly seen to hold the upper hand. Finestein does refer elsewhere to the nature and influence of different types of leadership, (including the rise of lay leaders with successful career backgrounds in the professions – in addition to those with business and entrepreneurial success). Communal professionals are also an element in the power balance in the Jewish community (to which Finestein makes only limited reference p 296) – they, in turn, may be divided amongst the more managerially influential senior executives of the major communal organisations and, to a lesser degree, rabbinic leadership,[62] with the powerful exceptions of the Chief Rabbi and the Beth Din (Jewish religious court) whose respective authorities are considerable.[63]

Whereas Finestein was somewhat reserved in his comments on the power balance within the community, Alderman (and Brook, 1989) showed no such restraint:

---

and gradually acquiesced to this division of labour, though does retain the data collection role for Jewish education.

[61] His examples were: the Institute for Jewish Policy Research, the Community Security Trust, the Joint Israel Appeal and its merger with Jewish Continuity.

[62] In the Strictly Orthodox communities, rabbinic authority is much greater, with leading Rabbis deeply respected and, in some cases, revered.

[63] Other sources of Jewish community leadership and influence might include a limited number of intellectuals, journalists and political activists, as well as the involvement of several celebrities.

> The funding fathers came, in an era of recession, to be relied upon as British Jewry's financial safety net. This was a blessing, but it was also viewed, in some quarters, as a curse. Anglo-Jewry has always relied on the charitable instincts of a small group of moneyed benefactors, such as the Rothschilds and Montagus in the nineteenth century and the Waley-Cohens and the Wolfsons in the mid-twentieth. But the leading members of these great houses did not fail to involve themselves in the machinery of Anglo-Jewry's governance, such as the United Synagogue, the Federation of Synagogues and Board of Deputies. By and large, the funding fathers of the 1980s and 1990s have turned their backs upon these institutions, rightly regarding their propensity for endless talking to no purpose, as a waste of valuable time. Besides, leadership of these bodies no longer bestows the status it once did. Nor are the funding fathers willing to permit others to decide how their money, generously donated, is to be spent. Unelected and unaccountable, the funding fathers became, as a result of the recession and in a special but crucial sense, the new rulers of Anglo-Jewry.
>
> Alderman, 1998, pp 387-388[64]

Whilst Alderman may somewhat overstate the impact of the recession – the 'funding fathers' were well entrenched before then – his and Finestein's observations remain entirely valid. British Jewry has witnessed the gradual demise of the elected communal bodies and the strengthening of those supported by major philanthropy and fundraising in which the philanthropists take a leading role. These observations held relevant implications for Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal in their need to harness philanthropic and other fundraising to their educational visions and initiatives.[65] [66] [67]

An outstanding locus of communal authority is the Office of the Chief Rabbi. Given the central role taken by the current Chief Rabbi in the establishment of Jewish Continuity, this is of vital significance in this investigation – particularly his efforts to marshal philanthropists, elected communal leaders, professionals, the Jewish public and others behind a mobilising vision that would inspire a new organisation. It is also worth noting that the *Beit Din*

[64] See Alderman's controversial attack on the Community Security Trust (CST) (Jewish Chronicle, 21st April 2011); the latest in his persistent line that seeks to challenge various communal leadership frameworks.
[65] Some refer to these leadership arrangements as 'the Establishment'.
[66] The Institute for Jewish Policy Research (JPR) (2003) Report 'Long Term Planning for British Jewry: final report and recommendations' claims to provide "for the first time – in a single volume – the latest research-based evidence on the UK Jewish philanthropic sector, with its annual turnover of more than £500m." (Institute for Jewish Policy Research: jpr/news. Winter 2003-2004 p 1). (It may actually be closer to £700m or more.)
[67] It is too early to assess the full impact of the current credit crunch/banking crisis-driven recession that commenced 2008-9. However, it will, in all likelihood, enhance this process. Furthermore, the recession is particularly challenging for many charities, and Jewish community education will inevitably suffer as a result.

(literally: House of Law/Court) is the senior religious authority for the Central/Modern Orthodox United Synagogue and promotes a more conservative application of Jewish Law. In practice, it (and its more right-wing acolytes) appears to have a constraining influence over the Chief Rabbi.[68]

Three final points with particular relevance to this research: first, Finestein noted the generational shift in leadership:

> Representatives of Jewish youth from all segments of the younger community have, since the 1960s, been more prominent in communal life than in any earlier period. Some of them successfully aspired to high elective office or have been invited into the highest communal counsels. A former professional activist in the religious youth service in his thirties was, in 1996, appointed to the key post of Executive Director of the merged Joint Israel Appeal-Jewish Continuity, after five years as the Director of the Chief Rabbi's office. [He was referring to Jonathan Kestenbaum.]
>
> Finestein, 1999, p 284

Second, Finestein drew attention to the fact that response to crisis in key matters of contemporary Jewish communal planning and leadership (educational as well as welfare and Israel) has been the major driving force for significant change.[69] For example, the recession of the early 1980s brought restructuring to various communal organisations (as indeed it did in the early 1990s, as well in the current recession). This too, had implications for the Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal initiatives (as well as the JIA). He observed: "It was characteristic that in Anglo-Jewry a significant catalyst towards the moulding of revised communal structures should be the combination of financial stringency and the consequential pressure for rationalisation and priority choices." (Finestein, 1999, p 296). Third, decision-making is also a function of the interaction between lay leadership (both philanthropic and others) and communal professionals. The different leadership roles in the lay-professional relationship need to work together, respecting the contribution of each and combining to best effect in a setting in which the boundaries and are not always clearly delineated. It is cautiously suggested that there is a phenomenon symptomatic of educational community planning processes which are led by lay philanthropists: they invariably include highly

[68] The future status, role and value of the Office of the Chief Rabbi is beyond the purview of this research but has attracted increasing communal interest and speculation.
[69] A view he shared in conversation with this researcher (February 2005).

successful business leaders who are often relatively impatient of what they see as unnecessarily prolonged planning processes, and who apply their self-confident, entrepreneurial business approach to tackling community problems (with a narrowly results driven perspective). Such an approach may be especially risky amongst those lay leaders who do not take the time to immerse themselves in the detail, do not have a wider understanding of community development nor consult properly with professional expertise. Nevertheless, their instincts may be no less accurate than the directions proposed by more methodical, process-driven professionals who they may or may not choose to consult. (Conversely, professionals should not be given unrestrained authority and they also need to focus on results.)

2.8 The Condition of Contemporary British Jewry – Narratives and Challenges

The discourse on the condition of the contemporary British Jewish community is usefully understood through two contrasting though not mutually exclusive narratives: the dominant one sees the community in serious decline (with the exception of the Strictly Orthodox) and focuses upon a number of challenges and threats; and the other sees a range of more positive indicators.[70] Many commentators simultaneously hold to both perspectives. The following extracts capture this dichotomy. Finestein introduced the subject in the following way:

> Robust projections of a viable Jewish future mingle with warnings of fragility and decline, without the regenerative immigrations from Eastern Europe and Central Europe which much affected the late nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth. Tell-tale signs of erosion and revival, of wide indifference, and wide enthusiasm for Jewish knowledge, offer at times a bewilderingly checkered community picture.
> Never before has there been such a plethora of Jewish religious and cultural institutions, seminars, and courses, for all sections of Jewish life and opinion and at all levels of age and attainment, as today. The annual number and variety of Judaica currently published in Britain hugely exceed the productions of any earlier generation. Yet informed

[70] An internal UJIA document (2004) observed: "It has been possible, during the past decade, to paint two entirely different pictures of the British Jewish community. On the one hand, it is argued, ours is a community in crisis. It is marked by demographic decline, increased intermarriage and assimilation; by the breakdown of identity, the fracturing of community, and weakening attachment to Israel (and the threat of anti-Semitism). But recent research has suggested a quite different reading may be possible. British Jewry is home to thriving day schools, transformed synagogue communities, unparalleled levels of adult learning and outreach provision; it is a community discovering innovative and creative expressions of Jewish identity, one continuing to love Israel through good times and bad."

> opinion has it that the Jewish community is largely a non-reading society, a feature regularly bemoaned by those active in the fields of publication, education (adult and otherwise), and community planning.[71]
>
> Finestein, 1999, p 253-254

Finestein summarised the challenge facing contemporary Western Jewry:

> The deepening Jewish integration into society at all levels, rendered ever more acute the concern for the cultivation and retention of a transmissible distinctively Jewish identity. This common interest within the Jewish community often aroused highly contentious public discussion over how to meet these ideals. Central to the exchanges have been the character and meaning of Jewishness in the open western society of today.
>
> Finestein, 1999, p 255

Schmool and Cohen made a similar assessment, noting: "In particular, rising levels of intermarriage (Miller S, Schmool and Lerman 1996; NJPS 1990) were taken as key indicators since they introduce family formation patterns that have the potential to remove increasing numbers of new parents and their children from the Jewish community and simultaneously dilute religious practice." Whilst also noting that: "Simultaneously we have seen, in all sectors of the community, blossoming adult education courses in Jewish culture, history and religion accompanied by high attendances by Jews of all ages at national and local conferences and seminars" as well as growth in numbers attending Jewish schools. (Schmool and Cohen, 2001, p 24).

Alderman drew attention to the fissures within the community[72] leading to the following conclusions:

[71] Rawidowicz (1986): "The world makes many images of Israel [the Jewish People], but Israel makes only one image of itself: that of being constantly on the verge of ceasing to be, of disappearing." (Rawidowicz, 1998, p 53). However, Rawidowicz went on to optimistically declare: "Let us prepare the ground for the last Jews who will come after us, and for the last Jews who will rise after them, and so on until the end of days. … let it be a people that is constantly dying, which is to say, incessantly living and creating …" p 63 – in Rawidowicz's view, the story of the Jewish People is one of successful continuity despite the tendency to always foresee the opposite scenario.

[72] See also Schmool (1999) identifying future challenges facing British Jewry.

> British Jewry stands on the verge of the next millennium more disorganised, and more divided, than ever before. …
> Religious polarisation now affects almost every communal initiative. …
> These instances are symptomatic of a much deeper malaise stemming, perhaps, from a complete breakdown of communal identity. Judaism once united the Jews of Britain; now it divides them. Zionism once united the Jews of Britain, and indeed, provided them with an alternative ethnic identity; now it divides them too. A substantial proportion of British Jews do, however, claim to feel secure in British society, and no longer think of themselves as living in exile. It may be, therefore, that in the next century much of what we now regard as modern British Jewry will disappear, submerging itself within a species of secular ethnicity while retaining picturesque memories of its Jewish origins. However, there may still be recognizably British Jews, a strange and largely suburban-dwelling remnant, small in numbers but rich in the distinctively Jewish contribution that it is still capable of making to British society."[73]
>
> Alderman, 1998, pp 409-410

Alderman made a pessimistic analysis and is perhaps the dominant one.[74] However, more recently, it has become increasingly possible to form a more positive assessment – as long as one is ready to take a view that is not solely beholden to traditional religious criteria of engagement (and even here there are positive signs emerging). Later research will be able to reflect on these developments and also better determine any impact made by both Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal.[75]

Finally, the recent work of Kahn-Harris and Gidley (2010) must, of course, be addressed. In a *Jewish Chronicle* interview (28th July 2010), their work was summarised: "Two academics have studied life in the community over the past 20 years and come up with an encouragingly positive conclusion." Addressing the period through to 2010, they viewed developments in British Jewry through a sociological lens and identified within the modern period a leadership-led "'strategy of insecurity'" (fears over assimilation and antisemitism) as a vehicle for change (p 10), which emerged against the earlier "*strategy of security*" [their italics] (p 12) "stressing the secure belonging of British Jews" (p 26) through values of

[73] In similar vein, Endelman (2002) entitled his final chapter: 'The Fracturing of Anglo-Jewry (1945-2000)'.
[74] Though Lipman perhaps offered sage advice: "As the half century ended in 1989, the outlook for the Anglo-Jewish community seemed to be polarisation and decline. But, reflecting on how unpredictable the situation of 1989 would have appeared in 1939, to refrain from prediction might seem the wisest counsel of the historian." (Lipman, 1990, p 243).
[75] See Sacks himself on achievements, for example, Sacks, 2009, p 52.

"loyalty and civility" (p 12) – "*Private insecurity, public security* was transformed into *public insecurity, private security.*" [their italics] (p 27).[76] They contextualised these developments within the wider societal shift from monoculturalism to multiculturalism (p 29) as an important factor in this process (an overstated claim given the multitude of other variables which were not fully discussed). Thereafter, they identified signs of communal renaissance (pp 117-135). Significantly, however, they themselves also recognised that there were and continue to be additional strategies pursued by the leadership throughout this period. They analysed Jewish Continuity and, to a lesser extent, UJIA Jewish Renewal. The historian, E. H.Carr,[77] noted that one should "Study the historian before you begin to study the facts …" and that the facts "are like fish swimming about in a vast and sometimes inaccessible ocean; and what the historian catches will depend, partly on chance, but mainly on what part of the ocean he chooses to fish in and what tackle he chooses to use …" (Carr ,1961, p 23). It is important to point out that Kahn-Harris and Gidley were fishing in the same small fishpond – rather than ocean – as this researcher[78] and, therefore, it is no surprise that they report similar views in terms of the broad outline of events concerning Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal (pp 56-116).[79] However, this research uses a different lens, that of developments in Jewish community education and development and the Findings and Conclusion have a different focus and outcome. Returning to the Carr analogy, this researcher was fishing in the same fishpond with different tackle and, with more of a positivist historian's approach to catching more and a wider variety of fish served up in substantial portions (offering thicker description[80]). (Kahn-Harris and Gidley record in their Acknowledgements that "Roy Graham … also shared their time and important insights with us." attesting to his having already commenced significant research work in this area.)

The narrative by which Jewish community life is described and promoted is important for those involved in efforts to revitalise the community. At one extreme, there are some who describe encroaching assimilation as the second Holocaust, while others celebrate Jewish life

[76] Their 'security-insecurity' construct was somewhat confusing.
[77] Discussed more fully in the following section.
[78] Seven of their sixteen interviewees were included in this researcher's sample of thirty-five interviews – a more extensive sample embracing more of the key individuals involved.
[79] Both this research and that of Kahn-Harris and Gidley also follow Wagner (as far as he went) in his review of Jewish Continuity (Jewish Continuity, March 1996).
[80] Clifford Geertz (1973) 'The Interpretation of Cultures'. They also only make limited use of documentary source material.

and sell it with a positive and enthusiastic message.[81] This was a significant consideration for both Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal: delivering a message of a crisis to be confronted; a challenge to be addressed; and/or celebration to be joined. It had implications, at times contradictory, for both the invitation to engage in community life and the appeal to donate funds – fundraising tends to succeed better in the face of threat and danger.

In summary, one might identify a number of developments and challenges faced by contemporary British Jewry, including:

- an aging community (that has mostly been in demographic decline during the post-war period) with its consequent care and economic implications – a phenomenon that is statistically amplified for the mainstream community when the Strictly Orthodox (with their higher birth rates) are excluded;[82]
- the community's leading and wide-ranging welfare provision and support requires maintenance and expansion as required;
- Jewish philanthropy and fundraising needs to generate sufficient funds for Jewish education, welfare and Jewish communal life in general;[83]
- there is a growing recognition and expectation that the Strictly Orthodox will become an increasingly higher proportion of the community (eventually perhaps becoming a majority), with implications for welfare provision (including poverty relief), British Jewry's interaction with local and national government and other matters of communal life and organisation;
- assimilation rates have been growing, with significant falls in synagogue marriage ceremonies amongst the mainstream section of the community and rises in out-marriage;[84]
- there are several fault lines that divide the community, particularly between different streams of Judaism, and these need to be effectively managed;
- the synagogue continues to retain its centrality within the Jewish communal landscape but needs to provide compelling options which reach more Jews in more impactful ways;
- creative and alternative cultural, spiritual and religious opportunities within the community need to be cultivated – particularly for young adults;
- Israel remains a central feature of Jewish identity for the majority of British Jews who take immense pride in its achievements (notwithstanding concerns held by some with regard to certain aspects of its approach to various social, defence and diplomatic issues). The Israeli-Arab conflict generates great anxiety and concern in which Israel is considered by many Jews to be facing a continuing existential threat. However, there is

[81] As examples: Aish (a Strictly Orthodox outreach group) deploys the 'assimilation as a second Holocaust' message (Rabbi Naphtali Schiff, Jewish Chronicle, 15th January 1999, p 25), whereas the Jewish Community Centre for London has a more optimistic, celebratory message.
[82] In recent years, demographers have estimated that the rapid growth of the Strictly Orthodox community (particularly the Chareidim) has, for the first time since the Second World War, led to a higher number of annual births than deaths.
[83] This presents a particular challenge under current economic circumstances.
[84] It is not possible to provide highly accurate figures for out-marriage rates.

a possibility of some erosion in the strength of the relationship with Israel – particularly amongst younger generations (Miller S et al (1996); Cohen and Kahn-Harris (2004); Graham D and Boyd (2010)) – the relationship needs to be nurtured;

- the dramatic increase in numbers attending Jewish schools has to result in a transformative impact on the Jewish identity, connection and commitment of their pupils;
- the growth in adult education and cultural programmes needs to generate meaningful Jewish educational experiences;
- Jewish lifestyle has to be affordable for all members of the community (e.g. kosher food is more expensive than its non-kosher equivalent; mainstream Jewish population centres tend to be in more expensive housing locations);
- traditional patterns of Jewish communal engagement have relied upon people being 'joiners' (paying affiliation fees and engaging with institutions) but younger generations are increasingly reluctant to commit to institutional memberships (particularly synagogues) and seem to prefer more informal 'connections' that match their lifestyles and interests – communal frameworks will need to respond and/or adapt;
- various manifestations of antisemitism and the fear of international terrorism continue to trouble the Jewish community;[85]
- future leadership needs to be identified, engaged, nurtured and empowered;
- Jewish women are currently under-represented at leadership level and this needs to be addressed;
- the commitment to community volunteerism needs to be maintained and expanded;
- a more recent challenge has emerged around the need for community frameworks to keep pace with technological changes in the modern digital communication era;
- community co-ordination and planning needs to be enhanced, whilst encouraging independent initiatives and innovation.

[85] See The Community Security Trust reports: www.thecst.org.uk

3 EPISTEMOLOGICAL APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The research relied upon a historiographical epistemology and deployed documentary analysis and interviews as its methodologies. This approach was considered most appropriate for the research inquiry as the focus was upon a defined time period (1991-2000) and relates to two specific organisations and their identifiable leadership in the context of central Jewish educational initiatives within British Jewry. The aims and aspirations of these organisations and their respective leaderships, together with the main events and developments, were accessible through documents and interviews. The documents included a number of primary sources (including organisational minutes, reports and presentations) and a range of secondary sources (including newspaper coverage and contemporaneous journal articles). All of the individuals who played prominent roles at the time were accessible for interviewing. It was considered that semi-structured interviews would maximise the potential for interviewees to fully explore their experiences and understandings as thoroughly and usefully as possible. The documents and interviews were supplemented with a prior literature search. The documents (including the literature search results) were cross-referenced with each other, as were interviews, and all sources were deployed for triangulation purposes. A range of validity and reliability issues have been considered and addressed, as well as relevant ethical considerations.

Attention is drawn to the Appendices: Appendix One is a document-based Chronology of the main developments and decision-making and Appendix Two is a document-based Table setting out the main features of each of the main initiatives and reports – taken together they comprise a historical overview; Appendix Three is the Interview Schedule; Appendix Four comprises the Data-Analysis Process underlying the Findings; and Appendix Five is a List of individuals who played central roles.

The original research intention was to focus upon UJIA Jewish Renewal (1996-2000). However, it became apparent that it could only be properly researched and contextualised with a wider study of the precursor organisation, Jewish Continuity. This resulted in a significant expansion in the scope of the research (including, for example, the need to test the

findings of the Wagner Review (Jewish Continuity, March 1996) into Jewish Continuity, whilst providing considerably richer and deeper evidence and insight into the organisation). It is intended that the Findings will contribute to research in Jewish education and development; and guided by Alex Pomson when he wrote with regard to developing a stable field (of research in Jewish Education):

> … building on the work of predecessors, refining their ideas and methods, challenging their ideas when necessary, and applying them to new, previously unresearched contexts. This kind of carefully accumulated work is the hallmark of scholarship in most disciplines, but is not often enough pursued in Jewish education, where it seems that, in a scholarly form of slash-and-burn, doctoral candidates frequently feel obliged to start anew each time and clear a new patch of inquiry with the words "there has been very little written about …"
>
> Pomson, 2008, p 241

Finally, this research report uses the past tense in reference to all events and writings that happened in the past. It has also used the third person in reference to the researcher.

3.2 Sources of Literature for this Research

3.2.1 Search Facilities

Electronic literature searches were conducted through *onelog/metalib/summon, Zetoc* and *Google Scholars* via *Athens.* In addition, the specialist search facility RAMBI[86] was also deployed. The home library was used as well as services through SCONUL[87] and also extensive use of inter-library loans.

3.2.2 Jewish Studies in Tertiary Education – Academic Scholarship

[86] RAMBI is the Hebrew acronym for 'The Index of Articles on Jewish Studies' (*Reshimet Mamirim BeMidei HaYahadut*) at the Jewish National and University Library of The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel.
[87] SCONOL is the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries, allowing students to access university libraries across the country.

The British Association for Jewish Studies (BAJS)[88] has produced the 'Jewish Studies in the UK 2009' survey. It revealed a wide range of Judaic (religious, archaeological and historical) and Israel-related tertiary course options for 2009-10, but only limited opportunities in the study of contemporary British Jewry.[89] British Jewry does not attract significant attention in the Jewish world and is mostly in the shadows of its Israeli and American Jewish counterparts. Furthermore, its own capacity to invest heavily in Jewish-themed academic research is limited. It was concluded this field does not have recourse to a well-developed, pre-existing field of research. However, over the last two decades, there has been something of an upsurge in research reports (mainly commissioned by communal agencies) on contemporary British Jewry (as reported by Kahn-Harris and Gidley, 2010, pp 38-55). Therefore, there are a number of articles and several recent publications[90] that do relate directly to this inquiry and they are incorporated into the Findings section of this research.

3.2.3 Research and Data Sources within the Jewish Community

The Board of Deputies of British Jews is more of a 'raw data gatherer', and is acknowledged as the storehouse of publicly available data on the affiliated Jewish community – though the Institute for Jewish Policy Research (JPR) has intermittently sought a similar role. The Board would like to influence communal policy but lacks the resources and authority to develop and direct community-leading programmes; JPR would like the community to make use of its research in the formulation of community policy (though in the past they too have attempted to influence policy).

The Institute for Jewish Policy Research,[91] has been the leading research body within the British Jewish community, seeking "to assist Jewish communities to understand themselves better, determine their priorities and achieve their objectives; to provide a forum for all

[88] www.britishjewishstudies.org
[89] At any one time, there are several British universities providing specialist departments in various fields of Jewish Studies: Judaism (as Theology), ancient Hebrew language and Biblical Archaeology, the Holocaust, Middle East Studies (including Israel), modern Hebrew (Ivrit), Yiddish, elements of Jewish History (in addition to Holocaust and Antisemitism Studies) The number fluctuates and they vary considerably in scale but nonetheless represent welcome growth. However, contemporary British Jewry rarely features in the social sciences and appears to elicit only passing interest – only Cambridge and Southampton were found to offer 2009-10 courses that address contemporary British Jewry. (Kings College, London and Birkbeck, London now both offer degree courses in Jewish Education.)
[90] Including Persoff (2010) and Kahn-Harris and Gidley (2010).
[91] Generally referred to as 'JPR', its name modelled on the better known and more prestigious national Institute for Public Policy Research.

segments of the Jewish community to discuss critical issues of common concern" as well as engage in wider societal debate.[92] JPR would like to see itself as the Jewish Think Tank (Finestein, 1999, pp 275-6). In the decade 1995-2003, JPR was well-funded, staffed by some strong academics and consistently produced high quality research in assorted areas of importance to the Jewish community, including a multi-dimensional long term research programme on aspects of contemporary British Jewry.[93] Its 1996 survey of social and political attitudes of British Jewry became a pivotal reference work (JPR, 1996). However, it has not managed to attain the strong leadership role in the community alluded to by Finestein (Finestein, 1999, pp 275-6).

Jewish Continuity commissioned several of its own research projects (e.g. young adults, support for Jewish cultural programmes) in a combination of market research and more academically-driven research, and attempted to apply the findings in its strategic interventions. Together with the JPR and Board of Deputies work, their combined research efforts reflected a limited surge of communal interest in research to inform community planning and development. Initially, UJIA Jewish Renewal completed unfinished Jewish Continuity research projects and did co-fund various other projects.[94] It also invested in non-academic reviews and assessments for several change processes that it managed e.g. Jewish student provision on University campuses (UJIA, 1998).

Given the limited academic work and other research, it has been necessary to turn to additional and wider source material from within the Jewish community. *The Jewish Chronicle*[95] (known as *The JC*) is a respected weekly newspaper covering issues of interest to the Jewish community. The paper is widely recognised as a source of information on developments across the Jewish community, though focusing primarily upon the mainstream community and its organisations and personalities. It is also an important communication vehicle across mainstream, engaged British Jewry.[96] It has tended towards a liberal perspective in both religious matters and on Israel.[97] The paper has not shied away from

[92] Institute for Jewish Policy Research website: www.jpr.org.uk
[93] JPR (2003).
[94] In 2004, UJIA commissioned a major research project of its own: Cohen and Kahn-Harris (2004).
[95] The Jewish Chronicle website: www.thejc.com On the 3rd March, 2006, the Jewish Chronicle Archives became available online.
[96] A competitor newspaper, *The Jewish News*, distributed free, also has wide circulation but does not offer the same depth of serious coverage in communal matters. The *Jewish Tribune* and *HaModia* serve the Strictly Orthodox communities.
[97] Under a new Editor, it has recently taken a more pro-Israel position.

airing sensitive communal issues. It is generally independent in its outlook, though does generate significant advertising income from some of the organisations that it is reporting. Communal leaders are keen to avoid criticism from the paper, and look to secure its support and favourable coverage whenever possible, and to manage their relationships with it accordingly. The *Jewish Chronicle*'s news reporting provides a reasonable 'first rough draft of history' and, together with a range of opinion pieces, offers a useful source for the researcher.[98]

Other Jewish communal publications carried relevant articles on Jewish Continuity. These included:

- *The Jewish Quarterly* (a serious, limited circulation, non-academic journal offering coverage of weightier communal issues and matters of Jewish culture and other interest)
- *L'Eylah* (the magazine of Jews' College (now renamed as the London School of Jewish Studies) which carried articles on Jewish Continuity and served as a forum for Modern/Central Orthodox thinking) – no longer published
- *Manna* (the internal journal of the Reform Judaism movement)
- *Judaism Today* (originally a journal of the Masorti movement (conservative/traditional – located religiously between the Orthodox and the Progressive) which later became independent) – no longer published

A small number of communal commentators have written relevant material in these publications and contributed articles to various edited collections. These will be addressed in the Findings section.[99]

3.2.4 Documentary Evidence

The noted historian, Arthur Marwick, (amongst others) listed the range of documentary sources available to the historian (Marwick, 1981), indicating the potential advantages of accessing this material as well as the dangers of over-reliance on it in isolation and out of context. Therefore, with the necessary sensitivity, various organisational documents have also

[98] The noted and arguably maverick academic and commentator on British Jewry, Professor Geoffrey Alderman, makes extensive use of the *Jewish Chronicle* in his own historical writing on British Jewry and is also one of its opinion column writers.

[99] The year 2006 marked the 350th anniversary of the formal, legal re-entry of Jews into Britain under Oliver Cromwell in 1656 (after the expulsion of Jews from Britain in 1290 by King Edward I). However, despite considerable fanfare to mark the occasion, this did not herald a significant release of new books and articles on contemporary British Jewry.

been accessed, mainly those of the two organisations, Jewish Continuity and UJIA. These included:

- minutes of executive, trustees and other meetings
- various internal reports
- promotional materials
- selected correspondence

3.2.5 The American Literature

The American Jewish community has different characteristics and structure to its British counterpart. The American literature on Jewish communal life is far more extensive. American Jewry has launched several initiatives that are driven by a Jewish continuity agenda – operating in their own communal context. The British Jewish professional practitioners tended to down play the influence of developments across the Atlantic, though it was clearly apparent that there was some impact on their thinking.

3.2.6 Excluded Literature Fields

In setting the parameters for this literature search, it is also important to identify the limitations. The relatively large body of literature on the History of British Jewry will not feature here – except where it has dealt with British Jewry from the late 1980s onwards,[100] and addressed and analysed educational issues and relevant aspects of contemporary communal provision for Jewish identification and central educational agency development and organisation. Jewish Theology, Cultural Studies and literature on 'Jewish identity formation and development' will not be covered.

3.3 Historiographical Research

Historiography grapples with the fundamental philosophical and conceptual issues in researching past events. Two polarities of the historiographic research spectrum may be defined as positivist-empiricist and interpretative/relativist historiography (of which post-modernist would be an example) and form the basis of the paradigmatic debate to follow.

[100] The late 1980s mark the emergence in North America of Jewish continuity thinking and initiatives, and subsequently pursued in its own context within the British Jewish community.

Ontological, epistemological, methodological, and ideological issues are examined as they arise from the various approaches of historians seeking to determine or interpret the past, and impact upon this research.

3.3.1 Is It Possible to 'Know' the Past?

Two millenia ago, Lucius Annaeus Seneca (the Younger), a Roman philosopher, declared that "Nothing is certain except the past." Of all intellectual disciplines, History, it might be argued, is the study of existential certainties that are indeed anchored in the past, apparently unaltered by the present. Aside from the 'idealist' perspective that challenges all reality and existence outside of the mind, one might declare from a 'realist' perspective that history is indeed the study of something that one knows to have definitely happened. Therefore, 'deceptively, History intimates a beguiling vision of ontological certitude and epistemological triumph'. However, this enticing prospect of the discovery of 'absolute truth' is soon revealed as a mirage - one never truly 'knows' the past because it happened once in time and space, never to be repeated nor precisely recreated. Consequently, it is beyond total, objective, factual description and explanation. It is the theory and practice of historical research that offers epistemic keys by which one may only attempt to know the past – a past that is ontologically locked away.

The long-established positivist-empiricist research historians aspired to achieve the evidential standards of the natural scientist seeking nomological certainty through 'general laws holding beyond time and place' in the tradition of the natural sciences. It was they who dominated this field of inquiry throughout much of the Enlightenment era and beyond, and held that if one conducted sufficient research to recover all the 'facts' one would be able, at least theoretically, to present the past with 'scientific certainty'. This understanding would offer a 'cause and effect' explanation of human events. The intellectual descendants of this view have modified the extreme positivist-empiricist principles but otherwise continue in the same tradition.

Counter to this perspective are an array of interpretative epistemologies. They have challenged conventional thought in the field (with increasing confidence and growing influence). This category includes a broad range of relativists, perhaps the predominant

grouping representing the intellectual stream known as post-modernism. For example, in contemporary historian Hayden White's interpretative perspective, all historical documents are best approached as fictional narratives and History is better understood as Literature. Moreover, White argued that the grounds for deciding on one historical perspective over another "are ultimately aesthetic or moral rather than epistemological;" (White, 1973, p xii). There are also structuralist approaches – amongst which Marxist analysis has been influential – a worldview interpretation that frames all analysis within the confines of a rigid analytical framework. In addition, there are standpoint epistemologies, amongst which Feminism represents a prominent perspective, seeking to argue subjectively for a particular position – in this case, that women need to be written into history or 'herstory'. The historiographical viewpoints are multiple and they are a function of theories of knowledge (epistemology), methodology and ideology involved in researching the past.

3.3.2 Defining the Terms: 'Past', 'History' and 'Historiography'

The views of the academic historian G.R. Elton, an empiricist-positivist, will be contrasted with those of Keith Jenkins, who advocates for an interpretive approach in a post-modernist context.[101]

By the second half of the twentieth century, the positivist ascendancy was under increasingly aggressive assault. The influential historian E.H. Carr was an assertive challenger: noting that the historian is 'necessarily selective', Carr declared that: "The belief in a hard core of historical facts existing objectively and independently of the interpretation of the historian is a preposterous fallacy, but one which it is very hard to eradicate." (Carr, 1961, p 12). Carr contrasted the approach of Lord Acton,[102] a renowned Positivist, with that of his own:

> First ascertain the facts, said the Positivists, then draw your conclusions from them. … The empirical theory of knowledge presupposes a complete separation between subject and object. … History consists of a corpus of ascertained facts. The facts are available to the historian in documents, inscriptions and so on, like fish on the fishmonger's slab. The historian collects them, takes them

[101] Jenkins's explicit aim is to move the debate within Historiography to a new plane, arguing that the study of this area has become encased for the last thirty years or so in what has become known as the 'Carr v. Elton Debate' (to be discussed shortly), and has been left behind by contemporary philosophical thought.
[102] Lord Acton established the Cambridge Modern History.

> home, and cooks and serves them in whatever style appeals to him [sic]. Acton, whose culinary tastes were austere, wanted them served plain.
>
> Carr, 1961, p 9

Carr challenged the perception that the "untiring and unending accumulation of hard facts" provided 'the foundation of history' and that 'the facts speak for themselves' (Carr, 1961, pp 15-16). Carr offered his own approach:

> Study the historian before you begin to study the facts. … The facts are really not at all like fish on the fishmonger's slab. They are like fish swimming about in a vast and sometimes inaccessible ocean; and what the historian catches will depend, partly on chance, but mainly on what part of the ocean he chooses to fish in and what tackle he chooses to use – these two factors being, of course, determined by the kind of fish he wants to catch. By and large, the historian will get the kind of facts he wants. History means interpretation.
>
> Carr ,1961, p 23

Carr's highly influential work 'What is History?' offered the following overview of history: "… it is a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his [sic] facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past." (Carr, 1961, p 30).

In its time, Carr's work became the scourge of positivist orthodoxy. Carr poured scorn on a "vast and growing mass of dry-as-dust factual histories … knowing more and more about less and less, sunk without trace in an ocean of facts." (Carr, 1961, p 15). He recognised that there was a challenge of 'objectivity' but addressed it by reference to the 'standard of significance' and 'relevance' in assessing and interpreting the facts. Of course, Carr was vulnerable to the more radical interpretivist charge that he lacked the confidence to extend his own argument to its apparently obvious conclusion: standards of 'significance' and 'relevance' in the process of interpretation will reflect the historian's ideology, worldview and values and inevitably will be highly subjective. So why should any one historian's interpretation be more highly valued than any other?

The leading empiricist historian, G.R. Elton (and others) also assailed Carr but from the other side of the debate, accusing him of opening the floodgates of an historical relativism in which

each historian is entitled to form his/her own interpretative view, independent of agreed criteria. Elton offered an approach devoid of the positivist excesses, a study of history 'for its own sake', and attacked the work of Carr and others:

> But that men [sic] cannot ever eliminate themselves from the search for truth is nonsense, and pernicious nonsense at that, because it once again favours the purely relativist concept of history, the opinion that it is all simply in the historian's mind and becomes whatever he likes to make of it.
>
> Elton, 1967, p 77

Elton was not ready to sacrifice the search for a more objective historical research process and refined his positivist approach accordingly. He defined History as follows:

> Historical study is not the study of the past but the study of present traces of the past; if men have said, thought, done or suffered anything of which nothing any longer exists, those things are as though they had never been. The crucial element is the present evidence, not the fact of past existence; and questions for whose answer no material exists are strictly non-questions.
>
> Elton, 1967, p 20

He is only interested in the past if it has 'left present deposit' (Elton, 1967, p 24), indicating his commitment to the need for clear evidence. He was only willing to extrapolate from the 'present deposit' if the additional findings were compelling. "Thus while history will rarely be able to say: this is the truth and no other answer is possible; it will always be able to say: this once existed or took place, and there is therefore a truth to be discovered if only we can find it." (Elton, 1967, p 74).[103]

This Carr-Elton debate dominated the study of history for the latter third of the twentieth century, but new ideas have emerged from the post-modernists who have pushed the Carr position further and vigorously opposed Elton. They argue that all history is 'positioned' – informed by a canon, doctrine, worldview or ideology.

[103] Marwick (1993), a harsh critic of Carr, and more closely aligned with Elton, defined history as "a body of knowledge about the human past *based on the systematic study of sources*" (his italics).

The historian Keith Jenkins writes from a post-modernist perspective[104] and presented a challenging distinction between 'past' and 'history' in his book entitled 'Re-thinking History' (1991):

> Let me begin with the idea that history is a discourse about, but categorically different from, the past. … It would be preferable, therefore, always to register this difference by using the term 'the past' for all that has gone on before everywhere, whilst using the word 'historiography' for history, historiography referring here to the writings of historians. This would be good practice (the past as the object of the historians' attention, historiography as the way historians attend to it) leaving the word 'History' (with a capital H) to refer to the whole ensemble of relations.
>
> Jenkins, 1991, pp 7-8

The consequences of Jenkins's analysis are far-reaching. The 'past' is what happened. However, history, or 'historiography' as Jenkins would prefer, is understood by Jenkins to be the process by which one interprets the past. As it will only ever be subjective interpretation (and indeed ideological) by historians and as, in his view, one will never truly know the past, he reasoned that one needs to focus efforts on understanding the work of the historians who produce history. Furthermore, Jenkins also encouraged the historian to choose 'a position', thereby taking a stand that "effects; that aligns you with some readings (readers) and against others" (Jenkins, 1991, p 83). He concluded that the pursuit of objectivity in historical research (as pursued by traditional Positivists) is fatally flawed. If there is only past and future, with an ever-evolving present, then historical perspectives will always be fluid. There are no fixed points, and 'truth' (or the search for 'ultimate truth') will be perpetually evolving, though never reached, in the context of historical research.[105]

Therefore, Jenkins defined history as:

---

[104] 'Post-modernism' does not lend itself to precise definition. It begins with a critique of modernism and ends with an attempt to find common denominators amongst various post-modernist perspectives. The French philosopher Jean-Francois Lyotard wrote 'The Postmodern Condition' (1984) and in it he heralded the demise of the modernist 'meta-narratives' (Lyotard in Jenkins, 1997, p 36-38) – the over-arching storylines that offered an understanding and interpretation of human events through apparently compelling discourses such as Liberalism, Marxism or Universalism.

[105] Jenkins further extended his argument: all history is generated by historians, therefore, "History (historiography) is an inter-textual, linguistic construct." (Jenkins, 1991, p 9) and is constructed from the texts written by historians where language is the vehicle of interpretation with its inherent limitations.

> History is a shifting, problematic discourse, ostensibly about an aspect of the world, the past, that is produced by a group of present-minded workers (overwhelmingly in our culture salaried historians) who go about their work in mutually recognisable ways that are epistemologically, methodologically, ideologically and practically positioned and whose products, once in circulation, are subject to a series of uses and abuses that are logically infinite but which in actuality generally correspond to a range of power bases that exist at any given moment and which structure and distribute the meanings of histories along a dominant-marginal spectrum.
>
> Jenkins, 1991, pp 31-32

Jenkins considered much history to be the product of those historians whose work is dominant as a result of their relationship with power bases in society and their ideological positions. Another consequence is that those who do not write history, who do not share in the dominant discourse (where interests and power bases are critical), are effectively written out of it, the most obvious example for much of human history being women.

Jenkins held the view that history suffers from an inherent 'epistemological fragility'. He based this assertion on four main points. Firstly, no historian is ever able to precisely recover the past, and even were it to be theoretically possible the scope of the task of collecting all of the facts would be overwhelming. Secondly, it is impossible to retrieve the past. There are accounts of the past but they offer an imperfect and inadequate selection, which may only be tested against other accounts – there is no definitive 'text'. Thirdly, "history remains inevitably a personal construct, a manifestation of the historian's perspective as a 'narrator'". Furthermore, "The past that we 'know' is always contingent upon our own views, our own 'present'." Fourthly, the historian has the benefit of hindsight allowing the possibility of greater insight and understanding than the people who actually themselves experienced the past (Jenkins, 1991, pp 13-16). Consequently, Jenkins concluded that:

> Epistemology shows we can never really know the past; that the gap between the past and history (historiography) is an ontological one, that is, is in the very nature of things such that no amount of epistemological effort can bridge it.
>
> Jenkins, 1991, p 23

He encouraged "a sceptical, critically reflexive approach" to the interpretation of history (Jenkins, 1991, p 83).[106]

3.3.3 Methodology and Ideology

In many ways, epistemology in history is intimately bound up with the methodological approach adopted by the historian. For example, those relying heavily on documentary evidence from a profoundly positivist and empiricist approach will build their understanding on the foundations provided by these documents. Alternatively, a feminist standpoint epistemology may take the view that in many periods of history, men held power and 'dictated' the documents, invariably neglecting 'her story' – the role of women in those societies and throughout those events. Thus, feminist historians (and others) might be forced to read 'against the grain' of the document to discover new meaning from a deeply interpretative analysis and look beyond this more limited documentary evidence to construct a female perspective on history and base their analysis on a range of more creative methodological approaches.

The two perspectives reflect contrasting approaches to methodology (and the gathering of evidence) and the issue of ideology. Elton's views will again be contrasted with those of Jenkins. Elton argued that by rigorously applying good practice in the deployment of historical research techniques, a disciplined approach will stand the test of objectivity within scholarly debate. He contended that it is the 'proper practice of scholarship' that will solve the twin problems generated by 'lack of knowledge' and the 'need to select':

> The methods of the trained professional historian are designed to protect him [sic] against his human difficulties, and they do not render him immune to error, nor do they automatically eliminate bias and inadequacy, or the simple problems of time and space which hinder full or fully accurate knowledge. … The historian's method does not give him the powers of a god, but it reduces the effects of human frailty and creates a formidable foundation of certainty beneath the errors and disputes which will never cease.
>
> Elton, 1967, pp 84-85

[106] More recently, Jenkins has provocatively hinted that it may be time "to let history go" in the face of post-modernist understandings of contemporary society (Jenkins, 1999, p 7).

He continued:

> Historical method is no more than a recognized and tested way of extracting from what the past has left the true facts and events of that past, and so far as possible their true meaning and interrelation, the whole governed by the first principle of historical understanding, namely that the past must be studied in its own right, for its own sake, and on its own terms. … Its fundamental principles are only two, and they may be expressed as questions, thus: exactly what evidence is there, and exactly what does it mean? Knowledge of all the sources, and competent criticism of them – these are the basic requirements of a reliable historiography.
>
> Elton, 1967, pp 86-87

Clearly, Elton leaves no place for selectivity and subjective or ideological influence. The historian is expected to search through and discover all of the available source material before commencing the critique.

Carr attacked the positivists on the impossibility of actually successfully completing the enterprise of attempting "the compilation of a maximum number of irrefutable and objective facts" (Carr, 1961, p 15). "Anyone who succumbs to this heresy will either have to give up history as a bad job, and take to stamp-collecting or some other form of antiquarianism, or end in a madhouse." (Carr, 1961, p 15). Jenkins pursued a more radical critique. His challenge was that the whole Elton enterprise is flawed by the inevitability of selectivity and by the impossibility of objectivity. For example, Jenkins argued that: "Quite literally no two readings [of the same text] are the same." (Jenkins, 1991, p 29). For him, everything is subjective and reflects an ideological predisposition. No matter how far the historian may claim to apply "tight methodological rules and procedures," the exercise is not viable.

His critique rested on the following claim:

> For me what determines interpretation ultimately lies beyond method and evidence in ideology. For while most historians would agree that a rigorous method is important, there is a problem as to which rigorous method they are talking about … How could one know which method would lead to the 'truer' past? Of course each method would be rigorous, that is, internally coherent and consistent, but it would also be self-referencing. …

> Talk of method as the road to truth is misleading. There is a range of methods without any agreed criteria for choosing.
>
> Jenkins, 1991, p 18

Jenkins was aware that he needed to deal with the counter claim that in fact there are 'historical concepts' or 'heartlands' of history. He noted that these were defined in the 1970s around elements of 'time', 'evidence', 'cause and effect', 'continuity and change', and 'similarity and difference'. Predictably, Jenkins argued that other concepts might be equally valid such as 'dominant-marginal', 'elite', 'hegemony', 'centre-periphery' and so on. Jenkins's argument led him to the conclusion that since Carr wrote his seminal work 'What is History?', historians have been asking themselves the wrong question. The correct question should be 'Who is History For?', and here one gains a strong sense of the powerful influence Jenkins sees in the role of ideology in the field of historiography – the work that historians do. For Jenkins, all history is 'positioned'. As Jenkins argued in stark contrast to Elton: "History is never for itself; it is always for someone." (Jenkins, 1991, p 21). Jenkins was determined to draw attention to the role of dominant groups seeking to reinforce their own 'discourse of power' and maintain their dominance.

3.4 Historiographical Implications for the Current Research

3.4.1 Overview

The ontological impossibility of knowing a single absolute historical truth is clear; as is the notion that different succeeding generations will bring their own interpretations from their present standpoints, understandings and zeitgeists (Geyl, 1949[107]) – interpreting through the prism of their own present. Furthermore, it is also recognised that each researcher/historian brings his/her own 'baggage' and is unable to free him/herself from their own prejudicing burden. However, it appears to this researcher that the post-modernist approach is somewhat damaged and flawed by its intense relativism and interpretativism. (It is argued that the Holocaust as an historical event presents an insurmountable challenge for the post-

[107] Geyl examined the 'history of the history' of Napoleon, examining French writers in different time periods, arguing that each was influenced by the era in which they lived. For Geyl, history "is indeed an argument without end." (Geyl, 1949, p.16). Marwick launched a scathing attack on Geyl's work, arguing that Geyl had not quoted respected historians who had conducted methodical and meticulous research but contemporary commentators ("political propagandists" according to Marwick).

modernists. Those Revisionist historians who deny the Holocaust are presenting their own history and the post-modernists need to explain why that form of historiography is any less valid. This they attempt to do by arguing that Holocaust denial is not history at all but race hatred; however, this begs the question as to what right post-modernists have to decide the boundaries between the two. Furthermore, if such a right exists, then why should there not be others who choose to define different boundaries around different areas. It is suggested that the positivist historian has recourse to a body of evidence and historical method to oppose the Revisionists more effectively.)

The debate on the epistemological approaches to historiography has clear implications for the current research. There are abundant 'deposits of the past' (Elton, 1967) – evidential data – that have been available to this researcher and the central players remain available for interview. Carr was right to challenge the empiricists on their accumulation of data with his fishing analogy: it does indeed depend on where in the ocean one chooses to fish, with what tackle and what, in particular one is fishing for. This brings both a degree of subjective influence to the process of gathering evidence, as well as serendipity. Thereafter, as Carr noted, 'the facts do not speak for themselves'. Therefore, the question of interpretation also becomes critical. However, in this research, a determined effort was made to gather Elton's 'present traces of the past' and this process was made easier due to the focus of study being upon contemporary historical events. Furthermore, as there are few histories written on this area, one might argue that the evidence has not been as badly 'contaminated' by earlier historians – though clearly the data has been collected from sources that were not neutral and by a researcher who similarly was not 'baggage-free', and that too needed to be examined. Evidence has been readily available both in terms of documentation and human sources through interviews. Therefore, this researcher is confident that sufficient reliable evidential source material is available for analysis under a *cautious and qualified positivist approach*.

3.4.2 The Research Epistemology: a Qualified and Cautious Positivism

This research pursued a restrained positivist approach in an effort to present findings on what happened. Therefore, certain safeguards needed to be in place. For example, the insider researcher/historian role will be discussed under reflexivity; those who screened and filtered information needed to be examined e.g. who were the people taking minutes of critical

meetings and what were, as far as it is possible to ascertain, their intentions, their prejudices and influences; those writing opinion pieces in journals and newspapers also needed to be investigated for 'motive'; interviews needed to be conducted rigorously, the backgrounds of the Interviewees had to be contextualised and their views had to be triangulated both against documentary evidence and other Interviewees. Clearly, once the evidence had been gathered and presented, there was a requirement to analyse (and analysis is rarely devoid of interpretation). However, this researcher is confident that the documentary analysis has been acceptably thorough and the interview sample and methodology has been sufficiently robust to provide an academically defensible, positivist-leaning history.

A contemporary positivist is obliged to relate to the cautions set out by relativists such as Jenkins: it is not possible to recover all the facts and this researcher has had to be selective in the deployment of limited resources; there is no definitive 'text' and the researcher acknowledges the importance of reading them critically and comparing different texts; historians are inevitably subjective and clearly present-centred which has to be acknowledged; historians write with the benefit of hindsight which is perpetually evolving and that is certainly true – for examples, as professional experience in the field grows, as more histories are written, as new methodologies evolve and as more evidence is revealed, and as ideological shifts shape society, then new understandings and interpretations will also emerge and evolve (it is not so much a question of 'moving the goal posts' but 'moving the spectators through time and space'). Yet Elton is also right to encourage historians to study history in its own right, for its own sake and in its own terms, based upon an assessment of the evidence and an attempt to understand what it means, and that is what has guided this researcher; whilst recognising Michael Pickering's imagery in which he suggests that historians are only ever able to see part of the picture – "Illumination always casts shadows, and we see only what stands in the light." (Jenkins, 1999, p177).

In summary, this researcher recognised the helpful guidance provided by Rosman (though he is somewhat overly sympathetic to postmodernism):

> Postmodern theory, therefore, requires nuanced responses from historians. Rather than view it as a bête noir or angrily dismiss it as mere jargonized cant, many historians have come to understand that, beyond its historiographically problematic epistemology (which even leading postmodern historical critics cannot sustain in practice), what,

> at base, postmodernism demands from the historian is a more profound version of what modernist objectivism advertised: a self-consciously critical stance. Nothing – not sources, not interpretative procedures (hermeneutics), not rhetorical conventions, not one's own motivations, not one's own interpretations – can be taken for granted and left unexamined. The attempt must be made to multiply sources and perspectives as much as possible, while admitting that the resultant descriptions will always imply interpretations, will always be contingent, and will never be complete."
>
> Rosman, 2007, p 10

Finally, the following quotation from Norris (2000) was considered to be most compelling for the purposes and context of the current research:

> Nevertheless, there is such a thing as historical truth; not Truth with a capital T, not some kind of ultimate transcendent, all-encompassing Truth, but the sorts of truth that historians find out through patient research, through careful sifting of the evidence, through criticism of source-texts, archival scholarship, and so forth. … All the same, there are standards, principles, validity conditions, ways of treating, interpreting, criticising, comparing and contrasting the evidence which, if consistently applied, will give the historian a fair claim to be dealing in matters of truth.
>
> Norris, 2000, pp 36-7

3.4.3 The Contribution of Historical Research

Historical research into contemporary events and developments serves two important purposes. Firstly, it seeks to describe, explain and analyse what happened at that time. Secondly, it provides insights that may have contemporary relevance. This takes the historian into somewhat unfamiliar territory as the historian engages with areas such as social policy and frequently also enters the realm of the public and the political (Tosh, 2008). Though a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between the period under study here and the contemporary situation is well beyond the scope of the current research, the researcher fully intended to provide insight and direction for the present and the future based upon the lessons of the past. This is achieved by providing a greater understanding of developments in this

field, generalizable findings and transferable analysis.[108]

3.5 Interviews

3.5.1 Introduction

Research interviews are often experienced as a somewhat unnatural setting with a degree of seriousness brought to the proceedings through its apparent formality – enhanced by the question and answer format and the fact that it is often being recorded (the commencement of recording brings a certain weightiness to the proceedings).

Rubin and Rubin (2005) described qualitative interviews in the following way:

> Qualitative interviews are conversations in which a researcher gently guides a conversational partner in an extended discussion. The researcher elicits depth about the research topic by following up on answers given by the interviewee during the discussion. Unlike survey research, in which exactly the same questions are asked to each individual, in qualitative interviews each conversation is unique, as researchers match their questions to what each interviewee knows and is willing to share.
>
> Rubin and Rubin, 2005, p 4

Their 'responsive interviewing' method highlights the qualitative sensitivities in the interview setting which are discussed below (though they over-emphasize the interpretative dimensions of the process) (Rubin and Rubin, 2005).

According to Carol Jones (1991), the definition of a successful interview was given by Trevor Lummis (1987, p 62):

> … the art of good interviewing lies in being able to keep most of the interview conversational while following various digressions, remembering which questions the flow of information has answered

[108] Notwithstanding the challenges outlined by Jacobs (2005) when he asked 'What's Wrong with the History of American Jewish Education?' – educationalists see it as antiquarian and historians see it as 'presentist' (the past reviewed through the limited perspectives of present day understandings).

> and yet being prepared to question more deeply and precisely when necessary.
>
> in Jones, 1991, p 203

There are those within the research community who challenge the whole interview process as conducted in common practice. Feminist research, whose leading exponents include Anne Oakley, have raised gender-based challenges to the conventional approach to interviews. Fontana and Frey (1998) summarised this critique:

> It has been suggested that interviewing is a masculine paradigm (Oakley, 1981), embedded in a masculine culture and stressing masculine traits while at the same time excluding from interviewing traits such as sensitivity, emotionality, and others that are culturally viewed as feminine.
>
> Fontana and Frey, 1998, p 65

Therefore, they stressed the need for a more equal relationship in the interview setting. Not surprisingly, this is a view shared by post-modernist critique, with its emphasis on confronting power bases in society. Fontana and Frey (1998) summarised these critiques in the following way:

> A growing number of scholars, as we have seen (Oakley, 1981), feel that most of traditional in-depth interviewing is unethical, whether wittingly or unwittingly, and we agree wholeheartedly. The technique and tactics of interviewing are really ways of manipulating respondents while treating them as objects or numbers rather than individual human beings. Should the quest for objectivity supersede the human side of those whom we study?
>
> Fontana and Frey, 1998, p 71

It is necessary to respect and observe the ethical requirements of the research process, but the interviewees for the current research were not vulnerable to the concerns expressed by Fontana and Frey (1998) and others. Indeed, the 'power balance' was invariably in favour of the Interviewees and therefore different challenges arose. All of the lay people who were interviewed hold strong professional standing in their own respective fields suggesting that they would not be intimated; the Jewish communal professionals were mostly of higher

seniority than the researcher or at least equal; the expert informants were all senior Jewish communal figures. All Interviewees were familiar with the interview setting, having been interviewed in a range of other contexts, including research and media interviews. It would also be fair to note that the researcher felt that all Interviewees appeared to welcome the opportunity to be interviewed and willingly consented. All interviews were conducted in a convivial atmosphere and all were comfortable throughout with two exceptions: one interviewee was clearly still bruised by experiences at the time and another was arguably over-cautious to political aspects of these past events. It is also worth noting that there were a few limited instances where Interviewees felt a degree of reticence, most often occurring around matters pertaining to the Chief Rabbi, and to a lesser extent, with regard to fellow professionals or lay leaders. Overall, these concerns were not considered to have restricted or inhibited their responses, though there were instances where the Interviewees spoke off the record or insisted on the comments being non-attributable.

3.5.2 The Conduct of the Semi-Structured Interview

All Interviewees readily agreed to participate. A good rapport was established with all Interviewees, partly because of prior acquaintance with the researcher and partly out of a genuine engagement with the subject-matter, their role within it and an opportunity to reflect on the events. They were informed that the researcher was approaching them in his personal capacity and not part of his professional work and that the research was for post-graduate academic purposes. All Interviewees were interviewed at a time and place convenient to themselves.[109] The vast majority of interviews took between sixty and ninety minutes. Interviewees were also advised that if they had anything to add at the end of the interview then they would be most welcome to do so. Only a few Interviewees were able to answer all the questions covering the entire research period and all the issues raised. All were gratefully thanked for their time and insight.

Permission was sought and all but one agreed to be recorded.[110] Interviewees were given the option to turn off the recorder at any point and there were occasions in the majority of

[109] Interviews usually took place in offices at places of work, though one was in a quiet area of a hotel lobby and one in a restaurant, one in a coffee shop, two in lounge areas at an educational conference and six in the interviewee's home (three of whom were retirees).
[110] There was one exception in which the researcher was advised in advance not to request a recorded interview.

interviews where the Interviewees did indeed do so. Several Interviewees insisted that specific points or comments were not to be attributed, or was shared on the basis of complete confidentiality. It was agreed that the tape recordings would not enter the public domain and that they were only to be used for research analysis purposes by the researcher. Notes were also taken during interviews. The researcher made a commitment to all Interviewees that he would be judicious in the use of contentious or controversial quotations or references and make them non-attributable where necessary. The reason for this cautious and guarded approach was to reassure interviewees that they would not be compromised in the often uncompromising world of Jewish communal political life and its rivalries, ideological fissures and other sensitivities – it was necessary to secure their co-operation and this was successfully achieved.

The interviews rarely precisely followed the precise order of questions as set out in the interview schedule (see Appendix Three). The researcher needed to adapt to the Interviewee's trail of thought and assist and encourage with the occasional guidance on timelines, main events and key developments. It was preferable to allow the Interviewees sufficient flexibility to develop their thoughts in their own preferred sequence. This process was compatible with the research plan as interview data was later divided across all interviews according to relevant categories and concepts and subsequently analysed.

3.5.3 Hermeneutic Considerations

Hermeneutics is "concerned with the theory and method of the interpretation of human action. It emphasises the need to understand from the perspective of the social actor." (Bryman, 2008, p 694). This research applied a semi-structured interview approach, but acknowledged the following observation noted by Arksey and Knight (1999):

> Interviews are one method by which the human world may be explored, although it is the world of beliefs and meanings, not of actions, this is clarified by interview research. Since what people claim to think, feel or do does not necessarily align with their actions, it is important to be clear that interviews get at what people say, however sincerely, rather than at what they do.
>
> Arksey and Knight, 1999, p 15

Additional caution is articulated by Yin (1994): "However, the interviews should always be considered *verbal reports* only. As such, they are subject to the common problems of bias, poor recall, and poor or inaccurate articulation. Again, a reasonable approach is to corroborate interview data with information from other sources." (Yin, 1994, p 85). Green and Troup (1999), in their discussion of oral history, took it further still:

> In conclusion, historians now argue that oral history has a different 'credibility' from the empirical evidence of documentary sources. Subjective and collective meaning is embedded in the narrative structures people employ to describe the past. All memory is valid, according to Passerini: 'the guiding principle should be that all autobiographical memory is true; it is up to the interpreter to discover in which sense, where, for which purpose'. This means that every life history 'inextricably intertwines both objective and subjective evidence – of different, but equal value'.
>
> Green and Troup, 1999, p 236

(Indeed, one Interviewee aligned with the above when he explicitly stated that the story he told was his story and his truth … whether it was actually true or not.) It is accepted that subjectivity in interviewee reporting is indeed "embedded in the narrative structures people employ to describe the past." Nonetheless, perhaps Passerini's quotation above would benefit from modification: the guiding principle should be that all autobiographical memory is respected as that person's understanding of the truth; but it is up to the interpreter to discover the meaning, validity, and motivation behind it – in this research, through appropriate historiographical research. (Furthermore, this researcher did not accept that documentary evidence is necessarily any less subjective than oral history gleaned from interviews.)

These are important points in the context of this research: interviewees may have been eager to supply information that enhanced their own role or withhold information that may have caused reputational damage to themselves or their organisational allegiances. Similarly, they may have held back or accentuated criticism of others dependent upon their own predisposition and prejudice. Furthermore, they may also have been concerned to present a more positive image of their own role to the interviewer in order to impress, and the researcher needed to guard against the 'testing effect.' Of course, interviewees are also vulnerable to innocent mistake. A further danger is that interviewees are caught up in a pervading narrative and understanding of events that has entered a group or public

consciousness. This might lead to a 'group think' phenomenon in which key players all share a fixed and unchallenged understanding that has not been adequately tested, or a wider public narrative that becomes the dominant interpretation of events with wide and unquestioning acceptance (e.g. when a majority of interviewees report that a decision was taken for a specific reason yet alternative evidence or analysis suggests otherwise). In these instances, it is a further challenge to the researcher to overturn such narrative accounts when consistently shared by interviewees. Interviewees are inevitably subjective in sharing their own interpretations. The research challenge is to analyse all of the assembled data and apply research skills to better understand and explain what occurred and Yin (1994), quoted above, offers sensible advice with regard to triangulation.

These concerns have implications for the validity of the findings based upon interview data. Therefore, it was important in the current research to construct a purposive interview sample that drew upon a range of respondents and expert informants who could be cross-checked against each other's comments, as well as the documentary evidence available. The combination of these two methods allowed for a degree of triangulation – in addition to cross-checking between individual interview responses.

In terms of reliability issues, it was important to prepare a suitable research instrument in the interview schedule. The interview questions were tested and piloted and subsequently modified to ensure that terms used in the questions were properly understood and that the required data was extracted. This was also supported by the refinement of prompts and probes (as well as Interviewer reminder notes) to support each question in drawing out detailed responses and insights from the Interviewees.

3.5.4 Researching the Powerful – Elite Interviews

This research involved interviewing powerful Jewish community leaders and senior community professionals. Therefore, it was necessary to be aware of the specific challenges that might arise in this type of elite interviewing. Geoffrey Walford's edited collection of articles on 'Researching the Powerful in Education' (1994) raised a number of issues

pertinent to interviewing elites.[111] He summarised several challenges involved within which 'access' was identified as a potential issue, but in fact the researchers who contributed to his book often found it to be far less of a problem than anticipated. In the current research, that was also indeed the case – there were no problems of access. Regarding the interview with elites, Walford also usefully noted:

> As Moyser (1988) indicates, interviews with elite members differ from many interviews with those who are less powerful in that these interviewees can act as experts about events, processes, institutions and other powerful individuals. They will usually be exceptionally well informed about the issues in question, and may well have a good understanding of social science research.
>
> Walford, 1994, p 227

This was indeed the case in the current research, particularly in terms of their knowledge, experience and expertise – some also had social science research backgrounds. They were often particularly useful in analysing each other. Finally, with regard to the analysis and report, Walford (1994, pp 228-9) noted the importance of sophisticated analysis that penetrated any political and other camouflage that may result from powerful and experienced interviewees leading the researcher in a direction of their own preference and/or the avoidance of certain events and issues altogether. Again, this was relevant guidance that was applied in the current research. The Interviewer made a point early in each interview of displaying to the Interviewee the depth of preliminary research that had already been conducted, acting as a perhaps less than subtle indication that it would be difficult to mislead the Interviewer. Many over-stated their concerns about the passage of time and consequent limitations of memory, while some exaggerated their own ability to be more objective and dispassionate in their critique and assessment of their own roles after such a time lapse. Obviously, only a small number of Interviewees could meaningfully answer all of the questions. In actuality, the Interviewees were all surprisingly respectful of the interview process and the questions asked.

Finally, it is to be noted that the Chief Rabbi was not interviewed as, on balance, it was felt that sufficient material had already been garnered through interviews and because his

[111] The book focused upon interviewing civil servant and political elites involved in the development of education policy.

extensive written work was closely analysed. In addition, it was felt that the boundaries that would need to be respected when meeting the Chief Rabbi may have inhibited the interview process.

3.5.5 Researching Colleagues – Peer Interviews

In several cases, the researcher conducted 'peer interviewing' in so far as the Interviewee was a former or current colleague or was a professional in a partner organisation working in the same field. Jennifer Platt (1981) discussed interviewing one's peers and noted that much general discussion of interviewing focused on conditions in which the interviewer has a position of authority and power over the interviewee, as well as anonymity, and was unlikely to ever re-engage with the interviewee in any other context (Fontana and Frey (1998); amongst others), and more contemporary analysis dwells heavily on the power relationships involved. In contrast, Platt focused upon peer interviewing (mainly professional peers) which was particularly relevant to this research. Platt noted:

> Ones' peers have a variety of relevant characteristics: they are in a diffuse sense one's social equals, they are one's equals in role-specific senses, they share the same background knowledge and sub-cultural understandings, and they are members of the same groups or communities.
>
> Platt, 1981, p 76

She noted that not all of these conditions may occur at the same time but nonetheless this provided a useful reflection 'on interviewing one's peers'. As she pertinently went on to note, a peer interview "is not anonymous but has a history and perceived characteristics, some of which may be directly relevant to the research topic." (Platt, 1981, p 77). However, unlike Platt's experience of peer interviewing,[112] this researcher was not aware that the interviews were the subject of conversation between Interviewees. Platt also warned of the dangers of the interviews becoming more akin to regular conversations that colleagues might otherwise have and this was consciously addressed by this researcher. It was necessary to avoid adding incidental comments as one might normally do in everyday conversation, to explain to Interviewees that it was important to hear things from them, that they should not assume

[112] Her study was with research colleagues on subjects of academic interest.

knowledge on behalf of the Interviewer and to ensure that the interview was conducted in a respectful and tactful manner. Furthermore, after the initial conversational pleasantries, as soon as the formal part of the interview began with the commencement of recording and the researcher reviewing the terms of the interview, a formality (or 'role-playing' as Platt, 1981, p 78, might describe it) took over.

3.5.6 Development of the Interview Schedule (see Appendix Three)

Draft interview schedules were developed in which the documentary analysis provided broad areas of interest together with a number of informal conversations with relevant parties. Pilot interviews were critical in providing a number of important insights which are now discussed.

Breadth of Coverage/Duration of the Interview: the initial piloted interview schedule was found to be too long, attempting to cover too much detail. This resulted in the interview needing to focus on broader key areas and a reduced degree of specificity. This decision was complemented by the fact that prospective Interviewees were generally unable to recall sufficient detail for some of the more specific questions as originally framed.

Terminological Understanding: it became clear that it was critical for Interviewees to understand terminology in the way intended by the Interviewer i.e. the importance of ensuring that the Interviewee was actually answering the intended focus of the question. The communal issues under discussion are suffused with professional and practitioner language and jargon. Indeed, it came as a surprise to the researcher to discover that the Interviewees were generally less able to respond in the terms used by the organisational leadership. Therefore, terms such as 'Mission', 'Vision', 'Statement of Purpose' or 'Problem Definition' had to be replaced with more neutral and general phrases such as 'approach', 'mode of operation' or 'strategy'. This was not because they did not understand the terms, but because they were unable to accurately articulate or were otherwise unfamiliar with the specific Missions or Visions or Statements of Purpose of each relevant organisation. There was also a need to avoid potentially confusing phrases such as 'core values' or 'guiding principles' without further explanation and clarification, and the need for clarity for example concerning the term 'lay leaders' which needed to be tested to confirm usage and understanding. Another example of a key conceptual term open to multiple interpretations

was ‘cross-communalism’. It was clear that this was an important term that needed to be explored in even greater detail than originally anticipated. Furthermore, not all respondents were familiar with the terms and concepts of ‘Israel Experience’ referring to the name of the UJIA Renewal Department as well as the umbrella term for educational trips to Israel for Jewish young people.

The Danger of Assuming Knowledge: one of the initial experimental questions required what soon turned out to be a high degree of knowledge – it had been mistakenly thought that all the Interviewees would have at least some knowledge of internal Jewish Continuity and UJIA structures and modus operandi and this was clearly found not to be the case. (This revealed a further finding in itself, namely, that Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal personnel had not grasped that their partners and colleagues in the field did not fully comprehend their strategies and operations (and, as noted above, their use of language) in the way that they had hoped.)

The Impact of the Passage of Time on Human Memory: most Interviewees at some point early in the interview commented that these events took place some time ago and that they would probably not be able to remember the details. However, it was found that, though specific detail such as sequence of complex events was not always accurately remembered, their recall of major developments and broad direction was certainly sufficiently robust for the purposes of this research. At least once or twice in a majority of the interviews it was necessary to tactfully clarify or confirm the timescale and/or order of events. Of course, the researcher had to guard against providing memory aiding prompts that may have prejudiced reactions, or suggested leading questions or otherwise directed their responses.

Avoidance of Leading Questions: the pilot interviews revealed the need to construct questions that allowed for both positive and negative responses. Care had to be taken in drafting questions that may imply the area in question is contested and/or inadvertently drawing out criticisms from respondents when in fact the question was intended to be neutral – allowing for both critical and supportive assessments.[113]

[113] For example, though Jewish Continuity did not continue in its original format after 1996, it was discovered that there were differing interpretations over the precise nature of its subsequent state: some suggested that it had failed or folded or had been taken over by the JIA, whilst others argued that it had been transformed into a new model or indeed, as some tried to argue, had conducted a successful ‘insider takeover’ of the JIA after the

The Use of Prompts and Probes: there was a definite need to add individualised prompts and probes for those whose role was very particular and/or singular e.g. a former employee of an organisation with specific knowledge of a development such as the intent of the author of a document. There was a consistent need for probing in order to encourage the Interviewee to provide greater depth.

3.6 A Purposive Sample

There were a limited number of identifiable people involved in key roles affecting the relevant developments that took place between 1991 and 2000 – see Appendix Five. The criteria for inclusion was that they were leaders who were in a decision-making position or observers with a thorough knowledge and understanding of developments, and were sufficiently engaged, informed and aware to have an opinion and/or critique. A list of one hundred individuals was initially generated from which thirty-five were eventually interviewed. The construction of the sample was a critical part of the process. It was important to combine respondents and expert informants, lay and professional leadership, representatives of the central agencies that were the primary focus of the research as well as representatives from amongst the partner agencies with whom they worked. It was also imperative that they represented a cross-section of backgrounds and views. Precautions were taken to disguise non-attributable quotations. The final sample comprised the following:

Jewish Continuity Professionals:	4
Jewish Continuity Lay Leaders:	6
UJIA Professionals:	5
JIA/UJIA Lay Leaders:	5
Partner Organisation Professionals:	9
Partner Organisation Lay Leaders:	2
Other Informants:	4
TOTAL:	35

Jewish Continuity-JIA merger. Therefore, the question needed to be framed accordingly to allow for multiple responses, uninfluenced by the researcher.

Only six of the sample were female – none of whom were lay leaders – reflecting the broad composition of the Jewish communal leadership and hierarchy.[114]
A range of views and opinions were expressed across the sample, allowing for sufficient triangulation within the interview sample. The documentary analysis and literature review were conducted first, providing essential background information that assisted in the development of the interview schedule. However, the documentary analysis was more robust on the sequence of events and the interviews were more insightful on understanding.

Finally, there was additional value to the interviewing: as a result of meeting people face to face, the researcher was better able to appreciate both personality traits and attitudes of key players and that provided a more rounded picture of them as individuals. It brought to life personalities who featured in the written words of the documentary analysis (or the descriptions of others) in a vitally important way. If the research had relied entirely upon documentary analysis, a different and more limited understanding would have emerged.

3.7 Documentary Analysis

3.7.1 Approach

Documents need to be examined with the same rigour as interview records and with the same epistemological and hermeneutic sensitivities that were also discussed above. Documents need to be read in their context, their intended purpose understood, their authorship correctly identified and the possible motivations, pressures and influences upon that author properly assessed, highlighting any potential bias. Where the documents served an organisational purpose, the context of the organisation and its leadership at that time also needed to be addressed. It is necessary to balance these factors for a more accurate 'reading' or understanding. This process is greatly assisted by triangulation with other documents and other sources such as interviews.

[114] It should also be noted that each Interviewee is categorised in the list according to their most significant contribution, noting that several crossed into different categories e.g. some of the lay and professional leaders were involved in both Jewish Continuity and UJIA, and there are also Interviewees from other organisations who are also widely recognised as experts in the field. It is also important to record that all interviews involved both requests for information on what occurred as well as interpretative insights, and therefore all were being asked, at least to some extent, to act as expert informants in terms of providing analysis.

Carr was quick to warn of the dangers:

> The nineteenth-century fetishism of facts was completed and justified by a fetishism of documents. The documents were the Ark of the Covenant in the temple of facts. The reverent historian approached them with bowed head and spoke of them in awed tones. If you found it in the documents then it is so.
>
> Carr, 1961, p 16

Carr then moderated his tone, and provided wise counsel in approaching documents:

> Of course, facts and documents are essential to the historian. But do not make a fetish of them. They do not by themselves constitute history; they provide in themselves no ready-made answer to this tiresome question 'What is history?'.
>
> Carr, 1961, p 19

In the context of organisational documents, Bryman (2008) raised useful concerns by quoting Atkinson and Coffey (2004):

> Atkinson and Coffey's central message is that documents have a distinctive ontological status, in that they form a separate reality, and should not be taken to be 'transparent representations' of an underlying organizational or social reality. They go on to write: 'We cannot … learn through written records alone how an organization actually operates day by day. Equally, we cannot treat records – however "official" – as firm evidence of what they report' (Atkinson and Coffey 2004: 58).
>
> Bryman, 2008, p 527

Marwick (1993) defined the required approach as: "With all of these documents, historians find much of value in the assumptions which lie behind what is written, as well as in the overt thought being expressed." (p 119). He continued:

> No historian has ever imagined that a document is transparent, a straightforward statement of truth. Finding out the precise purposes of a particular document may be a lengthy process: once known, the historian will begin to be able to discount the biases, the subterfuges, the untruths which all documents contain. At the same time, he or she

> will squeeze out the unwitting testimony of the document: presumptions, attitudes, value-systems, beliefs, the things that the authors of the documents and its recipients took for granted and which, therefore, are no part of the purpose of the document, but which may be invaluable to the historian who has the knowledge and skill to prise them out and to make use of them. It is knowledge and method, above all, which are needed, not theory.
>
> Marwick, 1993, pp 120-121

As Murray and Lawrence (2000, p 94), stated: "Content analysis connects the purposes of the research to the messages of the documents." In order to interpret the 'messages' more accurately, it is necessary to discuss the nature of documentary (and other) evidence.
The minute-takers for each organisation were also identified and assessed. The JIA and UJIA minutes were taken by the male Company Secretary, a trained accountant, methodical, efficient and fastidious, a highly respected employee, fiercely loyal to the organisations and their leadership, and who understood the art of minute-taking to be reduced to the briefest description of subject-matter and an equally succinct summary of decisions taken – the result being rather anodyne; the minute-takers for Jewish Continuity were a female aide to the Chair of the organisation to whom she was also fiercely loyal and a respected and appreciated communal figure in her own right, and who saw in minute-taking the need to add just a little more of the discussion that took place; and a cautious and meticulous Jewish Continuity senior professional who was similarly circumspect. None of them would have included anything that might have embarrassed the senior leadership of their respective organisations, nor compromised the organisations concerned.

3.7.2 Types of Documentation

The historian, Arthur Marwick discussed documentary evidence in his seminal work, 'The Nature of History', and eventually expanded his taxonomy to thirteen.[115] For the purposes of the current research, 'Documents of record' include Minutes, Memos of committee meetings

[115] 1. Documents of record; 2. Surveys and reports; 3. Chronicles and histories; 4. Family and personal sources; 5. Polemical, hortatory, and prescriptive documents; 6. Studies of customs and folklore and other academic works; textbooks, works of sociology, etc. 7. Guides, handbooks, directories, and other works of reference; 8. Media of communication and artefacts of popular culture; 9. Archaeology, industrial archaeology, history-on-the-ground, and physical artefacts; 10. Literary and artistic sources; 11. Processed sources; 12. "Oral history" and oral traditions; 13. Observed behaviour, surviving customs, technical processes, etc. (Marwick, 1993, pp121-127).

and PowerPoint presentations within the JIA, Jewish Continuity and UJIA, as well as other documents such as promotional materials and strategic planning documents (these latter items belong in this category, though Marwick may have included some of them under 'Media of communication'.). A range of 'Surveys and Reports' are drawn upon which have been generated by relevant organisations and individuals. 'Polemical documents' and 'Media of communication' also provide a rich source of documents, including books, journals and newspaper articles. 'Oral history' is further qualified by Marwick as 'oral sources' but for current purposes might also include the tape recordings of Interviewees.

There were a range of specific contextual aspects to the current research which were relevant to the historical analysis of documents. For examples: as Hunter, 1995, p 163, noted: "I have found that one of the best sources of routine everyday knowledge about the community and about its elite is the local community press (Janowitz, 1967)." – this was certainly the case in this research, though the techniques of analysis of documentation nonetheless needed to be applied and the newspaper 'text' interrogated accordingly.

3.7.3 Conclusion

A document as 'text' is open to multiple interpretations and will be read differently by different people at different times. However, the researcher is obliged to apply the methods and techniques of the historian to the task of analysis: documents are forms of evidence to be studied to reveal their true significance (Marwick, 1993).

3.7.4 A Footnote on the Place of the Literature Review in Historiographical Research

In this research report, the material that would normally comprise a separate Literature Review is most usefully incorporated within the Findings and to some extent in the Background section (entitled 'British Jewry in the Context of this Research') – and also covered in the Document-based Chronology (Appendix One) and the Document-based Table of Key Features of Relevant Initiatives (Appendix Two). Support for this approach was helpfully provided by Cohen et al (2000):

> One further point: the review of the literature in other forms of educational research is regarded as a preparatory stage to gathering data and serves to acquaint researchers with previous research on the topics they are studying (Travers, 1969). It thus enables them to continue in a tradition to place their work in context, and to learn from earlier endeavours. The function of the review of the literature in historical research, however, is different in that it provides the data for research; the researchers' acceptance or otherwise of their hypotheses will depend on their selection of information from the review and the interpretation they put on it.
>
> Cohen et al, 2000, pp 161-162

3.8 Data Analysis

3.8.1 Scope

The researcher began by focusing upon events during 1996-2000 but soon discovered that a broader time frame stretching back to 1991 was essential to fully understand developments. This required additional data-gathering and significantly widened the breadth of the research. A thorough literature review was conducted. A wide range of primary and secondary documents were analysed and used to record the sequence of events, assess the roles of significant developments and players and identify central issues. The interviews were also piloted to sharpen the focus before engaging the full interview sample.

3.8.2 Documents and Interviews

It also became apparent that in general the primary documents (e.g. organisational reports, minutes and materials) provided a framework for mapping out main events and developments. Secondary documentary sources (e.g. newspaper and journal articles and opinion pieces) provided some insight but such literature was limited – particularly academic literature. In contrast, the interviews (a form of primary documentation in its potential evidential value) provided weaker data on the sequence of events or more detailed coverage but were far richer in interpretation and the exploration of meaning. Interviews were subjected to the same degree of scrutiny as documents – each as a different form of 'text' and each subject to the investigative methods of the historian. Lapses of individual memory were

compensated for by the primary documents; though in turn, Interviewees brought much more meaning and nuance than the documents.

The interviews were all recorded and extensive note-taking was also carried out. The interviews were then analysed. As for transcribing, Walford (2001) described it as "the fetish that most of us have about transcribing every tape-recording." (Walford, 2001, p 93). Walford did not recognise any firm rules on the need for transcription, assessing each piece of research on a case by case basis, and he concluded: "But in most cases the need for detailed transcription, or even any transcription at all, is more open to question." Walford, 2001, p 93). Indeed Walford openly stated his position:

> Let me put on record that I have rarely fully transcribed more than a few interviews for any of my research studies. First, this is a matter of time and energy. Estimates vary, and depend on the nature of the transcription, but a ratio of five hours for every hour of tape seems to be the minimum. Many people take far longer than this – especially if they are not skilled typists. I find it extremely dull and literally mind-numbing work. While some say that transcribing makes the researcher engage with the data, I find that this simply does not happen with me. My concern is with the next word or phrase rather than what is actually being said, so transcription adds little to my understanding of the content.
>
> Walford, 2001, pp 93-4

He went on to add other reservations: that transcribing the whole interview was not necessary as listening to the tapes and noting relevant sections was sufficient; the tape is a closer record of the interview than is a transcription (for example, the tape replays the interview as it actually was – though neither the tape nor the transcript capture the body language); and the transcription creates a text of words that are translatable into units of data that may lose the true context, meaning and intent of the interviewee – the tape recording is also not a perfect vehicle but in this respect is preferable to the transcript (Walford, 2001, pp 94-5). Walford's guidance in this regard was followed by this researcher.

3.8.3 Data Processing

Multiple models for data analysis are to be found in the literature (for examples, Cohen et al,

2000; Rubin and Rubin, 2005; Bryman, 2008) but they all largely follow a broadly similar process. The detailed breakdown of the interview data analysis is presented in Appendix Four. All the interview data was carefully processed and extensive notes were recorded based upon the ten areas of investigation set out in the interview schedule (which had been built upon documentary evidence already gathered and pilot interviews and conversations). The data was further analysed through a codification of the data units into twenty-five (subsequently reduced to twenty-three) specific categories, and further concepts and ideas were also identified within the categories. Central themes emerged and were developed and the Findings were then considered, developed and then considered again against the documentary analysis and review that had already been completed, providing triangulation and clarification. The interviews were far richer in interpretation. The Findings emerged under the following headings: Vision and Planning; Organisation and Implementation; Leadership Roles and Personalities; the Challenges of Cross-communalism, Relations with Communal Partner Organisations, Funding, Communications and Expectations.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

3.9.1 Introduction

Denzin and Lincoln (2000, p 447), usefully quoted Robert Stake in this regard: "Qualitative researchers are guests in the private spaces of the world. Their manners should be good and their code of ethics strict." In addition, the British Sociological Association's (BSA) Statement of Ethical Practice (March 2002) was also consulted by this researcher. Ethical concerns affect both the conduct of the researcher and the potential impact upon those who are researched.

This researcher has set out sufficient detail on his background ('Reflexivity' is covered below under the next heading) to allow the reader to assess how this might impact upon his interpretation and presentation of the evidence (BSA (March 2002), paragraph 7). Arksey and Knight (1999, pp 54-55), direct the qualitative interview researcher towards 'consistency' (a clear explanation of how the research has been conducted so that the wider research community may follow its development), 'truth value' (establishing as far as possible that

what is reported is an accurate reflection of what was provided by the interviewees) and 'neutrality' (that the researcher did not unduly influence and thereby distort the process).

Protection of the researched, most particularly those who agreed to be interviewed and also those who are mentioned in confidential documents, is generally addressed under four headings, summarised in Bryman (2008), relying on Diener and Crandall (1978):

1. whether there is *harm to participants*;
2. whether there is a *lack of informed consent*;
3. whether there is an *invasion of privacy*;
4. whether *deception* is involved.

Bryman, 2008, p 118

Much of the literature on ethics dwells on vulnerable participants in situations such as interview, participant observation or access to personal data. For the purposes of this research, while all four areas are addressed, the main concern was to avoid harm to those involved and to respect confidentiality and anonymity where requested. As already mentioned, commitments were given to Interviewees in particular as a necessary mechanism to gain their confidence in sharing insights on the events and developments that were the subject of the research. Confidentiality commitments were also given to the UJIA (who now hold the JIA and Jewish Continuity archives) with regard to access to documentation. As already noted, the Interviewees were in leadership positions and they were not vulnerable in the sense referred to in most of the literature. However, there is no lesser duty of care to a group of powerful individuals who were the focus of much of this research.

3.9.2 Reflexivity

Jenkins's (and others') emphasis on the interpretative aspects of research is certainly relevant. Therefore, in terms of reflexivity, it is necessary to disclose the role of this researcher as something of an 'insider researcher' who is also a full-time practitioner in the field. However, he only had very limited direct professional engagement with Jewish Continuity; as the representative of an organisation's grant application and also as a potential partner organisation on a specific project, which took place during 1995-6. From 1995-2003, the researcher was the Director of a centre for Informal Jewish Education (run by the Jewish

Agency for Israel), which, from 1997-8, was progressively taken over by UJIA Jewish Renewal. From 1997-8 to 2003, he occupied a middle management position, effectively seconded to UJIA Jewish Renewal. He was certainly engaged with the senior professional leadership of UJIA Jewish Renewal in its formative phase and was responsible for developing the centre for Informal Jewish Education that became a UJIA vehicle. However, he was not part of the senior management team of UJIA and was not directly involved with much of the decision-making that is central to this research. It is also important to record that there has been absolutely no interference in the research from UJIA, and unrestricted access to documents was granted (including Jewish Continuity and JIA documents).

He is a professional colleague of those professionally associated with the focus of this research – from both Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal and its partners – who comprise a small, well networked professional community. However, as a researcher, great efforts were taken to provide an evidenced-based approach to the research and a wide range of opinion and documentary evidence – both positive and negative – has been assembled. Finally, the researcher worked in an environment that was led by the philanthropic leadership of the community and therefore funded by the dominant community elites. Some of these leaders have been interviewed. However, it is again stressed that none of these communal leaders have interfered with the research process.

The broad chronology of events is not contested and is, essentially, publicly accessible to other researchers. However, unique access to documentation and the individuals directly involved has facilitated the assembly of evidence and original analysis brought to the public domain for the first time. However, the researcher is unavoidably exposed to the challenge that he was too close to be objective; though, it might also be noted, as an 'insider' he was in many ways also better placed to gather and assess the evidence. Therefore, the research is only as strong as the presentation of the evidence and the defence of his analysis, findings and conclusions.

The researcher did receive funding from his employer (the Jewish Agency for Israel/UJIA) towards the research fees. However, this was entirely in the context of general professional development and the researcher was totally free to investigate any research topic of his choice that would further his professional development (BSA (March 2002), paragraphs 44 and 56).

3.9.3 Ethical Considerations for Interviewees and Others Affected by the Research

Privacy (the term should be understood to also embrace confidentiality and anonymity): permission to tape record all interviews was requested at the start of each one and there were no refusals (with one exception in which the Interviewee's known uneasiness and aversion to being recorded was respected). It was also explained to each Interviewee that if, at any time, they wished to turn off the tape recorder or otherwise wanted to go 'off the record', they were entirely free to do so (and indeed encouraged to do so). Commitments were made to all Interviewees that the tape recordings were only for the purpose of ensuring accuracy when the data was later analysed and would otherwise remain confidential. Responsible usage was also agreed with UJIA as part of the terms of access to the JIA and Jewish Continuity archives that UJIA now holds (BSA (March 2002), paragraph 39). In this research situation, the focus was on two particular organisations with a relatively small, identifiable leadership whose roles in each organisation were publicly known. Therefore, the researcher had to be especially cautious in protecting privacy and confidentiality (BSA (March 2002), paragraphs 13 and 18). The protection of individual identities was placed at a higher premium than maximising exposure to the precise data sources and their content.

Harm: it was also made clear that the researcher had no intention of causing harm and would seek to guard against causing damage or embarrassment to any Interviewee. The researcher aimed to report accurately but without detriment to the Interviewees – the particular challenges involved were noted in the previous paragraph (BSA (March 2002), paragraph 26).

Voluntary, informed consent: all Interviewees freely and readily agreed to participate on an entirely voluntary basis. They understood that the researcher was conducting private academic work and not acting on behalf of his employer. The area of research was explained and was also self-evident from the interview questions (BSA (March 2002), paragraph 16).

Deception: the researcher made every effort not to deceive or otherwise mislead the Interviewees.

Respect for Interviewees: they deserved to be respected, having given up their time and willingly shared insights, and in some cases taken risks by entrusting the researcher with

privileged information (BSA (March 2002), paragraph 14). Interviewees were also informed that they would be consulted over any direct quotations that could be considered controversial (BSA (March 2002), paragraph 24).

In conclusion, it is worth recording that in the light of the potential sensitivity of the subject-matter of the research, thorough precautions were taken (with regard to Interviews and documentary analysis) by the researcher with regard to protecting the Interviewees and others quoted or named in the research. This consisted of the following:

1. the researcher established a high sensitivity threshold to guard against harming the Interviewees or others in the gathering and processing of data;
2. every attributable quotation taken from Interviews and reproduced in this research was sent to the Interviewee concerned for prior approval[116] and a response secured (Interviewees were made aware in interview that their quotations were to be considered for use in the research);
3. where an Interviewee requested an amendment, or to make a quotation non-attributable or to remove it altogether, this request was agreed (all requests proved entirely reasonable and did not affect the significance of the quotation);
4. where a document was individually authored, every effort was made to secure approval for use from that author;
5. where an extract from a document quoted a named person, that person was consulted either via interview or subsequent follow-up, or was otherwise validated for use by investigating:
    i) whether or not it was already in the public domain;
    ii) whether that person's role was publicly known or would cause harm were it to become known;

[116] Each person who was contacted received an adapted version of the following:
"Dear XXX,
I hope you are well.
You may recall that I interviewed you for my academic research on Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal (1991-2000). I am now writing up my Thesis and intend to use the extracts quoted in the attachment, and to record that I interviewed you. The research will be available in the public domain. However, I do not wish to cause harm, nor to misrepresent nor breach any confidences. Therefore, I am writing to request that you please review the quotations that I have extracted from the Interview and material from relevant documents, and raise any concerns that you may have.
Clearly, these extracts are taken out of context and how they are used within the body of the Thesis is entirely my own responsibility.
Many thanks."

6. leading figures from the relevant organisations was also consulted over the use of any documents that were not in the public domain (UJIA, JIA, Jewish Continuity);
7. where Interviewees requested anonymity that was accommodated by disguising or otherwise not revealing their identity.

This meticulous and highly cautious process involving reasonable measures was necessary on ethical grounds for the protection of Interviewees and others affected – it provided a higher level safeguard than might normally be applied. Furthermore, it did not detract from the research presentation and Findings. Indeed, the further consultation resulted in some useful adjustments (including a corrected name spelling, one minor mistaken transcription from an interview, and a number of useful clarifications). It was considered to have been a most worthwhile exercise.

4 FINDINGS

As explained, the research process produced a large amount of data which was systematically processed and analysed to generate these Findings (see Appendix Four). The semi-structured interview was designed around the outcomes of the documentary analysis and pilot interviews. This allowed for a broad pre-configuration around ten Finding areas, but thereafter it was the data analysis itself that determined the specific topics. The themes emerged through the following method:

1. all of the data from the Interviews were separated out into individual data units and categorised according to twenty-five subject-area categories that emerged from the Interview questions;
2. these were then processed further and reduced to twenty-three categories;
3. each category was then broken down into its own key concepts;
4. these concepts were then closely examined (together with data from the documents and the literature) in order to identify common, central themes which were then organised to form the sections in these research Findings.
   (See Appendix Four)

This fourth and final stage involved intensive reflection and consideration as a result of which it became possible to identify commonalities across the concepts and these were grouped together, complemented by material from the documents. Only a limited number of permutations emerged and the final thematic formulation was considered to be the most effective for addressing the research aims whilst relying upon the available data. It would have been possible to construct an alternative structure involving a slightly different arrangement of the 'Vision and Planning' and 'Organisation and Implementation' sections. However, it would not have made any significant difference to the nature and quality of the Findings. Finally, the research could have expanded upon the area of 'Cross-communalism' but this option was rejected for two reasons: firstly, it is covered elsewhere by other researchers and commentators; and secondly, it would have distracted from the research focus on community educational initiatives.

The following themes emerged from the research process, providing the template for the

analysis: Vision and Planning; Organisation and Implementation; Leadership Roles and Personalities; Challenges: Cross-communalism; Relations with Communal Partner Organisations; Funding; Communications and Expectations. The spotlight is mainly upon Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal; however, salient aspects of the JEDT and its Worms Report are also included to provide additional perspective, as well as the JIA. The Findings relied primarily upon data generated from the interviews and historical documentary analysis; however, the interview data was richer for the purposes of interpretation. In these Findings, all quotations or views ascribed to an individual, named or unnamed, resulted from interview or direct communication with the researcher unless otherwise stated. Documents are appropriately cited. (In addition, many of the primary documents are also referenced in the relevant sections of Appendices One and Two.)

4.1 Vision and Planning

'Vision' is understood here as a description of a better future that inspires the pursuit of its achievement. 'Planning' addresses the process whereby the vision is to be translated into practical outcomes. The initiatives that have been studied were each animated by differing visions and strategic thinking and planning processes.

4.1.1 Jakobovits: 'Let my people know' (Jakobovits, 1971) and the Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT) (including the Worms Report, 1992)

Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits (in office 1967-1991) raised fears of a crisis in which the community was facing oblivion due to the neglect of its children's education (he confined himself largely to schools) and the urgent need for a response (Jakobovits Inauguration Sermon (April 1967) in Bermant, 1990, p 192). His proposal, 'Let my people know' (Jakobovits, 1971), reflected a vision that was practical and output-oriented: to raise funds for the methodical, targeted support of Jewish school-building and educational projects, thereby educating increased numbers of Jewish children and training and developing more teachers and educational resources. His initiative was delivered through the JEDT which determined that "Jewish education is the most effective way of guaranteeing a healthy, thriving and vibrant Jewish community in this country." It aimed "to place Jewish education higher on the community's agenda to ensure that our heritage is transmitted from generation to generation in a way that has continuing meaning and impact. By supporting Jewish education, the trust is involved in securing the community's future. By supporting the JEDT you will play your part in this vital work." (JEDT leaflet n.d.)[117] It played a role in encouraging expansion in school building and demonstrated some progress in teacher development and resource development – he was himself apparently somewhat disappointed with the scale of the results (Bermant, 1990, p 194).

Furthermore, the limitations of the plan were highlighted by his surprising statement that Jewish educational curriculum was not to be addressed in the proposal (Jakobovits, 1971), and the absence of a deeper insight into how Jewish education might combat assimilation –

[117] Jakobovits described it as: "the communal energies and revised priorities generated by the Jewish Educational Development Trust as the first corporate endeavour to raise Jewish education to the top of Anglo-Jewry's domestic agenda and budget." (JEDT, 1981/82, p 2).

for Jakobovits, it appeared to be axiomatic that Jewish education would triumph as long as the young people attended and were exposed to it. (Short (2005) argued that investment in Jewish education in schools was against unproven returns and, on that basis, Sacks's Jewish Continuity initiative was mistaken; however, Short would have been more relevant by targeting Jakobovits as it was Sacks who promoted a far broader vision of Jewish education and continuity.)

The JEDT's Worms Report (JEDT, 1992)[118] was summarised by Finestein (2002, p 38): "The Report called for a 'national council' for the funding and supervision of educational facilities, Orthodox and non-Orthodox, and of the determination of priorities, adequate funding for the training and remuneration of teachers, and a higher degree of professionalism in all facets of educational supervision and administration." It was an insightful document but the process that accompanied it provided pertinent lessons for future initiatives. It was based on a systematic research programme of interviews and analysis. Its vision was of a coordinated, integrated Jewish educational system, well-funded and professionally managed, emphasising the need to invest in personnel.[119] However, its lack of advancement demonstrated that it was insufficient to provide an intelligent, well-researched critique that offered recommendations for improvement, in the hope or expectation that it would be picked up and implemented on the strength of the case built and presented in the document – it needed an effective implementation apparatus which the JEDT itself was unable to provide. (The JEDT was facing acute financial difficulties due to its over-commitment towards funding a new private Jewish secondary school, Immanuel College – problems compounded by the severe economic recession of the time (Worms, 1996, p 253)). Finestein applauded the Worms Report (JEDT, 1992) for "sharpening awareness of the shortcomings in the prevailing system. It contributed much to the innovative spirit which was, in effect, dissolving the residues of the Victorian legacy and, in particular, undoing the remnants of a besetting complacency." (Finestein, 1999, p 289). In fact, it was overtaken by the new Sacks initiative, Jewish Continuity (Worms, 1996, p 253; OCR, October 1992).

As will be discussed shortly, both Jewish Continuity and UJIA were far more sensitive to the

[118] "Members of the (Worms Report) Think Tank Committee: Mr. Fred S. Worms *(Chairman)*, Rabbi Anthony Bayfield, Mr. Allan Fisher, Dr. Myer Goldman, Mr. Gabriel Goldstein, Mr. Henry Israel, Dr. Stephen Miller (Editor), Mr. Maurice De Vries. Professional Consultants: Mr. Michael Mail, Mrs. Syma Weinberg." (JEDT, 1992, p vii).

[119] It was referred to by some as a proposal for the Jewish community's equivalent of a 'local education authority'.

presentation, engagement and funding aspects of their projects and the overall process of implementation – though with differing degrees of success.

4.1.2 The JEDT (including the Worms Report) and the Emergence of Jewish Continuity

Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks had a more expansive educational vision (Sacks, 1993abcde; 1994) which was intended to have a greater impact in changing the community's approach to education. Syma Weinberg was a senior professional with both the JEDT and Jewish Continuity[120] and she helpfully framed the contrast between them: "The JEDT was pursuing *systematic* change through concrete objectives such as school-building; and Jewish Continuity was striving for *systemic* change, an exercise in social engineering aimed at strengthening Jewish identity and community." Both had sought to elevate Jewish education as a communal priority (Jakobovits, 1971; Sacks, 1993abcde; 1994) and Jakobovits had succeeded to some extent in reinforcing the place of Jewish schools on the communal agenda; however, Sacks set out to lead a wider education programme across the community. Sacks had taken a strategic need and made it compelling, as expressed in his book, 'Will We Have Jewish Grandchildren?' (Sacks, 1994). Under Sacks, significantly more people became engaged and there was intended to be a wider range of educational activity towards a more ambitious vision. Both Jakobovits and Sacks had launched their visions on the back of a 'survivalist' crisis discourse in which the price of inaction would be the further assimilation and decline of the community.

Jewish Continuity proposal documents confirmed that the Office of the Chief Rabbi was indeed working on the practical implementation of the new programme from at least November 1992 onwards (Office of the Chief Rabbi, November 1992; Jewish Continuity, 24th December 1992 and 3rd February 1993). Nonetheless, JEDT staff members (JEDT, 5th October 1992ab) attempted to trigger the implementation of the Worms Report (JEDT, September 1992). Sacks and Jonathan Kestenbaum (Sacks's Director of his Office of the Chief Rabbi) had spent a busy first year with a number of high profile projects and a sense of 'clearing the decks' ready for the implementation and expansion of the Chief Rabbi's plans. Consequently, they perhaps appeared a little behind the pace in responding to the JEDT's Worms Report follow-up, and were left to respond to the JEDT professionals – however, they

[120] Weinberg later moved to the Office of the Chief Rabbi.

then acted swiftly and firmly. The Office of the Chief Rabbi (OCR) decided that both the Report and the continuation of the JEDT would hamper their own efforts – they had several concerns. Firstly, the OCR opposed a central Worms proposal for a "representative, umbrella body for Jewish education advised by professional educators and those engaged in communal planning and research." (JEDT, 1992, p 48)[121] – though they did share the critique that the field was 'fragmented' (indeed Sacks himself had addressed the fragmentation issue in a 1988 article.[122] The Worms Report's proposed Council was apparently intended to be cross-communal and this was opposed by the OCR, which felt that it would cause complications (somewhat ironically given its own subsequent problems over cross-communalism.)[123] It is also important to note that even within the Worms Think Tank there were tensions over cross-communal matters. Secondly, the new Chief Rabbi understandably wished to place his own imprimatur on a new project with the intention that it would capture and harness the enthusiasm that he had undoubtedly engendered and also that it would excite key stakeholders around his vision – the JEDT was clearly associated with the previous Chief Rabbi (Bermant, 1990; Worms, 1996). Thirdly, the JEDT, as already noted, was experiencing serious financial challenges and Sacks also felt that his new energy and leadership would generate the necessary increased funding that could then be targeted at his new initiative (Worms, 1996). Fourthly, Sacks was promoting a bolder vision for Jewish community education that would extend beyond nurseries and schools – he wished to engage the whole community in a wide-ranging programme (Sacks, 1993abcde; 1994). For these reasons, it is clear that the new Office of the Chief Rabbi encouraged the winding down of the JEDT and appropriated the Worms Report process, engineering what might best be described as a 'benign side-lining' in favour of its own branded project – the JEDT leadership appeared to be compliant. Michael Phillips had taken over the Chair of the JEDT under very difficult circumstances and Worms wrote: "In the event, he provided an invaluable bridge between the JEDT and its successor organisation, Jewish Continuity …" and he had set up the Worms Report (Worms, 1996, p 243-4). Elsewhere, Worms reported that "The JEDT was left in the

[121] Also referred to as the 'National Council for Jewish Education' (JEDT, 1992, p 43).
[122] "Is co-ordination possible between the wide variety of competing interest groups in this fragmented field?" (Sacks, 1988, p 35).
[123] Chief Rabbi Jakobovits would also have been potentially compromised by the proposal. One might consider the possibility that the cross-communal aspect of the Council, not explicitly addressed in detail in the Report, may have been encouraged in part by the new era of expectation that accompanied the incoming Chief Rabbi, Sacks.
Bermant: "… Jakobovits has tried to transcend communal divisions in his allocation of funds, but some sections of the community have complained that he has not given them nearly enough, while others argue that as an Orthodox rabbi he had no right to give anything to Reform institutions at all, which has not prevented them from demanding their share, and more than their share, of any funds he has." (Bermant, 1996, p 202).

lurch."[124] (Worms, 1996, p 253), however, the JEDT Trustees Meeting (Minutes 29th March 1993), chaired by Phillips, indicated support for the OCR's position – it appeared to be a genuine endorsement (perhaps also motivated in part by their preoccupation with raising the funds for Immanuel College).

4.1.3 Jewish Continuity: Vision and Planning

Sacks, supported by Kestenbaum, led the formation of the new enterprise in Jewish communal renewal (and Dr Michael Sinclair was soon to take up an important role). His leadership was inspirational and intellectual, but he was also to retain a veto power over major policy decisions and appointments in the new organisation; his direct, public involvement imposed an Orthodox standard that had to be respected (Jewish Continuity (16th July 1993) 'Certificate of incorporation of a private limited company Jewish Continuity'), though was later to cause considerable cross-communal complications. His most effective contribution was through the vision and the big ideas rather than the practicalities and smaller details.

Sacks had spent the summer of 1991 in Israel planning for his Jewish Continuity initiative during which he was in dialogue with the Mandel School and its Director, Professor Seymour Fox (amongst others) (Sacks, 1994, Acknowledgements).[125] Fox had a great deal of experience in Jewish continuity planning in North America, as well as developing the study of it at the Mandel School, and Sacks and Kestenbaum (who had been a former student of Fox) appeared to have been influenced by his thinking.[126] Weinberg reported that Sacks thought Fox would provide useful assistance in achieving the paradigm shift required – based on his success in America with Jewish Community Centres and his work at the Mandel Centre in Israel.[127] As Kestenbaum explained, Fox stressed the importance of 'intellectual

[124] Some suggested more sympathetically that the JEDT was in fact 'woven in' to Jewish Continuity.
[125] "Professor Seymour Fox, Alan Hoffman and Annette Hochstein of the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem lent their immense expertise in educational planning, and helped us to formulate the right questions." (Sacks, 1994, Acknowledgements).
Fox (with his colleague, Annette Hochstein) was later brought in to assess Jewish Continuity's performance (October 1st and 2nd 1995) – see under 'Organisation and Implementation'.
[126] Holtz (2008, p 1) in *Journal of Jewish Education* (2008, No 74, Supplement 1) ""Fox's influence on Jewish education, in this country (America) and in the world is inestimable. ..[H]e might validly be considered the most important figure in the field in this century" (p. 629). Lukinsky's evaluation was based on the number of institutions that Seymour established and the financial resources that he was able to enlist in the cause of Jewish education, to be sure, but greater than that were the intellectual contributions he made to the field."
[127] Notwithstanding the differences between North American and British Jewries.

underpinnings' behind the concept and the organisation, and emphasised the role of what he termed 'mainstreaming' – placing it firmly on the agenda of the mainstream community. Fox also stressed the need for the Chief Rabbi to build a persuasive case for potential funders and argued that Jewish education was a critical instrument of Jewish continuity (Fox and Scheffler, 2000). Fox also had some influence with other communal figures within British Jewry.[128] In addition to his interaction with Fox, Sacks had also been following developments in Jewish education in North America which were addressed in some of his writings (Sacks, 1988).

Sacks had declared his intent at his inauguration in September 1991, when he introduced his 'decade of renewal' (Sacks, 1991). For Sacks, 'renewal' was a mobilising aspiration for British Jewry – a rallying cry for increased engagement in Jewish life. (UJIA chose the term 'Renewal' to define its work in this area, though it was something of an amorphous concept). Weinberg described his aim as: "to renew the Jewish community through Jewish Continuity; 'renewal' was the concept and 'Continuity' was the programme."[129] [130](Another Jewish Continuity insider felt that, in theory, 'Jewish continuity' was a good slogan, being all encompassing without being denominational – the practice was to prove otherwise as it became embroiled in cross-communal controversy.[131]) It was Sacks's vision and ideas that provided the 'thought leadership' (as Kestenbaum termed it) through his writings, inspiration and the capacity to galvanise communal energy and enthusiasm in support of his Jewish

[128] Clive Marks (a leading Funder, Trustee and lay Treasurer of Jewish Continuity) engaged Simon Caplan to develop various projects of the Lord Ashdown Charitable Settlement (for which Marks was a also a leading Trustee) – Caplan was another former pupil of Seymour Fox and graduate of the Mandel School's Fellowship programme in Jerusalem, and was also professionally involved with the organisation. Marks was to become a vehement critic of Jewish Continuity.
Fox was later brought in to assess Jewish Continuity's performance – see under 'Organisation and Implementation'.

[129] In North America and in some of the literature, 'Jewish continuity' was also viewed as the concept.

[130] Harry Freedman (then Development Director of the Assembly of Masorti Synagogues) argued that Sacks was completely wrong and that what was needed was 'Jewish relevance', claiming that most Jews were engaged but did not appreciate nor find compelling what was on offer. Freedman advocated a pluralist and more flexible approach with "cross-communal consensus": "Its mission will no longer be 'continuity' but some expression of 'relevance' and this single change of emphasis is fundamental." (Freedman, 1996, p 26). It was an approach that was totally antithetical to the Orthodox Chief Rabbi. Sinclair responded, pointing out that the non-Orthodox striving for relevance led to many Jews leaving Judaism. He stated: "Continuity knows we have to make Judaism live, not by changing it, but by revealing its essence, so often obscured by poor presentation, transmission and experiences." (Sinclair, 1996, p 28). Posen offered a secular Jewish approach when he argued that Judaism (in all possible aspects of Jewish civilisation) be taught in a more engaging way (not exclusively from a religious perspective) to attract what he saw as the majority of mainstream Jews who rejected religious Judaism. (Posen, Autumn, 1996, pp 33-35).

[131] Discussed later under 'Cross-communalism'.

Continuity project. The title of his book; 'Will We Have Jewish Grandchildren?'[132] proved to be a powerful encapsulation of the challenge and resonated with many British Jews – it captured the moment. (Sacks's detailed analysis of the history and contemporary condition of British Jewry is beyond the scope of this research.)

According to Kestenbaum, the Chief Rabbi's pamphlets and book on Jewish Continuity (Sacks 1993abcbde, 1994) were intended to create "an intellectual climate for debate" and to "get the ideas into the system". Sacks (with Kestenbaum's support) offered what amounted to the following theory of change:

- a definition of the parameters of the debate on the state of British Jewry and its future challenges and aspirations;
- a proposition to inspire and rally the Jewish community;
- the creation of an intellectual climate around the ideas;
- the prospect of a new, leading, central communal agency – under the leadership of the Chief Rabbi;
- the possibility to attract the interest and the funds of major Jewish communal leaders and philanthropists – and to bring them into the process of major communal change at an early stage.

Sacks (1994) outlined a proposal for this new organisation, together with its mission statement, on how to achieve Jewish continuity. "A single body is *needed to promote, strategise and resource all those many activities in our community which create Jewish continuity. Its task will be to intensify Jewish life in such a way as to create future generations of Jews who are proud, knowledgeable and committed as Jews.* To do so it will have to aim at nothing less than a complete transformation of Anglo-Jewish attitudes, so that continuity moves from last to first place on our communal agenda. The new organisation will have to become the third arm of Anglo-Jewry, alongside Israel and welfare." (Sacks, 1993e, p 4). Sacks did not argue that continuity and education are conterminous: "Not all education creates continuity, and not everything that creates continuity is education." (Sacks, 1993e, p 6) – though he did somewhat blur the distinctions.[133] It was also to be aimed at all Jews

[132] The American *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* ran a series entitled: 'Will Our Grandchildren be Jewish?' (JJCS (1992) Vol 68 No 4.

[133] Fox and Scheffler (2000) 'Jewish Education and Jewish Continuity: Prospects and Limitations', argued that: "To strive to find an effective causal relationship between Jewish education and continuity will require a massive investment in existing institutions and the establishment of sites where thinking, research, experimentation and evaluation can be undertaken. Experimentation in educational settings will challenge and offer insights for theory and educational theory in turn will inspire creativity and invention. It is a massive undertaking, but it is appropriate for the huge challenge. A new era will have to be ushered in for Jewish

(Sacks, 1993e, pp 5-6). The mission was to re-energise and re-focus Jewish education. It would overcome complacency, develop opportunities for career progression and leadership recruitment and development and address problems besetting some of the pre-existing educational institutions. It would develop a coherent strategy (Sacks, 1993e, p 9) "a community-wide strategy for Jewish learning, experiencing and doing in all forms and contexts and for all ages and groups." (Sacks, 1993e, p13), and to raise the necessary funds to support it (Sacks, 1993e, p 13). Education was to be defined in a broader context than simply schools and synagogues and embraced informal education and community cultural activities. (Sacks, 1993e, p 3). It also planned to focus upon outreach and innovation at "key moments of affiliation and disaffiliation" (Sacks, 1993e, p14). Sacks aspired to create a "*lean* and *enabling* organisation" – "*'steering, not rowing'*" with a national outlook (Sacks, 1993e, p 10). Finally, it identified the following intervention areas: "to increase funding for continuity-creating projects, including Jewish day schools, Jewish enrichment at non-Jewish schools, youth groups, adult, informal and family education, student societies chaplaincy [sic], outreach activities, residential retreats and Israel experiences." (Sacks, 1993e, p 15). It was a plan for radical communal transformation. (Short (2005) challenged Sacks's historical analysis and his evidence base[134] and went on to suggest that if the analysis was flawed then "the policy initiatives it inspired that relate to education are unlikely to meet with success." (Short, 2005, p 255). However, Short himself acknowledged that his own critique was based overwhelmingly on the case regarding Jewish schools and it is clear that the Jewish Continuity (and UJIA Jewish Renewal) initiative had a purview extending far beyond schools (as Short himself again recognised); so his own argument missed its target by failing to address the majority of the policy initiatives that were in fact non-school based.)[135] Broadly, Sacks did achieve its first phase goals and it was clear from the interviews and documentary evidence that this was a moment of genuine inspirational leadership in which an individual leader's vision captured the Jewish communal imagination. However, the implementation phase was to be far less successful.

In practice, the group of senior communal philanthropists and leaders (the Sounding Board

---

education if education is to make the required difference, to change the trendlines. Ambitious yes, but not unrealistic." (pp 16-17).

[134] A debate beyond the remit of this research.

[135] Short's comments may have been better directed at the Jakobovits initiative.

(first meeting, 17th February 1993)) assembled by Sacks and Kestenbaum[136] and chaired by Dr Michael Sinclair, had already begun the planning process. At their 31st March 1993 meeting, and apparently based on the various working papers and guidance from the Office of the Chief Rabbi (OCR) (November 1992-June 1993) (supported by the JEDT staff), they had identified several tasks around: Lay Leadership; National Fund Raising Campaign; Educator Recruitment and Training; Lead Communities; Education for Jewish Pupils in Non-Jewish Schools; Research and Planning; Communal Events; Marketing; Liaison with Government. (In their document entitled 'Jewish Continuity: Tasks and Targets', 26th March 1993, they had gone further: "… the areas outlined below have been identified because they underpin the system as a whole and are the foundations for a vibrant educated community." It also pointed out: "There are issues that will pervade the activities of Jewish Continuity relating to a number of tasks, and these include: a) the importance of an holistic approach to education for all ages involving both the formal and informal arenas; b) the need for "outreach to the unaffiliated"; c) the centrality of Israel to Jewish life." It identified the following five years task headings and targets: Lay Leadership (500 activists); National Fundraising Campaign (£5 million per year from 10,000 donors); Educator Recruitment and Training (majority of Jewish Studies teachers to have a validation Certificate); five schools to offer intensive in-service training for their teachers (25 special merit teachers to develop their expertise and 15 bursaries per year for training in Jewish education); Lead Communities (5 will be established); Education for Jewish Pupils in Non-Jewish Schools (new coordinating body); every pupil will have opportunity to access some form of Jewish education; training for educators (15 educators deployed); Research and Planning (participation rates; educational outcomes; attitudes; deployment of educators; the economics of education); Communal Events (1 annual nationwide educational event and each lead community will organise 1 annual communal event); Marketing (promoting the image and activities of the organisation); Liaison with Government (panel of experts to co-ordinate community's relations with government on education).[137] [138] (They were later expanded under Michael Sinclair (Jewish Continuity Chair) and Clive Lawton (Jewish Continuity Chief Executive),

[136] Kestenbaum had drafted various documents in October/November 1992 and February 1993 that did preconfigure aspects of what became Jewish Continuity: however, what actually emerged appeared to lose his more structured approach of: understand the capacity, context and strengths; clearly define the role and tasks; create a 'fit for purpose' organisational framework to deliver the tasks which should be selected against clear criteria.

[137] At the Jewish Continuity Steering Committee (Minutes 14th July 1993), the following areas were later prioritised: Jewish Education in Non-Jewish Schools; Lay and Professional Leadership Training; National Fundraising Campaign; Curriculum Development; Lead Communities; Research and Planning. There were also further iterations.

and the Jewish Continuity Task Groups were formed around these areas.) Though clearly inspired by the Chief Rabbi, little further documentary evidence was found in the Jewish Continuity archives of detailed analysis and planning by the Sounding Board on how the vision of the Chief Rabbi was to be turned into a concrete and effective programme – though, of course, that is not to say that it did not take place. (Once Jewish Continuity became operational, Lawton and his Chair, Michael Sinclair, were determined to engage new, often younger and less experienced lay leaders in the planning and operational process but their own influence remained dominant.)

Sinclair's thinking requires further consideration. He articulated his own approach around the theory of 'disruptive technologies'[139] – essentially, innovative interventions that would change the existing way of conducting business. He stated that from the outset (i.e. his initial meetings with the Chief Rabbi) he framed Jewish Continuity as a dynamic change agent. Sinclair's strategy rejected what he described as the communal establishment way of doing things and implicitly (and often explicitly) deemed many of the existing major institutions and systems to have failed or at best to be sub-standard or ineffectual. Therefore, a 'disruptive intervention' was required in order to successfully impact upon the current condition – in business terms, to shake up the marketplace.[140] Furthermore, the need for a 'disruptive move' was considered to be urgent as results were deemed to be required within fifteen to twenty years. In his view, it was tactically desirable to deliberately bypass the

---

[138] This process may have been very loosely modelled on the Report of the Commission on North America (see under 'Mandel'), November 1990, p 48, in which they listed twenty three agenda items: the early childhood, elementary, high school and college age groups; young adults; family; adults; retired and elderly; supplementary and day schools; informal education; Israel experience programmes; integrated programmes of formal and informal education; the Hebrew language, with special initial emphasis on the leadership of the Jewish community; curriculum and methods; the use of the media and technology (computers, videos, etc.) for Jewish education; the Community – its leadership and its structures – as major agents for change in any areas; assistance with tuition; the physical plant (buildings, laboratories, gymnasia); a knowledge base for Jewish education (research of various kinds: evaluations and impact studies, assessment of needs, client surveys, etc.); innovation in Jewish education; additional funding for Jewish education. However, it was noted by the Office of the Chief Rabbi that the same approach could not simply be picked up and transferred to Britain without significant adaptation.

[139] "A disruptive technology or disruptive innovation is an innovation that helps create a new market and value network, and eventually goes on to disrupt an existing market and value network (over a few years or decades), displacing an earlier technology there. The term is used in business and technology literature to describe innovations that improve a product or service in ways that the market does not expect, typically first by designing for a different set of consumers in the new market and later by lowering prices in the existing market." www.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Disruptive_technology

[140] Sinclair quoted a number of business and historical precedents including the contrast between IBM and Apple or Microsoft, the ability of Sky with its greater manoeuvrability, structure and management ethos to make greater inroads into the market than the BBC, and, as older examples, the Lubavitch approach to the spiritual rescue of Soviet Jewry, or the impact of the printing press and religious learning on the religious establishment of the time.

existing establishment figures as they were considered to be part of the problem and that new lay and professional leadership needed to be introduced – capable, enthusiastic and energetic (and often younger) individuals driving change in the community and heralding a fresh approach to the intensification of Jewish life. Sinclair intended to adopt an action-oriented policy to shake things up.[141] He recognised it was not without risk and that enemies might be made and some wrong decisions might be taken, but the higher goal outweighed the risks. The focus was upon children and young people who would, in turn, influence their parents, who would then influence the community.[142] (Sinclair went further: he challenged the idea that the Fox/Mandelian approach (which he characterised as more of a management consultancy style over-emphasising the process of strategic planning) would have had anything like the same impact. However, it should be pointed out that in the research, though others used the language of change (e.g. working outside the system), none used the term 'disruptive technologies'[143] and none of the other senior Jewish Continuity leadership expressed the Jewish Continuity scheme in as blunt and assertive terminology. Sinclair argued that today, British Jewry is a vibrant community and emphasised the role that Jewish Continuity played in that revitalisation; or as he put it "the bomb that we launched at the start of Jewish Continuity" – almost twenty years on, Sinclair claimed that the impact was immensely significant. Unsurprisingly, the UJIA leadership made similar claims regarding their contribution to the revival of British Jewry – as have others. However, measuring and evaluating the impact of these initiatives was beyond the scope of this research and will be left to future researchers.)

In interview, Sinclair stated that he had set out timetabled measures of success for Jewish Continuity. (He recalled that he had discussed them on a Jewish radio programme and that they might have been reported by Ruth Gledhill – a Times Journalist.) He declared that his measures included:

[141] In various ways, Sinclair was responsible for introducing a number of new projects that he would claim disrupted the existing markets in a positive way e.g. he considered the Hebrew Reading Crash Course to be one such project example, and that his other work at the Saatchi Synagogue was to positively impact on other synagogues in terms of doing things differently and reaching more people in more creative and engaging ways e.g. programmes, role of women, etc..

[142] Sinclair was conscious of research that showed the damaging outcomes when there was dissonance between the school and the home i.e. that where school children attended a religious school but lived in a secular home they were liable to walk away at a more rapid rate than children attending a secular school and living in a secular home. Therefore, the policy had to have a more holistic impact across the community, and a focus on bridging any gaps between children and their parents – including the home environment.

[143] Importantly, Sinclair's approach was characterised as the application of 'disruptive technologies' in the notes from the Mandel Institute's Jewish Continuity Consultation, 1-2 October 1995) i.e. Sinclair had clearly used the term in the discussions around Jewish Continuity's role.

- seventy-five per cent of Jewish children in full-time education within twenty years;
- reverse the demographic trend of deaths over births;
- a measurable increase over ten years in consumption of Kosher food through retail outlets and restaurants;
- increased sales of Jewish books;
- aimed for significant majority of teenagers to go on Israel trips – a dramatic increase;
- increase informal adult education;
- increase training of Jewish Studies teachers.[144]

However, not all of these were included in the Jewish Continuity Strategic Plan (22nd December 1994); though the following was detailed in an April 1996 newspaper article (immediately after the release of the Wagner Review, March 1996) on the theme of 'change':

> For the individual this may mean buying a Jewish book, renting a Jewish video, subscribing to a Jewish magazine, learning to read Hebrew, going to shul more frequently, visiting Israel, getting involved in Jewish voluntary work, lighting candles on a Friday night, or all of the above and many more. …
> We are blessed with an abundance of dedicated volunteers for welfare, Israel, youth activities and much more.
> We have more children in full-time Jewish education than ever in our history. The JIA/Jewish Continuity partnership has promoted the Israel experience so effectively that we have a larger proportion of teenagers visiting Israel than any other diaspora community – nearly 50 per cent of 16 year-olds.
> Over 1,000 people have now signed up for Jewish Continuity's Hebrew Reading Crash Courses – first pioneered in the UK by the Jewish Learning Exchange and Rabbi Rashi Simon. Over 5,000 Jewish children in non-Jewish schools are being given more and better Jewish experiences through Jewish Continuity's JAMS and J-Link programmes. RESQUJE (another Jewish Continuity project at the Institute of Education) is training more Jewish Studies teachers than at any other time in the history of our community."
>
> Sinclair in *Shalom*,[145] fortnight ending 3rd April 1996

Sinclair's role will be revisited later.

Notwithstanding Lawton's plea for time for experimentation and learning, a major criticism levelled at Jewish Continuity was the delay in the emergence of a coherent strategic plan – after much pressure, it finally appeared by December 1994 (Jewish Continuity, 22nd

[144] See also: Sinclair, The Jewish News, 25th May 2007.
[145] A Jewish community newspaper supported by Sinclair.

December 1994). This appeared to have been the first detailed strategic thinking and planning document produced by Jewish Continuity; however, broad brush strokes were certainly clear before its emergence. A senior Jewish Continuity professional described the new organisation: "Jewish Continuity was to look at the totality of the education enterprise – bigger and bolder. We did not hold all the answers so we wanted to stimulate initiatives." Jewish Continuity characterised its own approach as 'to let a thousand flowers bloom' (Lawton) whilst its critics disparagingly referred to it as 'a scatter-gun approach' (several Interviewees). They were clearly interested in innovation and making an impact across the community. They were also committed to researching emerging questions such as the impact of Jewish cultural activities and the attitudes of young Jewish adults[146] and they thought they had the time for experimentation and institutional learning. They were also keen to establish an engagement with a number of pre-existing bodies (for example, the Union of Jewish Students). Essentially, the model was based upon:

- funding partner projects that were aligned with Jewish Continuity's priorities;
- working with partners to develop new projects that were similarly aligned;
- establishing new central projects to answer needs defined by Jewish Continuity;
- the Jewish Community Allocations Board (established May 1994) was later to respond to applications from the field on a cross-communal basis.

All of this took place guided by a spirit of 'shaking up the system'.

The Jewish Continuity operating model for grant-making was presented in a document dated 7th December 1993, in which it set out its allocations process for external applicants, indicating that the applications would be assessed by the Task Directorate to see if the proposals met Jewish Continuity criteria; if so, they would then be referred to the relevant Task Group who would engage with and evaluate the external projects alongside the internally generated projects (i.e. Jewish Continuity's own work: "proactive, reflecting its own educational/continuity agenda" and run either by an external organisation or by Jewish Continuity itself). The whole process and recommendations would then be reviewed by the Jewish Continuity Board. (Later plans were to suggest that up to eighty per cent of the funds – from significantly increased income – would be allocated to Jewish Continuity's own central programme.)

[146] Jewish Continuity commissioned a number of research reports in this area e.g. on Jewish Book Week and the UK Jewish Film Festival – see www.kahn-harris.org/

Jewish Continuity adopted a risk-taking, fresh attitude ('let a thousand flowers bloom' and 'light many fires') but with a projected £3 million annual budget this did not necessarily reassure some of its own more conservative stakeholders.[147] It was also clear that Sinclair and Lawton developed their own approach which was antithetical to the Mandel-Fox model that had helped inform earlier thinking on Jewish Continuity. This was eventually to set them on a strategic planning collision course with those who were loyal to the 'Mandelian' school, amongst others. Lawton became increasingly vulnerable to criticism for the absence of a coherent and comprehensive Jewish Continuity plan based upon a close analysis of the context and the challenge (Clive Marks[148]; Jewish Continuity, March 1996).[149] It is worth noting, however, that the organisational direction had, at least to some extent, been set in motion in advance of his arrival[150]; furthermore, he was operating in a stifling working environment that imposed demanding time pressures and extremely high levels of expectation – only some of which was of Jewish Continuity's own making. By mid-1994, Lawton was being pushed for a strategic plan: the JIA wanted something compelling and robust that they could work with[151]; and by this time, the advice from the Office of the Chief Rabbi appeared to stress a well-structured approach, clearly scoped, appropriate for the environment, with monitoring and evaluation and reflecting a systematic strategic planning approach and not just focussing on projects; they also seemed to favour working with what already existed – they also emphasised the importance of the process and of consultation.

Lawton finally secured approval for his 'Jewish Continuity – A Strategic Direction, 5 Year Goals and 1995 Programme' (22nd December 1994).[152] It was intended to be an internal working document and included the following components: "Mission – The mission of

[147] Clive Marks was an accountant by training with a preference for a more formal and traditional approach to organisational life – together with several other lay leaders. He was also clearly irritated and uncomfortable with having to participate in a Jewish Continuity leadership programme that included 'bonding activities' that he felt were more suitable for "a group of fourth formers"; he thought it needed to be on a higher level. Yet Lawton's alternative approach certainly attracted a new cohort of Jewish community leaders through more modern techniques and views on training and development. It reflected a cultural and generational clash.

[148] Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting Minutes, 27th March 1995: "Mr Clive Marks wished to stand down as Treasurer so that he had more time to concentrate on strategy and planning." Marks had been calling for the Mandel Institute's involvement since the early days of Jewish Continuity.

[149] Lawton himself claimed that Jewish Continuity was in fact more advanced than most other communal organisations in presenting their activities (e.g. through their newsletters, grants, etc.).

[150] Lawton appears to be first recorded in the Minutes as attending Jewish Continuity meetings in August 1993, and working limited part-time until January 1994.

[151] Lawton queried whether other organisations at that time (including the JIA) produced plans of their own that were open to scrutiny and revealing the details of exactly where and how their funds were deployed. Indeed he claimed that Jewish Continuity led the way in terms of planning and transparency.

[152] The plan had gone through several iterations and Sacks and Kestenbaum offered sound advice on strategy and structure – not always taken or understood.

Jewish Continuity is to secure the future of British Jewry by creating a vibrant community of proud, knowledgeable and committed Jews." It identified the 'Key Areas of intervention' as: "Targeting Key Personnel" (formal and informal professional educators and lay leadership); "Building Community" (centring on key institutions but focusing on youth as an early voluntary engagement); "Providing Gateways to Jewish Life" (using life cycle moments and, "given the right circumstances", cultural events); "Developing the 'Israel Experience'" ("recognises the centrality of Israel in Jewish life" and as "one of the most potent ways of enhancing Jewish identification amongst young people.").[153] It then went on to identify "Our Target Group" focusing on "The 13-35 age group: Teenagers; Students; Young Adults and Families with young children." Women were also noted as an addition to this category. The document then proceeded to discuss "The Role of Our Organisation: To work in collaboration with existing organisations and communal frameworks; To develop relationships between existing organisations and between new initiatives; To provide a consultancy and advice service to those considering pursuing work in the field of Jewish continuity; To provide resources and advice to the *Jewish Community Allocations Board*[154] to enable it to support programmes it judges will enhance the prospects of Jewish Continuity; To establish initiatives in fields that other pre-existing organisations cannot or have not pursued (perhaps because of issues of scale, scope, resources or risk) that might enhance the prospects of Jewish continuity; To involve the maximum number of lay people possible in working for and espousing the cause of Jewish continuity." (Jewish Continuity Strategic Plan, (22nd December 1994)). Amongst other good practice commitments, it strove "to be inclusive in respect of all Jews," and to be research-driven, committed to consultation and links "with existing communal agencies and leading experts in the field." The Paper then went on to the "1995 Programme" and listed its "Targets And 5 Year Goals" under the following headings: 1.Educator and Education Service Development; 2. Lay Leadership Development; 3. Community Development; 4. 'Israel Experience' Development; 5. Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools (JAMS); 6. Student and Young Adult Provision; 7. Outreach and Personal Development; 8. Research for Planning; 9. Development of Communal Dialogue (Jewish Continuity Strategic Plan (22nd December 1994)). Each category included 1994 Achievements and 1995 Targets and 5 Year Goals – it was an extremely ambitious

[153] These four 'Key Areas of Intervention' were described as 'strategic axes' and also set out by Sinclair (Jewish Chronicle, 16th December 1994, p 24).
[154] The Jewish Community Allocation Board had been set up in May-June 1994 to allow Jewish Continuity to fund across the wider cross-section of the religious community in the hope that it would not compromise the Chief Rabbi.

programme. Simon Rocker reported it in the *Jewish Chronicle* (December 1994, Community Chronicle): "Last year, nearly 70 per cent of the organisation's £1 million expenditure was distributed in the form of grants. The balance was spent on its own core projects and on administration. Mr Lawton expected that around £1 million of this year's scheduled £3 million budget would go in grants, which are decided by an independent allocations board. By 1997 [when they were hoping to reach £5 million], grants might take up 20 per cent of spending, while the lion's share would go on the organisation's own schemes." If this was indeed an accurate description of the intended direction, it indicated the operational framework that Lawton and his colleagues were building for Jewish Continuity.

Worms (the author of the Worms Report) reported in his autobiography that he had responded to Lawton (January 1995) concerning Jewish Continuity with his disappointment at the treatment of the JEDT; the deep concern that "Firing Shrapnel shots in the hope of hitting something is no substitute for a well-thought out structural plan"; the lack of support for "Existing organisations that work well but are hampered by lack of funds … First priority should surely be given to tried and tested educational establishments that need funds to carry out their work properly.";[155] "Jewish Continuity should not be seen as a purely Orthodox organisation."; and he awaited to see how they would prioritise the investment in the teaching profession. (Worms, 1996, p 253-256; Worms, Autumn 1996). (Marks had been similarly critical on strategic direction – as was the JIA and later Wagner (Jewish Continuity, March 1996). Ansell Harris, another communal grandee and critic, stated in the *Jewish Chronicle* (28th April, 1995, p 30): "It was not a plan. It did not define goals, priorities, or the means of achieving them." – he also pointed to the lack of accountability, budgetary indications and monitoring and evaluation procedures. As will be discussed in the next section, Lawton's practical implementation was to be blown dramatically off course.

4.1.4 United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA) – Vision and Planning

The UJIA set out its vision and mission statements:

[155] Kestenbaum's analysis was that "Reprioritising the community has to emerge from a shared vision and have an effective organisational execution of that vision." In his assessment, the vision was not sufficiently shared (and indeed Jewish Continuity had exacerbated communal organisational friction) and the execution was flawed.

> "Our vision is that future generations of Jews will be safe, proud and knowledgeable members of the Jewish People, committed to our unique heritage and to the eternity of Israel."
>
> "Our mission is to secure the future of the Jewish People. We pursue this mission by mobilising the UK Jewish community's support for
> (a) the *rescue* of Jews in need throughout the world, and their absorption into Israel; and
> (b) the *renewal* of Jewish life in Britain, and of our partnership with Israel."
>
> UJIA, 2001, p 10

The Vision statement borrowed language from Sacks and Jewish Continuity and also performed a balancing act as it set out to reassure those JIA supporters who were protective of their existing Israel programme; and, at the same time, incorporate the Jewish Continuity agenda within the new organisation. The name had to include 'Israel'. They adopted the 'United Jewish Israel Appeal' (UJIA),[156] and 'Rescue and Renewal'[157] as the sub-heading for the two sides of the programme. This was a successful exercise in terms of securing cooperation, and integrating the two interest groups under one umbrella. However, it was a compromise formula[158] that did not synthesise them behind a unitary mission and a single, integrated campaign – though at that stage it was probably not a realisable goal.[159] After the Jewish Continuity (and JIA) traumas of the previous three years, 'stability' was the overriding imperative for UJIA and 'compromise' was a sensible way to achieve it.

The formation process for UJIA carried a number of advantages over its Jewish Continuity predecessor:

- expectations had already begun to deflate (and were therefore more manageable);
- there was less time pressure;

[156] There were unsubstantiated rumours that at some future date there might be a move to promote renaming it as the 'United Jewish Appeal' but this never materialised.
[157] 'Jewish Continuity' as a name was already tarnished and 'Rescue and Renaissance' (a term used in America) was too clumsy. 'Renewal' was a term adopted in North America by radical Jewish liberals as an umbrella for their 'left' leaning Jewish activism in America but despite that association, it was 'Rescue and Renewal' that was considered to work best for British purposes as the designation for the two key intervention areas. UJIA Jewish Renewal effectively replaced Jewish Continuity. ('Revitalisation' was also considered.)
[158] For example, the phrase 'eternity of Israel' was open to interpretation to suit various constituencies.
[159] Nor has that been successfully achieved to date (the reformulation of the UJIA under the Israel Programme and the UK Programme both investing in young people and education (UJIA, 2005-7) has yet to achieve the unitary mission intended).

- the cross-communal issue had been eased via the merger agreement (and with the Chief Rabbi's greatly reduced public role);
- cross-communal conflict was again sharply intensified by the Hugo Gryn affair (August 1996-February 1997 and beyond), though it enhanced the sentiments of many that future tension was to be avoided in a spirit of communal harmony;
- the integration with the JIA brought fundraising capacity for both sides of the programme;
- the personalities of the leading players were more conciliatory and constructive and less confrontational (overwhelming Interviewee responses).
  (This assessment based upon interviews with the leading players.)

Kestenbaum and Jonny Ariel (Director of UJIA Jewish Renewal) were thereby afforded the relative luxury of using the latter half of 1996 to conduct their planning and consultation.[160] However, ideas and planning were still crystallizing well into 1997,[161] and in some cases, beyond.[162] (Kestenbaum was also faced with making a number of difficult redundancies early on in his role which impacted on staff morale. Nonetheless, he did manage to secure the confidence of the staff at a difficult time of transition.) Kestenbaum had in fact secured until the start of the 1998 campaign year (Autumn 1997) to complete the planning process and it was, to some considerable degree, in place by then. The process was conducted in a low key manner and, partly based upon the lessons of Jewish Continuity, they:

- deliberately set out to calm the animosity and tension, and manage expectations;
- took their time to analyse the issues and challenges with greater intellectual rigour and depth;
- directly addressed the cross-communal problem (without the Chief Rabbi complications and limitations);
- engaged with key stakeholders and opinion formers and consulted widely (this also secured more time to develop their plans);
- built alliances with strategic partners;
- drove hard on the need for a clear and more focused strategic plan;
- began to develop their operating framework.
  (This assessment based upon interviews with the leading players.)

Brian Kerner (the first UJIA Chair), Kestenbaum and Ariel entered into the organisation-planning and building process, and Ariel recalled his four greatest fears at that time as:

[160] Ariel reported that he "consulted with over a 1,000 people in small groups within the first six months." There was a further delay due to a serious football injury suffered by Kestenbaum at the start of the 1996-7 season.
[161] Documents were prepared for three crucial meetings: 'JIA Vision Setting' (20-21 January 1997, 'JIA Vision For Our Future' (June 1997) (which had been preceded by an Executive Retreat (May 1997)) and a draft 'UJIA Programme Book (The New Organisation Launch '98') (21st September 1997).
[162] The definitive planning document ('The Next Horizon') was not actually completed until December, 2000.

- the inability to create cross-communal calm;
- loss of the income stream from the wealthy JIA Israel-oriented donors;
- strategic dependence upon partner organisations and the consequences of them not being the "energising capacities" that Jewish Renewal needed them to be;
- the concern that the *Jewish Chronicle* might attack the new organisation.

They succeeded remarkably well on cross-communal calm; reasonably well on retaining the JIA income[163]; reservations grew concerning the partners after a number of disappointing attempts to engage them in change processes[164]; and the response of the *Jewish Chronicle* was indeed "astonishing" (as Michael Goldstein, a Jewish Continuity and senior UJIA lay leader described it – in terms of its non-critical approach) – though how much was successful media management and how much was a lack of newsworthiness will remain a moot point (it may have been that the Jewish Chronicle was simply disinterested).

Ariel adopted what he called an 'acupuncture approach': the metaphor was based upon identifying the pressure points to target in a situation of limited resources. Kestenbaum borrowed the same phrase: "An effective policy was more about acupuncture than surgery" and went on to recall a formative meeting he had early on in the planning process. He had been encouraged to consult with the head of the National Lottery who asked Kestenbaum how much money he had available annually, to which Kestenbaum replied: £2 million (as a hypothetical figure for the purposes of his discussion). He was then asked for 'the economics of the field' – the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of Jewish education in Britain – to which he replied: £50 million (again hypothetically for the sake of his discussion). The advice he was given was to the effect of: 'you cannot buy it – you can hardly even leverage. You are hugely dependent upon your capacity to influence; to invoke a sense of expertise; and to do a little bit of leveraging with your money' In fact, Kestenbaum probably underestimated the size of the 'GDP' so all the greater was the magnitude of the challenge.[165] Kestenbaum took from the meeting the understanding that:

[163] As the peace process in Israel increasingly failed, other organisations achieved significantly better growth in their Israel fundraising: for example, Magen David Adom (raising money for emergency medical services) dramatically increased its income (as a percentage, far beyond that achieved by the UJIA) – under the leadership of a fundraiser who had previously worked for the JIA.

[164] By February, 2003 (and earlier), Ariel – together with others – was cautiously raising the question of whether the partnership model needed to be reviewed. (9th February 2003, UJIA Jewish Renewal long term planning seminar, at which Ariel was the guest speaker.)

[165] JPR suggested that it was £95 million per annum JPR, 2001, p 13 – with perhaps £3 million available to the UJIA.

- they needed to construct a theory of organisational renewal with finance – albeit relatively limited – as leverage and influence (working within the system was necessary to maximise leverage);
- encourage Ariel to be vision-driven (learned from Mandel/Fox);
- develop capacity-building and partnership-building capability;
- assemble a strong organisational infrastructure (including expertise).

There was clearly an intense level of intellectual rigour being applied to the task of UJIA planning compared to that of Jewish Continuity – though UJIA was working in a more clement climate.[166]

Ariel only fully completed the planning process with the publication of 'The Next Horizon' (UJIA, 2001) – the UJIA strategic plan – though he not unreasonably maintained that much of it was in place by late 1997-early 1998; Jon Boyd (who began working for UJIA as the drafting of the plan commenced) summed it up as: "I think it was the result of four years work."[167] [168] Ariel applied the following four questions early on in the planning process:

> Question 1: identify what will success look like in twenty years time? – three years was too limiting;
> Question 2: Where do we intervene in the current reality? – from where we are now to where we are going (as defined in the first question); for example, which key institutions and axes – people and programme; (Jewish Continuity had been too wide);
> Question 3: What does this organisation have to be? What is its role amongst the various acupuncture points? Its nature, role, unique added value, its 'culture'; its interaction with other organisations. Its ideological stance; what is the identity of this outfit in its deepest sense?
> Question 4: What do you do first? The first phase was profoundly affected by where we are now. There would be a second and a third phase. It needed to have professionals, research, money and so on in place.
>
> Ariel, Interview

He also reported that they devoted huge energy to shaping the organisation; "how it thought about itself; learned about the field; fundraised, publications …"

[166] Kestenbaum also thought that if UJIA was to consist of funding without expertise it would be far less effectual. Michael Wegier, a later successor to Ariel, was of the view that without the funding, the UJIA Jewish Renewal expertise would only be requested by partners in limited and selective ways.
[167] It is also worth pointing out that the UJIA plan was developed during an era of optimism for Israeli-Arab peace – by the time the Plan was published the peace process was falling apart.
[168] One commentator asked whether the document comprised reflections and a summary of thoughts and lessons from the first four years, as much as, or more than, a plan for the next three years.

Ariel was able to draw upon the support of his father, Professor Derek Pugh, a specialist in the study of organisations, and Ariel later worked closely with the ubiquitous Professor Leslie Wagner (an education specialist) and Tony Danker, a lay leader who was employed professionally at the McKinseys management consultancy firm and, according to Boyd, was used to challenge and critique 'The Next Horizon' (UJIA, 2001).[169] During late 1996 and early 1997, Ariel assembled a small planning group of 'insider' professionals with substantial Jewish education experience and expertise. He also consulted with a range of other groups and individuals. [170] In 1997 and 1998, he sent groups of senior Jewish educational leaders on professional development seminars to the Mandel School in Jerusalem – programmes like this all contributed to an organic planning process (as well as achieving 'buy-in' and cooperation from partners). Ariel was also deliberate in "pushing the quality of discourse to transform the quality of Jewish education" and professionals felt more valued and elevated, and lay leaders were similarly engaged. (Ariel's role is discussed in more detail under 'Leadership Roles and Personalities'.) In contrast with Lawton, there was far less emphasis on experimentation and the exploration of 'causation' and more reliance on what was already known to work and what would generally enhance community education provision. (On a wider UJIA canvas, they were also addressing the fundraising challenges and communications plan.)

Ariel and Kestenbaum were instructed by Kerner to review and reassess all aspects of the programmes and activities of both the JIA and Jewish Continuity. There were a number of residual Jewish Continuity projects that had to be addressed: for examples, the Hebrew Reading Crash Course (HRCC) was to be retained, as was Pikuach,[171] Jewish Activities in

[169] Danker introduced Ariel to 'The Three Horizons' planning model: what is currently being done; what new areas are being launched; and what is being tested now that will be the core business of the organisation in a few years time – the name 'The Next Horizon' was loosely drawn from this formulation. Danker felt that "'The Three Horizons' framework was appropriate for a growth situation" – they did not realise that they were not going to secure a significant growth budget. He also felt that it was a suitable model for what was an 'addition' versus 'substitution' plan – was it about adding new programme elements and/or substituting existing ones? (Danker was a former Chairperson of the Union of Jewish Students (UJS) (1993-4) and had also worked in the Office of the Chief Rabbi (1994-6).)

[170] During the drafting of 'The Next Horizon', Ariel consulted across the main religious bodies to establish what came to be titled 'The Ten Commitments' (UJIA, 2001, p 8) – individual acts that would have resulted from successful UJIA Jewish Renewal interventions. Its significance was political in so far as it was accepted across the mainstream Jewish religious spectrum. However, it was never actually deployed as a practical measure and, indeed, it would have been extremely difficult to have done so.

[171] Pikuach (translated as 'supervision') is the Jewish Education inspection service and was a joint project between the Board of Deputies of British Jews and UJIA. "Pikuach is the UK Jewish community's response to the Government's requirement to ensure that denominational religious education is systematically inspected under the framework set down by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted)." (Board of Deputies of British Jews, 2007, p 2).

Mainstream Schools (JAMS) was to have a reduced budget but RESQUJE[172] and a number of other projects were to be run down. In addition, there was a complex process of protracted negotiation with the Jewish Agency for Israel (JAFI). Though UJIA Jewish Renewal planned to take over the Jewish Programme and Materials Project (JPMP) (cross-communal centre for Informal Jewish Education) and Israel Experience (educational travel) both from JAFI, there was an extended period of patient manoeuvring over a period of a couple of years as they gradually engineered full recalibration of management and control – eventually formalised in August 1998 (UJIA-JAFI Agreement (August 7th 1998) – under which JAFI provided administrative and financial services and management, with its agreement required in a number of areas; and UJIA Jewish Renewal was to have "functional responsibility" which meant educational professional management and direction. It was perhaps fortuitous timing that JAFI was also changing direction – it was itself facing a financial crisis in a changing environment. A local senior Jewish Agency professional accused it of "abdicating educational responsibility" in Britain, though in reality its resources were over-stretched, and the British experience was to serve as something of a precedent for future change across its worldwide operations. Finally, Jewish Renewal's Educational Leadership Department was only established some time later than the other two departments – it took longer to develop and there was a lack of a suitable professional to lead it. The post of Director of that Department was advertised in November 1997, but only commenced in September 1998.[173] UJIA Jewish Renewal then had in place its departments for Informal Jewish Education, Israel Experience, Educational Leadership and a small Research and Development Department. The focus was on young people (and those who worked with them) – but not exclusively so.

Ariel acknowledged that these were "broad strokes and that it did not all work out as neatly." He explained that the planning was not immediately formulated as the final "programmatic initiative" but that the "big frame"[174] was set and the work of building political allegiances took longer than estimated and delayed the 'The Next Horizon'. Of course, the other 'building blocks' were already previously in existence (within JAFI). There was clearly an

[172] RESQUJE – Research for Quality in Jewish Education: "Thus the aim of the Unit was to develop a professional community of educators who have the capacity to contribute to ensuring meaningful Jewish continuity in the UK." (Institute of Education, 1995, p 1) – but it was not working effectively.
[173] Philip Skelker had previously been Head Teacher at Carmel College (Jewish boarding school). The College had closed and he had taken up a temporary position teaching English at Eton. His commencement in the UJIA role (he was appointed March 1998) had been delayed due to a serious injury his son had suffered in Israel.
[174] Including: what later appeared as 'Our Theory of Change' in The Next Horizon (UJIA, 2001): nurturing visionary frameworks; mobilising effective leadership; cultivating upbeat culture.

extended planning process that continued as the organisational structure and programme was already being implemented. Ariel was able to construct a situation within which he was able to promote things that were already being done at the same time as highlight future plans. The actual writing of the 'The Next Horizon' appeared to have taken at least eight to ten months of intensive work (Jon Boyd Interview). This was a very different timeframe and environment to that faced by Lawton at Jewish Continuity.

Interviewees were asked to assess the outcome of this planning process. However, only a few were able to respond on a strategic level. Professor Leslie Wagner differentiated between a 'strategic council' and a 'strategic authority'. The former he described as deliberative through research, building a wider picture, creating an overview of what is needed while the latter is an implementing body – but, he added, no single community organisation would be able to play the role of an 'authority'. He saw UJIA Jewish Renewal as trying hard to be strategic, focusing upon its three big priority areas of Israel Experience, Informal Jewish Education and Educational Leadership. He felt that this was a better approach in which UJIA Jewish Renewal was able to establish priorities and support these areas financially – to make a difference where funding could make a difference. Though he also noted that "there was a lot of planning for the future … but not enough focus on delivery in the first three years as there might have been" – and he held that they should have done more. Tony Danker pointed out that UJIA Jewish Renewal had the advantages of being the second iteration (after Jewish Continuity) and identified some of its defining features as: it was a 'strategic enabler'; able to focus upon what matters, what has impact; fund what works; form partnerships with big communal institutions; fact driven; thoughtful professionals; benefiting from the JIA partnership. Leonie Lewis saw it as an opportunity to reshape education – both formal and informal – and create a cadre of highly trained, literate, Jewish professionals and a 'professionalised' lay leadership in a well-structured framework, trying to map out a strategy for the Jewish community in Britain. Professor Anthony Warrens suggested that: "If Jewish Continuity was deemed to have failed, then it needed to look different – even if only cosmetically so. The journey of travel was the same; stylistic change was needed. The objectives were the same: Schools, Israel Experience, Informal Jewish Education." Two Interviewees defined the two iterations evolving essentially along a single continuum – the development of one process with two iterations – if not quite one organisational framework. However, rather more Interviewees emphasised substantive differences between the two in areas including:

- the approach of their personnel;
- the strategic planning process;
- the scope of their ambition;
- the style of operation;
- their use of funds;
- their engagement with partners;
- their attitude to risk and change.

It seems reasonable to claim that overwhelming stylistic variances alone set the two iterations apart and that other substantive differences confirmed it: there was clearly a significant change of direction in the second iteration – even if it might be argued that the broad, fundamental vision was essentially the same and that there was overlap in intervention areas.

4.2 Organisation and Implementation

In this context, 'Organisation and Implementation' relates to the organisational and operational platform (including structure, management and decision-making) and the principles, processes and mechanisms for implementing the programme.

4.2.1 Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT)

The JEDT was funded by a small group of wealthy communal philanthropists. It stated: "Our purpose is to heighten interest and substantially increase support for Jewish education throughout the community. The funding emphasis is on improving and expanding facilities in four major areas – schools, teacher training, resources and innovative projects." (JEDT leaflet (n.d.). As an independent Trust instigated by Jakobovits, they were answerable only to themselves (though they did also employ professionals to run it and provide advice). They were not acting under the direct communal public spotlight and had the finance which they had raised internally; they needed no other mandate than that bestowed upon them by the Chief Rabbi and by the fact that they were spending their own funds. By preserving a low profile, their activities did not attract wider communal debate. The JEDT was also a product of its time:

- spiritual leadership was treated with greater deference allowing Jakobovits more latitude;
- the wealthy philanthropists were largely unchallenged in this area of work;
- other communal forces were yet to reach the point at which they were able to influence and affect developments (for examples the Jewish media[175] and the non-Orthodox and Strictly Orthodox movements).

Finestein also noted that it was an independent OCR initiative – not United Synagogue – and it included Trustees and Patrons who were Progressive synagogue members (Finestein, 1999, p 281).

[175] Jakobovits also had issues with the Jewish Chronicle (Bermant, 1990, p 90) under the editorship of William Frankel; though things improved somewhat for Jakobovits under Geoffrey Paul, who took over as Editor in 1977.

The degree to which the growth in Jewish schooling was at the instigation of Jakobovits's initiative, as opposed to the independent demands and preferences of Jewish parents and changes in government policy, is debatable and beyond the purview of this research, though 'parent power' and government intervention certainly had a very considerable independent impact.[176] It is fair to say that the vision set out in 'Let my people know' (Jakobovits, 1971) was at least partially realised during his term in office (and significantly extended during the office of his successor) – schools were built and were filled and people did begin to engage with his ideas, though not on the scale he had anticipated.[177] Worms's assessment of the JEDT was: "That body in its limited way was successful." (Worms, December 1996). However, though the mainstream schools, particularly at secondary level, have generally produced impressive results in secular studies, the same cannot be established for Jewish Studies in those schools nor the influence of their Jewish ethos – the case for the positive Jewish impact (short term and long term and in multiple aspects) of a Jewish secondary school education remains contested.[178]

4.2.2 Jewish Continuity

In sharp contrast to the JEDT, Jewish Continuity was intentionally launched with much

[176] The growth in Jewish school attendance during the Jakobovits and more particularly Sacks administrations (for numbers, see Jakobovits 1971, p 31 (12,478); JEDT 1992, p 63 (16,005); JLC 2007, p 51 (26,470)) is due to a number of factors: accelerated demographic growth amongst the Strictly Orthodox (where there is also total attendance in Jewish schools); favourable government policy in support of building faith schools; the concerns and perceptions of mainstream parents to find the best secular education – with Jewish secondary schools in particular providing a remarkably strong and compelling option for those in the comprehensive sector (e.g. strong league table performances); parental concerns to find a safe and secure school environment for their children (less bullying, more middle class intake, etc); the opportunity to learn with other Jewish children. For some, there was also the attraction of the Jewish education provided, though more were also comfortable with a general Jewish ethos – as long it was not too overbearing. (See earlier summary for sources.)

[177] Jakobovits stated at the Sacks Inauguration (September 1991): "The thanksgiving is increased by a particular joy. During this final year of office, concluding today, two new Jewish day-schools have been approved, while another opened earlier this year, already operating with such singular success. I refer to Immanuel College, so magnanimously named in my honour. These three schools will almost exactly complete the educational development programme for new schools announced some 20 years ago. Much remains to be done. But for much we have reason to rejoice and be profoundly thankful." (Persoff, 2002, p 276). It was not quite as 'complete' as he described.

[178] See earlier discussion under 'British Jewry in the Context of this Research'. Undoubtedly, there is serious need for intensive longitudinal and other research on the impact of a Jewish school education. Unfortunately, Miller S (1988)'s research into the effects on Jewish identification of Jewish Secondary school attendance during 1985 has, for too long, remained something of a singular exercise. However, as previously noted, it is understood that a longitudinal study has been set up for the new cross-communal Jewish Community Secondary School (JCoSS), which opened in Barnet, London, September, 2010 (and other schools may follow this research direction).

fanfare and a very high public profile.[179] The initial communications messages were designed to be attention-grabbing and starkly emphasised the threat of assimilation facing the community. The Jewish Continuity leadership (led by Sinclair) claimed to be "a breath of fresh air" behind a transformative endeavour – an alternative look and a new approach as compared to the traditional leadership and the pre-existing institutions within the often conservative community. It was challenging and direct – confrontational in the eyes of some. This set the scene for Jewish Continuity's mode of operational delivery. It aspired to be transparent, modern, high profile, innovative, experimental, non-conformist, counter-cultural and exciting; an organisation with an edgy and contemporary feel, full of promise for the future – it made sense as a model but the practical roll out ran into multiple difficulties. Furthermore, when a new organisation launches with such energy, enthusiasm and purpose – attracting attention, raising expectations and agitating other players in the field – it sets itself a very high bar of attainment. As will be discussed, Jewish Continuity was to fail in balancing promise with performance. This was due in part to unforeseen external circumstances but also as a result of internal shortcomings.

It consciously worked to engage a wider range of lay leaders and not just the philanthropic elite.[180] The leadership wanted to place the organisation "outside the system" and this was both a strength and weakness. Its Chair was also an 'outsider' and it had an assertively nonconformist Chief Executive; moreover, the Chief Rabbi had also, according to Kestenbaum, "positioned his projects outside the system." After all, it was about achieving change beyond the existing establishment infrastructures in an attempt to harness energy through decentralisation – this also included an attempt to position Jewish Continuity at 'arm's length' from the Office of the Chief Rabbi. Its operating framework was to complement its aspirations for communal transformation. Helena Miller, a respected Progressive Jewish education professional at the time, described it as "an energising and positive time with a lot of potential, bringing education to the forefront. It was a bit non-specific and not quite sure where it was going: support existing agencies? fundraising? expertise? grant-giving body? But a time of promise: good ideas could apply for a grant – a time of possibilities." Jewish Continuity was very ambitious with an upbeat culture, and, initially at least, much self-confidence.

[179] Jewish Continuity contracted the HYPE! public relations company to deliver their marketing and promote their brand.

[180] In its engagement of people, it appeared in some ways to be seeking to create a 'movement' for Jewish Continuity (Shire) (indeed, this may have been part of Sinclair's thinking).

Their London Belsize Park offices made a statement: professionals could meet in decent surroundings and feel valued. Leonie Lewis, a respected Orthodox community professional, observed that "It was a hub; with physically smart offices for a Jewish community organisation. It 'walked the walk' and created the right ambience – it felt more professional. It also had a 'buzziness' to it. … Jewish Continuity was more 'of the time' – 'of the present' – it was seemingly more relevant." Of course, this was also in contrast to the experiences of most other communal educational agencies which were, at that time, experiencing sometimes debilitating, recession-driven financial pressure.[181] A senior community educator shared this paraphrased view of Jewish Continuity: one could drive past late at night and the lights would still be on; they were obviously having a great time and the rest of us were rather jealous. Undoubtedly, Jewish Continuity had achieved its early goal of setting the desired tone and creating the intended environment: education was being valued – even if some of the existing community educators and their institutions felt alienated and excluded.

In early 1993, as noted above, the Sounding Board led by Sinclair and then followed by the Jewish Continuity Board and Executive, commenced work on the structure and mode of operation of the new organisation – they had already identified several 'task force areas' (what later became the basis for the 'Task Groups') and part of this operating framework was in place ahead of Lawton's appointment. However, Sinclair and Lawton then drove it forward. From the outset, Lawton openly asserted that he favoured an initially broad approach because "people did not fully understand what 'creating community' meant" and he needed space to experiment. This led to wide variations in the type and quality of projects, and as the Progressive community professional, Michael Shire**,** observed: "the Besht Tellers Theatre company at King Solomon High School was fabulous; the puppet theatre company was a joke."[182] In addition to the more mainstream grants, this captured the initial assessments of the early Jewish Continuity funding programme – though the cross-communal complications were also immediately exposed. However, Jewish Continuity also supported a range of pre-existing programmes that were felt to be in alignment with the Jewish Continuity agenda (for examples, the Union of Jewish Students, Spiro Institute and Aish HaTorah all received grants in the first Jewish Continuity Project Awards (April 1994)) – there was no doubt that Jewish Continuity also allocated significant funds to established organisations.

[181] Harry Freedman reported on how the Assembly for Masorti Synagogues (AMS) was under financial pressure, and the Orthodox United Synagogue was also facing serious budget cuts (Kalms Report, 1992).
[182] It was a reference to a small Jewish Continuity grant that drew some derision – Lawton continued to express amazement that such a minor low cost project could, in his view, draw such a hugely disproportionate reaction.

(Funding to organisations such as Limmud was also later to increase significantly.) However, there were no non-Orthodox allocations in the first round – none had applied as they were still unclear as to Jewish Continuity's cross-communal policy and approach.

It was legitimate for Sinclair and Lawton to challenge the communal status quo. The problem was that in so-doing, there was a threat to the integrity and standing of the new organisation. Perhaps if enough funds had been available to placate various key stakeholders and/or to show the wider community the scale of the investment, then they may have been able to protect their challenging mode of operation. Alternatively, or in addition, if they could have contrived to bring more of the existing stakeholders with them – however antithetical they may have been to the new Jewish Continuity operating ethos – then maybe they would have developed a more stable platform. In practice, however, they did not have enough funding to 'buy the field' and they also managed to alienate too many stakeholders. This was compounded by the fact that the Task Groups became unwieldy – Jewish Continuity was soon running away with itself.[183] Nonetheless, the scope of the Task Group work[184] was inspiring and capable of capturing the public imagination and, taken together, the Groups' foci constituted a composite design for communal renewal – unfortunately, it was just not deliverable.[185] It was over-ambitious and too big a management, tracking and financing challenge – a lesson for UJIA. Of course, the cross-communal, financial and organisational complications were to impact both rapidly and dramatically.

Many Interviewees and others drew attention to other Jewish Continuity weaknesses. As early as October 1994, Felix Posen (a secular culturalist) wrote cuttingly: "What a let-down it has been so far. Continuity is nothing but a redistribution committee, handing out funds mainly to the Orthodox and to those whose grandchildren are, in any event, likely to remain Jews." He added: "The Jewish Continuity script alienates those it needs to reach who are on

[183] However, in terms of its day to day operations, the archives revealed that the administrative processes within Jewish Continuity were fundamentally sound. Jenni Frazer, a Jewish Chronicle journalist referred to Clive Lawton's leadership approach as "the somewhat more happy clappy style of Continuity" (Jewish Chronicle, 21st December 1996, p 9) but in fact the new UJIA Jewish Renewal leadership acknowledged that they had inherited an internally well-run, well-documented organisation with administrative systems in place (Ariel Interview). Furthermore, Jewish Continuity was more transparent than most in disclosing its funding decisions.

[184] By February 1996, Jewish Continuity was operating across the following areas: Arts, Media and Culture; Bursary Committee; Community Development; Formal Education; Informal Education; Israel Experience Development; JAMS (Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools); Leadership Development; Outreach (and Adult Education); Research for Planning; Students and Young Adults. (Jewish Continuity Connects Newsletter, February 1996).

[185] Task Group members are listed in the Wagner Review (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 61).

the periphery." (Jewish Chronicle, 14th October, 1994, p 28). Jonny Ariel noted that by December 1994, Jewish Continuity was coming under huge pressure to deliver: "Learning of the one hundred plus projects funded by Jewish Continuity and the JIA, you had to ask: does it all make sense?" Lira Winston described it thus: "There were too many people, too many projects and too many ideas across the whole community – it was not manageable in the long term." Tony Danker described it as having "suffered from a lack of focus." Another commentator gave a more critical and overly-severe assessment: "as an agency it had the fundamentally right agenda but doing it completely the wrong way." Jewish Continuity had dramatically over-promised and under-delivered – even if everything else had gone according to plan they would have needed massive resources and capacity to deliver successfully.

Clive Marks was the first Jewish Continuity Treasurer (and one of its major funders through his trusteeship at the Lord Ashdown Charitable Settlement) and he was later to emerge as the informal 'leader of the opposition' within Jewish Continuity. Marks was uncomfortable with the organisation: "The great and the good were there doing their duty; each had their own area of expertise but no one could really register protest; the organisation creaked. It felt like a golf club of the good and the great but they did not truly understand the structure of education." Marks also commented: "Small amounts of money were spread too widely … Jewish Continuity was over-reaching." As Jewish Continuity's difficulties increased, Marks continued to persuade Sinclair about the need for the involvement of the Mandel Institute and its Director, Professor Seymour Fox. Marks also persuaded Sir Trevor Chinn (JIA) to become involved with the planning problem and Fox and Annette Hochstein were eventually brought over to Britain.[186] Lawton clearly resented this intervention and felt he was being obstructed and undermined ('by the Americans living in Jerusalem telling us what to do').[187] Marks felt very strongly that Jewish Continuity needed proper strategic planning which he considered to be missing. He became increasingly critical of what he saw as strategic mismanagement (in addition to increasing concerns about the financial situation) and eventually resigned (May 2005) – he was later to claim vindication after the publication of the Wagner Review (Jewish

[186] Worms also claimed: "I am glad that after much pressure on my part, Professor Seymour Fox has, at long last, been invited to advise on the problem." (Worms, 1996, p 255).

[187] Lawton reported that he was not aware of Fox's initial influence when he took the job. There may also have been a degree of subsequent frustration from the Fox camp supporters that it was not a 'Mandel/Fox Fellow' (or someone equally sympathetic) running Jewish Continuity. Lawton was not a 'Fellow' and with hindsight and after a damaging experience he ruefully even suggested that perhaps the Chief Rabbi should have appointed one. A 'Mandel-shaped' chip grew on Lawton's shoulder – it was perhaps understandable but it was there nonetheless.

Continuity, March 1996).[188]

From a Jewish Continuity perspective, one insider also noted that applicants for funds were becoming upset as there was nowhere near enough money to go round. "There was a finite sum and we had to make choices: we acted with honourable intentions but could not support everyone." In fact, their 'intentions' were weighted in favour of a cross-communal imbalance (discussed later) and also an apparent bias away from certain pre-existing organisations. However, they were 'honourable'; but there was clearly mounting criticism from both inside and out.

Worms summarised Fox's views (regarding Jewish Continuity): "He explained to the London meeting that they did not have a strategic concept, that their multifarious plans were far too ambitious to implement with the limited finance and personnel available, that 80 different grants to 80 different organisations could not be properly monitored and that they had to decide whether they were a charity which allocated money or an enabling organisation or a hands-on body which would be active in the field with its own staff." (Worms, 1996, p 256).[189] Lawton was of the view that Jewish Continuity was a hybrid and did not need to fit into any singular operational model prescribed by Fox. Under his own charismatic leadership, Lawton had set out to experiment and to develop research to explore how to achieve both 'community' and 'continuity'. Together with Michael Sinclair, he was also clear that the existing structures needed shaking up and a fresh approach was vital. However, he originally thought he had more time to roll out his experimental and developmental model.

Jewish Continuity's operational framework was overrun by the pace of developments:

- the level of communal expectation generated by Sacks and by Jewish Continuity itself could not be met;
- the cross-communal issues and the role of the Chief Rabbi created apparently insurmountable difficulties (Jewish Continuity, March 1996);
- the Jewish Continuity-JIA agreement (July and October, 1994) and its consequences dictated the finances available;[190]

[188] Posen also launched a stinging attack on what he saw as the failings and spurious claims made by Jewish Continuity (Posen, Spring 1997).
[189] See Wagner Review, Appendix 8: Mandel Institute Seminar 1-2 October 1995, Main Points Arising (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 79).
[190] See Sacks's understated summary of the impact of the JIA funding partnership: "Less than two years old, still learning to walk, Jewish Continuity was being asked to run. This imposed strains." (Jewish Chronicle, 29th March 1996, p 30).

- the Task Groups required unmanageable levels of professional maintenance and also lacked adequate competencies;
- the clamours for a strategy railroaded Lawton's more long-term experimentation and 'learning organisation' approach;
- new deadlines were set and time pressures grew and they were incompatible with both Jewish Continuity's own timeframe and the structures and processes in place;
- Lawton and Sinclair could not contain Clive Marks's increasingly scathing attacks, nor the Mandel critique (1st and 2nd October 1995), nor the concerns of the Office of the Chief Rabbi, nor the JIA's rapidly growing uneasiness.

Lawton could not control nor manage all of these competing forces (Jewish Continuity, March 1996). Whilst it was fair to say that there were several developments beyond his control, including the cross-communal issues, the financial arrangement with the JIA and Sinclair's forceful application of his 'disruptive technologies' doctrine, Lawton was certainly adding to his own difficulties:

- he had not established sufficient allies amongst key stakeholders, including partners;
- his style was challenging for too many;
- he was not able to generate and promote a compelling, coherent strategic approach.

Success in planning and operational delivery requires responsiveness to constantly changing circumstances, and tactical prowess is also a function of nimble adaptation – Lawton and Jewish Continuity were overwhelmed and lost the initiative; other forces were increasingly determining the direction of travel.

4.2.3 The Jewish Continuity-Joint Israel Appeal (JIA) Relationship

In July, 1994, the Joint Israel Appeal (JIA) agreed a funding arrangement whereby it offered to fundraise on behalf of Jewish Continuity (JIA-Jewish Continuity Press Release, July 8th 1994) – the two organisations were later to merge. Therefore, it is important to understand what was happening inside the JIA at that time. The JIA was often disparagingly regarded by its critics as a 'rich man's club' at the centre of community leadership. A leading, senior JIA figure observed that "membership bought status and dignity … and also bought the right to lead." These were often generous donors who were donating their personal wealth for the benefit of Israel, the Jewish People and their community (and also, invariably, to non-Jewish causes) – and though membership of the 'club' may have had benefits, they were under no

obligation to part with their own money. (This was a familiar pattern of philanthropic leadership across the community.) Furthermore, the major donors coupled their giving with a community-wide appeal within a unitary fundraising campaign framework – on that basis, it was a community operation.

The 1993 Israeli-Arab peace process, economic progress in Israel and the welcome improving situation of Jews in distress around the world increasingly militated against the fundraising efforts of the JIA (in addition to the recession of the time). It was certainly not about to collapse but it was clearly a tired organisation in need of an overhaul – and this was the case even before the emergence of Jewish Continuity. A critic of the JIA suggested that it was successful as a 'money collecting agency' in times of crisis, rather more than as a 'fundraising campaign' that attracted people with an engaging message and engendering a consistent commitment through financial support. Another senior JIA insider conceded that "to an extent JIA was losing its purpose." In addition, below the surface there was an emerging split within the ranks of the JIA: on one side was the 'Israel first' lobby and on the other, those who emphasised a broader agenda that recognised a symbiotic relationship between supporting Israel and Jewish education in the Diaspora. The split was to be exposed over the later JIA fundraising relationship with Jewish Continuity and over their eventual merger.

The dominant individual within the JIA at that time was its long-serving Chair, Sir Trevor Chinn, a wealthy and successful businessperson and a towering community philanthropic figure with a strong personal presence. He was a widely respected and highly-regarded Jewish community leader and a passionate supporter of Israel and Jewish education (as well as other causes), with an insightful understanding of the Jewish world. Several JIA colleagues suggested that he was undoubtedly an outstanding and respected lay leader, though on occasion somewhat autocratic in his leadership style. He had always been committed to Jewish-Israel education in the Diaspora as a way to strengthen both Israel and the Jewish People and the bond between them. Kestenbaum reported that the peace process that began publicly in September, 1993, reinforced Chinn's view that the JIA could no longer remain the same. Noting JIA's involvement in Israel, Chinn continued: "But you can't look at the national priorities of the Jewish people today without recognising that Jewish continuity in the diaspora is a major element." (Jewish Chronicle, 15th July 1994, p 1). Finestein (2002, p 37) quoted Chinn as declaring in 1994 his support for "a new strand of Zionism, concerned

with the means for the cultivation of an informed and transmissible Jewish awareness." Finestein (2002, p 43) summarised the significance of the transformation: "The decisions of the Joint Israel Appeal in 1994 to enter into partnership with Jewish Continuity, and later to enter the merger, reflect the final virtual consensus that the needs of Israel and of the Diaspora are complementary. These events in Anglo-Jewry had a wider significance than domestic only."

In reality, the JIA was already a significant funder of both Jewish and Israel education in Britian. It had supported the JEDT, various schools, the Jewish-Zionist youth movements and Jewish students, amongst others (for example, the JIA Board Meeting Minutes, 14th December 1993, described a programme of extensive annual allocations for 1994). However, it provided this support in a deliberately low key manner. It also worked closely with the Jewish Agency for Israel (JAFI) (including through its London Education Department office) which was its Israel-based partner – JIA was technically part of the fundraising arm of JAFI.[191] It was wrong to suggest that the JIA was a 'failed brand' (as one Interviewee described it) but, as already noted, attitudes towards Israel were shifting and it was increasingly out of kilter with new realities and a new generation of prospective donors seeking greater transparency and meaning (JIA Board Meeting Minutes, 13th May 1993) – the JIA itself was sufficiently self-aware to have been continuing to discuss the issues at its Board meetings (14th December 1993; 21st April 1994; 2nd June 1994).

The emergence of Jewish Continuity was clearly seen as a potential threat to JIA fundraising on the grounds that donors would be more likely to switch their 'Israel giving', rather than their 'welfare giving', to 'education giving.' Many JIA funders were also sympathetic to an ideological symmetry between support for Israel and support for Jewish-Israel education – raising further concerns about future donor trends and the potential appeal of Jewish Continuity. The new Jewish Continuity body began to make an impact in the community[192] and JIA uneasiness increased (there were already concerns over its fundraising capacity (JIA Board Meeting Minutes (9th March 1993) and talks with Jewish Continuity were recorded as early as 9th February 1994).

[191] Part of *Keren Ha'Yesod* (literally 'Foundation Fund'), the fundraising arm of the Jewish Agency for Israel.
[192] The striking (and expensive) Jewish Continuity advertising campaign in the Jewish Chronicle (and elsewhere) – commencing December 1993 – certainly added to the impact, as well as the powerful voice of the Chief Rabbi.

In July 1994, after several months of discussion,[193] the JIA agreed to a startling arrangement with Jewish Continuity to raise £12 million for it over three years[194] but it certainly did not have the money in reserve; it obviously felt that it would be able to collect donations by encouraging existing donors to give more and by attracting new donors. As one JIA stalwart and Jewish Continuity sympathiser put it: "momentum would be generated and more people would join the 'giving club'."

From Chinn's perspective, it looked like a responsible move. He probably calculated that it broadened JIA's appeal beyond its tired Israel campaign and that it would be able to present the responsible position of avoiding the duplication of Jewish Continuity having to build its own fundraising capacity – it would also bypass a potential conflict over competitive fundraising.[195] It represented a paradigm shift that many felt captured the moment in the changing realities of the Jewish world. (Finestein described it thus: "The readiness of the Joint Israel Appeal in 1994 to contribute, as such, directly – and substantially – to Jewish Continuity was a major event in the community's history." (Finestein, 1999, p 292)). It was indeed a brave and daring decision led by Chinn – though not without risk. It triggered internal JIA dissent.[196] Furthermore, JIA's finances were apparently potentially shaky – certainly over-stretched – and the decision, therefore, appears to have been something of a gamble.[197]

Nonetheless, the move marked the seismic shift that Fred Worms had championed (though arguably prematurely) in his March 1976 paper, 'Facing Facts: Is it within the power of the Community to arrest the crisis in Jewish Education?' (Worms, 1976), about which he later wrote: "I thought at the time that the only body which had adequate machinery to raise the funds for Jewish education was the Joint Israel Appeal. … The JIA was a sophisticated fund-raising body with a large staff, national coverage and many specialist fund-raising committees. I maintained that if only 10 per cent of the funds raised by the JIA could stay in

[193] A photograph appeared in the *JIA Reporter* (September 1994, p 2) marking the launch of the partnership featuring Dr Michael Sinclair, Sir Trevor Chinn and the Israeli Ambassador to London, Moshe Raviv.
[194] £3m, £4m and £5m in each of the succeeding three years commencing 1995 (Memorandum of Understanding, 5th October 1994).
[195] In addition, the later JIA-Jewish Continuity Memorandum (5th October 1994) included the following important pledge: "Jewish Continuity is committed to working across the whole community."
[196] Having failed to bring with them sections of their own support, they were far more cautious to carry everyone with them on future major organisational decisions. (See 17th April 1996, JIA Board discussion).
[197] There was serious financial concern in some quarters (both in terms of the lack of funds available and over-commitment to new projects in Israel) but Chinn himself did not appear to agree with that financial assessment.

this country and be channelled through a revitalised JEDT then one could engage in long-term planning, found new schools, train better teachers and pay them salaries that would make their profession a desirable one." (Worms, 1996, p 228). He also quoted the *Jewish Chronicle*: "On the 4 June 1976, the *Jewish Chronicle* carried a leading article on my proposals highlighting their call for the revitalisation of Jewish education with the injection of substantial funds by the JIA and the drawing together of the finest educational brains, resources, ideas and personnel." In a later *Jewish Chronicle* article (18th June 1976), the paper wrote that "the funding of Jewish education would give to the JIA the opportunity to bring together independent and committed individuals to consider the purposes of Jewish education and to insist on constructive programmes and the avoidance of waste and duplication." (Worms, 1996, p 229).[198] However, it is important to note that though Worms was pushing the idea (and had some impact in revitalising the JEDT of the mid-1970s by extending its donor base), it took someone of Chinn's stature to actually make it happen (a decision of that magnitude probably could not be authorised without some level of wider JIA Board approval but Chinn was clearly the driving force).

In a sense, the two organisations were forced upon each other: the JIA needed the boost to its weary image and flat campaign (and was concerned over competing for funds) and, for some of its members, it was also desirable to increase their investment in Jewish education; Jewish Continuity was able to avoid the strain of building its own fundraising apparatus – its own future income potential being at best somewhat unproven – and exploit the opportunity to engage some of the leading communal philanthropic elite in their cause and widen the delivery of their message. Until that point, Sacks had brought in a handful of wealthy funders (including Sinclair, Marks, Bradfield) but their wider fundraising potential was as yet unrealised. Lawton stated: "We thought that the JIA deal would provide fundraising and that they would work together to raise the funds and bring donors with." Lawton also felt that he had secured sufficient public commitments and agreements that would be binding on the JIA. However, any optimism over the arrangement was soon dissipated. The funding was not delivered: the JIA blamed the problems on cross-communal difficulties that were increasingly damaging the Chief Rabbi and Jewish Continuity; Jewish Continuity accused the JIA of not being serious about fundraising for its education programme. (Further analysis is provided

[198] Worms received support from the Office of the Chief Rabbi (Worms, 1996, p 227; Bermant, 1990, p 195).

under 'Funding'). For both parties, it was a financially driven deal with an overlay of ideological conviction.

The JIA's involvement also had a highly significant additional impact for Jewish Continuity. Those who were becoming increasingly concerned and disillusioned with Michael Sinclair and Clive Lawton's direction (including the Office of the Chief Rabbi), thereafter had the JIA as a potential lever for restraint and change. By the summer of 1994, the JIA leadership and others were demanding from Lawton a coherent strategic plan, arguing that they could only 'sell' Jewish Continuity if it was properly packaged in a robust framework (Chinn reported back to the JIA Board (JIA Board Minutes, 5th October 1994) that Jewish Continuity "were very sensitive to our concerns and were developing a strategy which would clarify their programmes and goals." Furthermore, the JIA funds were generated on the back of a community-wide fundraising campaign. Therefore, Jewish Continuity would have to be far more sensitive to wider communal concerns and ways of operating – its room for manoeuvre was to become more limited. It was not clear that the Jewish Continuity leadership fully grasped these implications from the outset.

An experienced senior communal professional later described the JIA as an organisation that was profoundly committed to Israel and its significance, and that also enhanced the high levels of communal attachment to Israel. However, he went on to state that it had an "authoritarian, hierarchical and over-bloated management" and did not have the strong infrastructure and campaign that it was projecting. Ariel described it as having "a culture and a rhetoric of a past time." An embittered Lawton asserted that: "In the end, the JIA did for us as a deliberate strategy. JIA were threatened and wanted to buy us out. They were sclerotic and flabby and running out of energy." This was a rather hyperbolic over-statement though not altogether without foundation in terms of its organisational condition – though there was certainly no evidence found in the course of this research to suggest that the demise of Jewish Continuity and its agenda was a deliberate JIA organisational strategy.[199] Nonetheless, insufficient funding was being offered to Jewish Continuity and the situation was rapidly deteriorating. In their own ways, both sides had very badly miscalculated.

[199] There were those in the JIA who felt that it was already in the Jewish continuity business though not on the scale of Jewish Continuity.

4.2.4 The Wagner Review (Jewish Continuity, March 1996)[200]

Wagner recorded in his March 1996 Review ('Change in Continuity: Report of the Review into Jewish Continuity'): "I was invited by the Trustees of Jewish Continuity in consultation with the JIA to chair a review of the organisation …." (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p (ix)). He described it as "customer oriented" (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p (i)) and it begged the question: who were the 'customers' and what was their 'orientation'? The Review provided the ideal opportunity to raise the concerns of the Office of the Chief Rabbi, the JIA, the internal Jewish Continuity dissention and external organisations, as well as offering a potential change mechanism. Kestenbaum (on behalf of the Office of the Chief Rabbi) was probably influential in engineering the Wagner Review – with the backing of the JIA. There were several issues at stake:

- donors were losing confidence – the JIA, Clive Marks and others;
- there was a need to release the pressure on the Chief Rabbi due to the cross-communal issues;
- there was a management problem at the heart of Jewish Continuity which needed to be resolved;
- critics argued that there was an absence of a coherent strategy;
- the financial pressures were mounting;
- there was growing communal concern.
  (Jewish Continuity, March 1996; Findings of this research)

The ever-loyal Leslie Wagner (who had stepped in to manage the Jewish Community Allocation Board (JCAB) (Jewish Continuity Board Minutes, 23rd June 1994)) was brought in as a management consultant to address the problem and deliver a solution (Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting Minutes, 2nd October 1995). He was asked "To review the functions, structure, governance, religious complexion and funding of Jewish Continuity;" (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p (ix)) and he did indeed find failings in all these areas. It was clear that most of the leading players wanted to remove Lawton – and to extricate the Chief Rabbi himself – though as one insider put it: "to do so without loss of face." Perhaps it is accurate to state that the Review's 'customer orientation' was to:

- reposition the Chief Rabbi;

[200] References to the Wagner Report (Jewish Continuity, March 1996) findings are to be found in the relevant section of this study and in Appendix Two.

- change the management;
- re-structure the organisational arrangements;
- reconsider the strategic direction.

Wagner found that Jewish Continuity "should consider taking on a more strategic and co-ordinating role and to achieve this it will have to change its method and style of operation." (p 28) and "It should only be a deliverer of services itself in exceptional circumstances." (p 28). The findings of this researcher broadly affirmed the analysis of the issues presented in the Wagner Review (Jewish Continuity, March 1996). It might also be argued that Wagner's remit was limited whereas the current research offers a richer sense of what transpired as well as extending beyond March 1996.[201]

The major challenge was to ensure that the project could survive in some form thereafter. An Office of the Chief Rabbi insider reported that the Chief Rabbi was initially reluctant to exit but then realised that it would endure without him. An informed lay leader judged that Wagner was a person of integrity: "We all knew what the outcome would be but we did not give him conditions … he would not let us. He knew the picture and was independent." Shire, a Progressive professional, also reported that "Wagner was great – he listened to us." However, Sinclair felt that: "Leslie Wagner is a communal politician and he produced a report that made people happy – it was like a government-inspired judicial review." To some degree, they were probably all correct.

Brian Kerner favourably summarised the Wagner Review in the following way: "The Wagner Report was a very good piece of work – he came out with a sound Report. The religious streams needed to work with Jewish Continuity under one roof." Kerner (as well as others) went on to claim that Wagner "created Renewal" through the subsequent merger. However, Wagner himself maintained that he did not anticipate the merger when he wrote the Review. In the recommendations, his third option was for a cross-communal body with a strong JIA involvement but he was unsure that the JIA had succeeded in bringing its own donors on

[201] Alderman (1998, p 398) "Two years later Continuity was dead. Its failure was the result of a number of structural weaknesses; lack of a concrete strategy; lack of accountability; apparent total lack of monitoring or evaluation mechanisms; obsession with its own image; seeming inability to build on the best practice to be found amongst already existing organisations. But overshadowing all these was the malevolent impact upon the good intentions of Continuity and its staff of the religious chasms within Anglo-Jewry: it would, in other words, be inclusivist. At the outset, Continuity announced that although all organizations within Anglo-Jewry were eligible for funding, it would not support activities which involved participants breaking the laws of the Sabbath (in the orthodox sense) and kashrut (again, in the orthodox sense)."

board and therefore was wary of its commitment to a Jewish education programme. Therefore, he was reluctant to propose anything that might appear too radical. In his view, "if you get out too far ahead of where the main players are, they are likely to ignore you." Furthermore, Wagner believed more generally that reports are merely a catalyst for future change. It is unlikely that the full-scale Jewish Continuity-JIA merger was envisaged by Wagner, and certainly not in the form that later transpired. However, Wagner argued that "it broke the ice" and it did, indeed, have a catalytic effect. It was a carefully crafted and executed Review.

4.2.5 The Jewish Continuity–JIA Merger

The reasons for the Jewish Continuity-JIA funding deal were discussed above and those reasons also underpinned the subsequent merger – in addition to the growing instability, uncertainty and tensions. The pivotal person in the merger process was the JIA Chair, Brian Kerner – who was also on the Executive Board of Jewish Continuity. (However, a number of other powerful lay leaders also claimed some responsibility and/or played a role, for example, Chinn was involved in significant direct negotiations with Sinclair.) After the Wagner Review, discussions had been taking place throughout the spring of 1996 based upon the three options Wagner had identified (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, pp 46-53) (it may even have been the case that his draft Review findings, submitted in December 1995, had triggered discussions and that some had already tentatively considered a merger). The Orthodox United Synagogue had agreed that they would work together but refused to sit in one central building with other religious groups. Brian Kerner recalled that on 25th May, 1996, after a particularly difficult meeting, he had had enough and decided on the 'merger' – a merger which would give him the freedom to take things forward in the way he saw fit and that meant 'under one roof'.[202] (However, several respondents intimated that significant merger conversations had already taken place – perhaps earlier in 1996 (though no documentary evidence was found).)

The merger process was led by the Implementation Group made up of senior Jewish Continuity and JIA leadership, which met several times (JIA/Jewish Continuity Merger and Implementation Committee, Minutes, May-July 1996). One leading figure observed that the merger needed a personality around which the whole merger process could coalesce and that

[202] At that time, Kerner sent out a confidential letter to that effect.

was Brian Kerner; and that it needed a central figure to build the organisational and operational framework and that was Kestenbaum." Kerner had a far more consultative approach than his JIA predecessor, Trevor Chinn, and a number of small meetings took place. Kestenbaum himself led the organisational aspects of the process. There needed to be a change of professional leadership (it was clear that Kestenbaum would not work with Lawton). Furthermore, Alan Fox's (the JIA Chief Executive) retirement was accelerated – there was a sense that he too needed to be removed as he did not appear to have the same enthusiasm or capacity for the new agenda and he would have potentially impeded Kestenbaum had he remained in post in what would have been an awkward hierarchy.[203] Sinclair and Chinn were both directly involved in the merger negotiations. Leslie Wagner remained a consultant to the process of establishing a new body, and the new leadership also discussed matters with Fred Worms. The deal was agreed between the two parties in July 1996, and formally approved at simultaneous JIA and Jewish Continuity meetings held 10th November 1996.

The name of the new body was the subject of much discussion. Some in Jewish Continuity would have been happy to lose the reference to 'Israel' – either immediately or at a later date. In the end, they settled on the 'United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA) – it retained both 'Jewish' and 'Israel' (there was never any danger that the 'Israel' reference would be removed) but, perhaps as importantly, it was also 'JIA', prefaced by a 'U', and the term 'Jewish Continuity' was ditched (though 'Jewish continuity' as a concept continued to inform the discourse).

Marlena Schmool, a respected researcher and commentator on British Jewry and former employee of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, made a pragmatic assessment of the merger, arguing that Jewish Continuity could not have been allowed to disappear as too much was at stake for the Chief Rabbi, funders, and other leaders. A senior JIA lay leader also commented that everyone was losing reputation after the funding targets were not met and that it was becoming a "potentially lose-lose situation". A more blunt Jewish Continuity lay leader's view was that: "Once JIA had reneged on its obligation to pay Jewish Continuity, Jewish Continuity could not survive." For the Masorti movement, Harry Freedman reported that he greeted the merger with concern in terms of potential competition for fundraising. However, Rabbi Tony Bayfield held a more upbeat assessment, no doubt driven by the

[203] Leading JIA lay leaders were fiercely loyal in their emphatic defence of Fox but it was clear that he was not the right person to lead the new organisation.

positive outcomes that the UJIA later brought in terms of engagement with the non-Orthodox community: he saw the merger as something fresh, a solution to failed attempts on cross-communal education and "a way out of disaster." Shire recalled how the Reform movement felt that they had played a role but he was of the view that it was really the JIA who had effectively reengineered Jewish Continuity. Michael Goldstein argued that the merger saved both organisations and Sir Harry Solomon (a respected Jewish Continuity leader and also later involved with UJIA) described it as "a great marriage of convenience … a necessary takeover."[204] Howard Stanton (Jewish Continuity and UJIA Treasurer) described it as "a reasonably elegant way of getting both out of a mess."

In reality, it was an acquisition by a larger partner of a smaller one. As Solomon stated: "There is no such thing as a merger – it is 'take or get taken'." Sinclair attempted to place a positive interpretation on the move and described it as a 'reverse takeover' in which the ideas of the smaller Jewish Continuity would increasingly dominate the thinking and programme of the new body – changing it from the inside.[205] In effect, JIA 'took over' Jewish Continuity, though in a constructive and cooperative way. Kestenbaum had insisted that, from an operational perspective, Jewish Continuity could not be a subsidiary within the new organisation (UJIA) but had to be part of a fully integrated vision and organisational platform. Sinclair joined the new UJIA Board, Howard Stanton became its Treasurer, together with a number of other Jewish Continuity lay leaders who were placed throughout the new organisation. Several of the Jewish Continuity professionals also joined the new body. Kestenbaum (a Modern Orthodox Jew, and directly descended from the revered Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsh, providing some credibility with the religious right) became the new Chief Executive and he recruited Jonny Ariel to develop and head the new Jewish Renewal programme – Ariel was not Orthodox. Kestenbaum brought rigour, professionalization and modernisation to both JIA and Jewish Continuity in the form of the newly emergent United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA). He was an ideal complement to Kerner's engaging style.

[204] One senior figure described them as: Jewish Continuity was a vision without an effective machine; whereas JIA was an effective machine with no vision.

[205] An assessment of this claim would require an analysis that was brought up to date and would therefore be beyond the purview of this research. However, up to 2010, there is strong evidence to show that UJIA maintained a genuine commitment to the Jewish Renewal agenda (it was later renamed UJIA UK Programme (2006-7)) both in terms of programme and financial commitment – though the style, strategy and operating platform began to change. However, in response to an opinion piece by Mick Davis (the UJIA Chair), Michael Sinclair wrote a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle* declaring that UJIA must not drop the Jewish education portfolio (July 2010) – there was growing communal uncertainty by 2010, in significant part brought on by the acute recession of the time.

Indeed, the Kerner-Kestenbaum combination (supported by Ariel) did a great deal to gradually overcome the resentment and resistance of factions on both sides – though some did walk away.

The Chief Rabbi's role became less prominent, as he perhaps "became a lot wiser and less naïve and felt that he had taken it as far as it could go" (as one senior Jewish Continuity lay leader commented). The new body was also better placed to address the cross-communal challenge and, as will be discussed, it did so successfully.

In summary, the merger brought together two partners who recognised the necessity of working in unison but who had not originally planned to merge. The diehards on each side were against it but the leadership, given what had transpired and the difficulties they had encountered, acted responsibly. Ideologically, it was Worms who had been calling for such a union of interests for the previous three decades (as previously discussed) – though his calls were premature. Sacks (through Jewish Continuity and his wider involvement) had created the possibility of change and made the breakthrough in terms of reconfiguring the communal landscape; events then took over and deflected the project from its originator's initial trajectory. A new leadership emerged: Kerner was a diplomat who brought people together and Kestenbaum[206] was a consummate politician and accomplished leader and manager who brought in Ariel to lead the Jewish Renewal programme. The new leadership brought a change in content and approach and, importantly, in their operational delivery[207] – addressed below.

4.2.6 United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA)

The UJIA leadership who were interviewed freely acknowledged that they had undoubtedly learned from Jewish Continuity's mistakes and experiences. Ariel noted that they had to 'dampen down expectations' and set out to deliberately 'under promise and over-deliver'. UJIA went for 'low hanging fruit' in its early days – a sound approach as it needed to show

[206] Kestenbaum was later asked to summarise the merger challenge: "The first challenge was to merge the operations while retaining the volunteers and contributors from the two constituent parts. The second, and greater, challenge was to create a unified body embracing a new and exciting vision; one which would attract thousands of new donors without alienating the previous organisations' traditional support base." www.charityaward.co.uk/category.php?cat=5&yr=8

[207] As Danker observed: "The change from Lawton to Ariel mirrored the organisational shift."

'early wins'. Ariel had a deliberate policy of communicating with key stakeholders to keep them up-to-date and engaged – it proved an effective mechanism for avoiding antagonism. These were the driving slogans and tone of the UJIA during the early months and beyond. In the second iteration, UJIA Jewish Renewal benefitted from precious commodities including patience, time and the painfully learned lessons of its precursor body.

Ariel applied his 'acupuncture approach' and for the immediate post-Jewish Continuity period that meant to "get out of the exciting – marginal" and into "mainstream hard core critical points." (It was also more aligned with the Mandel-Fox approach – both Ariel and Kestenbaum were Mandel Fellows.) The broad brush strokes were clear: the 'spinal column' as he put it, was to comprise Israel Experience, Informal Jewish Education (Young People) and Educational Leadership (identified in the UJIA document: 'The New Organisation – Vision for Our Future' (July 1997) – though Educational Leadership took time to become established.[208] Simon Caplan described UJIA Jewish Renewal as built around an "establishment structure" and as "an attempt to rationalise trends and approaches that were there being done but in a piecemeal way. This is the Renewal response: you don't have to own everything as a macro-planner."[209] As early as 15th November 1996, the *Jewish Chronicle* (''New approach, new style and a new cast' as merger takes shape', Jewish Chronicle p 2) was reporting "The new Continuity division aims to be an "enabling organisation" working with existing education agencies rather than a "service provider" running its own programmes. But Continuity's current commitments will be underwritten by the JIA as a "moral obligation"." – this was clearly the line being promoted by the new leadership.

Informal Education and Israel Experience were built on the pre-existing platform that was owned and managed by JAFI's Youth and Hechalutz Department (and for which the JIA had

[208] As a further insight into the choice of intervention areas, it is worth noting that the senior Jewish Renewal staff conducted an exercise in which the question was: what are the three most impactful intervention areas in a scenario where funding was not a consideration: the consensus view was that the home, synagogue and school would be the ideal. However, they went on to recognise that the acute budgetary limitations placed these three beyond the means of the organisation as a departmental framework.

[209] There was some discussion of other intervention areas, for example, a department for Community Development – Ariel agreed to look at it "when someone comes back to me with a workable definition of what it is and how it will work." It got no further. Other suggestions included Family Education, Young Adults (addressed to a limited extent within Informal Jewish Education and through external grants to partners), Adult Education (which eventually became a Lifelong Learning Unit within the Informal Jewish Education Department) arts and culture (too expensive) and religious outreach (which was dropped).

been a long term funder). Jewish Continuity had already given a substantial cash injection[210] to the Joint Committee on Youth Allocations (JCYA) to boost these two departments and the benefits were already showing in terms of both quality of staff and programme and increased participation rates. (UJIA perhaps came closest to fulfilling the role of an 'education authority' in the context of its support for the youth movements within the field of informal Jewish education.) In contrast, a leading, senior educational professional argued that: "Renewal was shifting the road one way or another but it was not creating a new road."

Managing the UJIA's relationship with JAFI was a matter requiring some subtlety: Kerner reported that senior JAFI professional leadership in Israel were initially vehemently against the UJIA proposals, raising concerns over funding levels and disbursement strategy in Israel and direction and control over education in Britain[211] (confirmed by Dubi Bergman, JAFI Director in Europe). However, in the end they acquiesced. Bergman also saw it as an opportunity to secure increased funding for two of his departments in Britain, and he also worked well with the UJIA professionals which increased his manoeuvrability.

As a new department, Educational Leadership was more of an innovation, though it too worked mainly with existing partners – it focused primarily on teachers but also rabbis[212] and, to a lesser extent, the professional development of youth leaders. As previously noted, there was some delay before Ariel was able to bring in Philip Skelker to run it. It had taken a while for this third department to find direction but it increasingly focused upon schools. The school sector was dominated by the Orthodox and Skelker had impeccable Orthodox credentials – but he was also ready to engage with the non-Orthodox. Ognall warned of the dangers of Jewish Renewal "falling into the trap of capital projects" (school buildings) and their potentially huge drain on funds. However, Wagner felt that more could have been done by Jewish Renewal on schools in other ways. Alan Hoffman noted that "It was natural for Renewal to become the parent to informal Jewish education [Jewish Programme and Materials Project (JPMP)/Makor] and Israel Experience. … But Worms had identified the

[210] £250,000.
[211] See Bermant's caustic retort regarding JAFI in the Jewish Chronicle, 7th October 1994, and suggesting that the response to the JAFI Chairman should be "Mind your own bloody business."
Also: "In September [1994] the Chairman of the Jewish Agency, through which JIA funding for Israel is channelled, sharply criticized the agreement with Continuity, stating that this "unilateral, almost secretive decision breaks the rules of the partnership between us." Agency officials were particularly concerned about whether donations to Israel would suffer." Kochan, M. and L. (1996) at p 250.
[212] Later dropped and returned exclusively to the various religious central bodies.

need for serious personnel and training for the formal sector."[213] Hoffman felt the question was: how deeply Jewish Renewal would also address personnel in the formal sector and he reported that he was concerned that UJIA was still working that through a decade later. He noted Kestenbaum's concern that it could become a 'budgetary black hole' but nonetheless Hoffman argued that "Mainstream Jewish schools were not receiving enough attention."[214]

Ariel "played the long game" in assembling the departmental platform for the work. He and Kestenbaum were also meticulous about bringing people with them and the need "to carry the community". Ariel quoted Jim Collins: "you need the right people on the right buses sat in the right seats." Ariel invested heavily in recruiting the right lay and professional personnel and investing in them. Schmool saw "UJIA as smaller scale and more manageable. Each [UJIA] initiative was better focused. Key people were in place to effect through quality development."

UJIA Jewish Renewal removed the scenario in which the central agency was saying 'No' to funding requests from the field and instead allowed itself to target the funding to achieve its strategic goals – though some funding was inevitably political in nature i.e. to cement necessary partnerships in the community (for reasons of fundraising and denominational balance). UJIA did not retain the Jewish Community Allocation Board (JCAB) or any equivalent. It took a while to wean people off the grant application process. Furthermore, the new UJIA focus also meant that many of the Jewish Continuity-funded projects were run down (e.g. RESQUJE; arts projects). Instead, funds were directed to the central capacity of UJIA and grants to a more limited range of partners that shared clear strategic congruence with UJIA plans – including the Orthodox and the Progressive bodies for formal education and a number of external grants to partners. As previously noted, it was largely only Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools (JAMS), the Hebrew Reading Crash Course (HRCC) and Pikuach (a joint project with the Board of Deputies of British Jews) that survived the cull of former Jewish Continuity projects.

Kerner felt that UJIA Jewish Renewal was professionally run and based on knowledge and investigation. Ariel was interested in qualitative outcomes and also recognised that it was not

[213] Worms also happened to be Hoffman's father-in-law.
[214] By 2005-6, the UJIA had adopted a major Jewish education curriculum project (the Jewish Curriculum Partnership), which took over an earlier smaller UJIA-AJE project – it was an initiative for the central Orthodox sector.

always possible to show direct causality: therefore, it was also important for him to identify qualitative interventions including encouraging partners to conduct their own reviews and pushing the quality of the educational discourse. UJIA Jewish Renewal ran a number of seminars for senior educators, set up two major educational conferences and conducted several reviews of leading educational partner bodies.

Finally, there were a number of critiques of UJIA Jewish Renewal. One suggested that it lacked originality and imagination and appeared to be largely built upon two pre-existing departments (Informal Jewish Education and Israel Experience – under JAFI) and that the third one (Educational Leadership) primarily worked with partner organisations that were already well-established (mainly in the schools sector).[215] In a related area, questions were also asked by interviewees about the success of UJIA Jewish Renewal's development work[216] with Jews College/London School of Jewish Studies (LSJS) and the Agency for Jewish Education (AJE) and also Leo Baeck College and the Centre for Jewish Education (CJE) – its two primary partners in the formal education sector.[217] Others asked whether the field of Informal Jewish Education would have flourished equally well had the UJIA simply increased funding to JAFI. A further lesser criticism was that the UJIA Jewish Renewal language was sometimes rather impenetrable and it was also not always clear who did what within the organisation.

The level of investment in Jewish schools drew the most Interviewee challenges. It was increasingly clear that growth in Jewish school attendance was the single biggest educational development of the period and questions arose over UJIA priorities – favouring informal Jewish education (raised by both Hoffman and Wagner amongst others). However, there were also legitimate concerns that UJIA involvement in funding Jewish schools might become a financial black hole (particularly if it was involved in funding buildings) for the organisation (UJIA had, early on, phased out funding for the Zionist Federation Education Trust which funded affiliated Jewish schools). UJIA Jewish Renewal chose to focus upon personnel development in Jewish schools but its role and contribution was not widely known beyond those teachers themselves (and their school authorities) who were directly involved. As an additional dimension to this issue, UJIA was also under pressure, in part from its own donors,

[215] The Bursary Fund was established but was later wound down.
[216] The 'Renewal Consultancy' to assist major educational partners in the community did not prove to be a sustainable model.
[217] Though change was eventually made.

to target Jewish young people who might be more distanced from the community – and that would include those attending non-Jewish schools. An arguably more pressing challenge came from non-Orthodox communal leadership where, for example, both Bayfield and Gilbert raised concern that UJIA Jewish Renewal was not focusing sufficiently upon the unaffiliated or peripherally affiliated Jews – it was too close to the already engaged and involved mainstream Jews.

Other criticisms included: Gilbert (amongst others) argued that UJIA did not recruit nor retain the same numbers of enthusiastic new lay leaders as Jewish Continuity. In terms of budget management, Andrew Gilbert pointed out that UJIA had not properly worked out exit strategies from each project that it funded – this was to have adverse implications when regular growth budgets did not materialise and there was no spare funding to develop and expand. Kerner felt that the biggest failing was UJIA's inability to convey the education story to donors and the wider community. UJIA did win the Charity Awards 2001 for Education and Training for their successful merger of two pre-existing organisations (led by Kerner with Kestenbaum's support); however, some interviewees were still concerned at the continuing apparent lack of full integration. Bayfield commented overall: "My criticism of it: still too authoritarian – too top down; too focused on a particular section of the Jewish community rather than the totality of the Jewish community and not I think focused enough upon genuine research and understanding of the needs of people out there. Not enough engagement. Hampered by politics namely, if we invest in one section of the community it needs to be balanced elsewhere." A leading, senior educational professional also added: "The merger should have been one plus one equals three but it was one plus one equals one and a half." However, this appeared rather harsh.

In addition, interviewees were asked if the whole enterprise was all 'worthy but dull',[218] lacking in originality and innovation and over-cautious. Wagner responded: "'Worthiness' is a very strong objective for a communal organisation, … if they were 'worthy and efficient' they should regard that as an accolade." Kestenbaum opted for 'worthy but credible' – in a context in which the goal was to embed it within the system. Ariel described it as "worthy but

[218] "Worthy but dull?" (and "Virtuous but dull?") was a question originally asked by the UJIA's new Director of Communications – the person tasked to package it up as an attractive fundraising proposition. (Jon Boyd had asked at the July 2000 UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive meeting: "How do we respond to the Anthony Wagerman [UJIA Communications Director] view: "Renewal is largely virtuous but dull"?") Tony Danker may have actually originated the phrase: 'Worthy but dull.'

not majestic". Shire also disagreed with the epithet, stating that UJIA Jewish Renewal created a new language for a post-Jewish Continuity era. Danker felt that there was some truth to the 'worthy but dull' description. Amongst the Interviewees, on balance, it seemed 'worthiness' was at a premium in the traumatic post-Jewish Continuity days – and understandably so.

In summary, all of these criticisms were relatively mild when compared to those levelled at Jewish Continuity. Several Interviewees went on to offer thoughtful reflections on the contrast between Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal. Lewis summarised the two organisations: "Jewish Continuity seemed very ad hoc. It did not seem to be strategic in its decision-making. Jewish Continuity was individual and maverick. UJIA was part of the fabric and infrastructure – with respectability and accountability. It was more rooted in existing organisations. It did not feel that way with Jewish Continuity. UJIA was less whimsical. Jewish Continuity looked like a dynamic organisation; UJIA did not." Tony Danker described them in the following way: "Jewish Continuity was a pioneer – a movement of divergence and experimentation and a new phase in community life; trying to bring a whole set of ideas and organisations and entities into the frame to explore and to take further. And Renewal was a movement of convergence … it felt there had been enough experimentation and we had learned some lessons and it's now time to converge around a series of key beliefs – and Ariel is a great appointment in that regard. … Jewish Continuity was a movement trying to do everything and not a strategic enabler."[219] He also observed: "Jewish Continuity was a movement and Renewal was an agency. Continuity did not feel compelled to answer the question: are we a 'strategic enabler'?; a deliverer of services?; simply a funds allocation body? It was all those things plus anything else that sounded like a good idea; and above all else it was a movement. Renewal had the tremendous advantage of being the next iteration of Continuity i.e. standing back and saying: what should we be and what shouldn't we be; which I think Leslie's Report [Wagner Report, March 1996] was the beginning of, and Ariel and Kestenbaum, and Ariel in particular, thought through this concept of the 'strategic enabler', and a sense of identifying what matters and what has an impact and what won't." Leslie Wagner's assessment was:

> I think Continuity was actually the JEDT as it should have been because it was a developmental organisation – it [Jewish Continuity]

[219] Simon Rocker described UJIA as: "It's a programme of consolidation and development rather than headline-grabbing innovation." (Jewish Chronicle, 3rd October 1997).

> was not a strategic organisation. … it identified areas for development and sought to fund them. It didn't take a strategic overview. … To be a strategic authority, it would have to have the authority to take that further and implement it – but I don't think any organisation can be an authority because it lacks the powers – it's got the power of the chequebook, but real power lay elsewhere. So I think that Continuity both in conception and largely in delivery was a developmental agency; it didn't fail because it was only a developmental agency, it failed because it was a bad development agency – a poor one. … It [the Jewish Continuity Strategy document, December 22nd 1994] just broke all the rules of what you do in a strategic document.
>
> Leslie Wagner, Interview

UJIA Jewish Renewal was far better organised and constructed and pursued a more strategic approach – albeit more cautious. Wagner went on to describe UJIA Jewish Renewal as striving to be a strategic body focusing upon three priority intervention areas which it considered to be important and where action and funding were needed and could make a difference. Finestein (2002, p 44) summed it up as follows: "It [UJIA] envisages itself as a facilitator (not as a founder or executant of plans) for the expansion of Jewish educational facilities (formal and informal, day school and part-time) and for the development of the highest standards of professionalism in all departments, educational and administrative. The merger came about because it was necessary, if religious differences were not to disrupt any overall system for educational funding."

A *Jewish Chronicle* Editorial (24th September 1999) paid tribute to Kerner at the end of his term and approvingly commented on the UJIA: "Its "rescue and renewal" agenda clearly needs little fixing. Its success in preserving the old JIA's core causes while attending to the long-underfunded areas of education and youth work have built on a dramatically altered Israel-Diaspora relationship, becoming a model for other communities. But it has also perhaps stumbled into a potentially more important communal role: to take the lead, at a time when our religious organisations often seem unable to rise above their doctrinal disputes, in helping to set a genuinely community-wide agenda – on education, Israel issues, and overall funding questions – which rests not on what divides Jew from Jew, but on the challenges of common concern to all." Finally, in November 2000, a *Jewish Chronicle* editorial praised the UJIA: "Now, the good news … The UJIA's annual review meeting – an exercise in public accountability which, itself, reflects a new trend in communal leadership – reported a sizeable rise in donations, as well as a range of successes in developing a dual agenda combining

support for Israel projects with unprecedented backing for Jewish education, outreach and training within the British community."[220] (Jewish Chronicle, 10th November 2000).

Assessing the long term impact of Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal is beyond the scope of this research. However, it is noted that the Mandel Institute held a consultation with Jewish Continuity (1-2 October 1995) in which it was reported that: "Discussing ways of forcing the community to reassess its priorities, Professor Fox said that an alternative to the 'disruptive technology' [Michael Sinclair's term] approach was 'love and affection'. The Sinclair-Fox paradigmatic juxtaposition may be a helpful starting point for the work of long term impact assessment, though a wider framework to include the UJIA approach would embrace: 'disruptive technology'[221]-'sustaining innovation'[222]-'strategic enabling'[223].

(In fairness to Sinclair, he would almost certainly argue that the parameters of this research were framed around what he might determine as Fox/Mandelian concepts i.e. around the strategic planning process. Consequently, Sinclair would claim that one should not be fixated on the organisational, operational and strategic analysis but instead focused on the vision – the big picture. By criteria defined under his rubric of 'disruptive technology' and 'agent of change' (exemplified by new lay leadership, some well-targeted funding to organisations such as Limmud, engagement with Jewish Book Week and UK Jewish Film Festival and others, funding to the Joint Committee on Youth Allocations (JAFI and JIA) for Israel Experience and the informal Jewish education resource centre, support for innovative new projects and interventions, changing norms in Orthodox synagogue life, transforming the JIA and the elevation of Jewish education as a communal priority – in addition to other measures mentioned elsewhere), almost two decades later, he would claim that it was an outstanding success. However, multiple variables were impacting on the community, and other players would certainly lay claim to having brought about the positive developments. Furthermore, his assessment raises a number of important contextual concerns. Firstly, the environmental realities were vitally important and Sinclair needed to take them into account.

---

[220] Even that week's *Jewish Chronicle* cartoon by the often more caustic Jeremy Gerlis was supportive of the UJIA.
[221] As previously defined.
[222] "In contrast to *disruptive* innovation, a sustaining innovation does not create new markets or value networks but rather only evolves existing ones with better value, allowing the firms within to compete against each other's sustaining improvements. Sustaining innovations may be either "discontinuous" (i.e. "transformational" or "revolutionary") or "continuous" (i.e. "evolutionary")." www.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Disruptive_technology
[223] A possible encapsulation of the UJIA approach.

Notwithstanding the argument that in some senses the application of disruptive technologies may inherently require a somewhat opportunistic and potentially abrasive approach, it has to work effectively within the context. Unfortunately, this did not happen in terms of partnerships, communal fundraising requirements and the relationship with the JIA. If the intention was to take on the 'establishment', it was necessary to be equipped to succeed; arguably it was the 'establishment' that prevailed through the dominance of the 'old guard' and less radical leadership. Secondly, the operational mechanism was the product of an organisation that was surely designed to last beyond forty-two months; but it seemed that it was not conducive to a lasting application of his disruptive technology and Jewish Continuity became so 'disruptive' that it damaged itself (in the multiple ways discussed above). Thirdly, he did not appear to bring many of his leadership colleagues with him in his application of 'disruptive technologies' (no other Interviewee or Jewish Continuity document used the term[224]). Several key players did not share his approach to existing communal partners, nor to his presentation and decision-making style in the application of disruptive technology (though an appearance of heavy-handedness may well understandably also be a characteristic of the approach). Fourthly, there are those who would argue that the communal trauma caused as result of the shake-up was unnecessary and unacceptable. Fifthly, the analysis also needs to be contextualised within the cross-communal debate. Sinclair was anchored in the Orthodox position (he used the phrase 'Normative Judaism') and that was an additional complicating factor. Sinclair's language and tenor did not appear to be shared by many of his leadership colleagues – Lawton adopted a different and softer tone. Furthermore, the whole enterprise was forced, to some considerable degree, to adapt to the communal religious landscape – whether Sinclair liked it or not. Sixthly, and more broadly, the entire Jewish Continuity enterprise was situated within the orbit of the Chief Rabbi and his Office and, notwithstanding Sacks's own determination to shake up the system, this clearly carried constraints for the application of disruptive technologies. Fundamentally, Jewish Continuity was Sacks's initiative. Seventhly, and perhaps most importantly, there have been many other variables at play and others would make similar claims to having achieved the transformation to which Sinclair attributes the application of his disruptive technology.) Nonetheless, Sinclair, supported by Lawton, was clearly an agent of change who challenged the status quo and what he considered to be the sense of stagnation that accompanied it. Again, detailed analysis of later impact is left to future researchers.

[224] Though it was certainly mentioned in the Minutes of the Mandel-Jewish Continuity Consultation (1st and 2nd October 1995).

4.3 Leadership Roles and Personalities

Different sources of leadership were assessed: the rabbinic leadership of Jakobovits and Sacks; the lay leadership who achieved their positions through philanthropic giving and interest in the community as well as individuals who were willing to offer time, expertise and commitment all on a voluntary basis; and the professional leadership of those employed to work in the field of Jewish community education. All three categories were made up of people who brought a deep personal commitment to their efforts. During Jonathan Kestenbaum's interview, he asked rhetorically: "in the spirit of everything else, can we tell the story of an innovative approach through the cast of characters?" The answer is: undoubtedly so. Leadership and personality had a significant influence on developments.

4.3.1 Rabbinic Leadership

The former Chief Rabbi, Lord Jakobovits, was a conventional rabbinic figure characterised by traditional patterns of authority and leadership. He was descended from a long and respected rabbinic line and followed a central European tradition within Orthodox Judaism; together with the strength of his Yeshiva-based Jewish learning, these strong credentials conferred great respect upon him.[225] He was widely admired and also had some profile on the national stage – enjoying a positive relationship with Margaret Thatcher. He succeeded in presenting a plan for Jewish education which was partially implemented through the JEDT.

Sacks was a younger generation rabbi intent on bringing an updated approach to an otherwise traditional rabbinic role.[226] He had spent significant time in secular learning (including the achievement of a double first from Cambridge), and has a wide-ranging literacy in philosophy, sociology and other fields. He is a brilliant communicator and widely admired as an intellectual whose prolific writings[227] and lectures resonated well beyond the Jewish community (for example, he gave the Reith Lectures, 1990).[228] Though obviously well-versed in traditional Jewish texts and learning, he had spent less time in intensive Yeshiva

[225] Alderman (1998) claimed that the status of the Office diminished on his watch and that he failed to repair the damage of the Jacobs Affair.
(In addition, he courted some communal controversy through his relatively dovish positions on Israel.)
[226] Sacks was inspired by the Lubavitcher Rebbe (Schneerson) – though was not himself Lubavitch – and the Six Days War (1967), which drew him into the Rabbinate (Sacks, 2000).
[227] See www.chiefrabbi.org/
[228] He also has a growing following amongst North American Jewry.

study than other leading rabbis. Some of those to his religious Orthodox right also considered him to have been over-exposed to secular culture, further undermining his authority amongst traditionalists.[229] [230]

An associate summed up his intellectual strengths: "his quality of mind, coherence, range, with a gift of synthesis and of identifying the important – a great academic and a great communicator." As an orator, he has been seen as a product of his time with a talent for the sound bite[231] and a remarkably powerful rhetorical flourish in his delivery.[232] Amongst his rabbinic colleagues, there was no one to challenge him intellectually or in leadership stature – with the exception of Dayan Ehrentreu who, in 1984, had been appointed by Jakobovits to head the Bet Din (religious courts). (According to Bermant, 1990, p 104), Ehrentreu "regards the status of the Beth Din as almost autonomous.")

Sacks is recognised as one of the country's leading clerical figures (across all religions) and his Office has emphasised his role as a 'moral voice' on the national stage and consulted internationally on a range of issues. Despite various sources of aggressive criticisms from within the Jewish community, he is widely acknowledged as British Jewry's most articulate, compelling and inspiring public figure.[233] The British Jewish public have generally taken enormous, vicarious pride in having such an eloquent and intellectually powerful representative, basking in the reflected glory that the admiration of the non-Jewish world tends to bestow upon him. He has also inspired a generation of Central and Modern Orthodox Jewish leaders, amongst others. However, his pursuit of Jewish communal change was to prove a bruising experience, attracting controversy and revealing the traditionalist constraints faced by a Chief Rabbi encountering modernity.[234] [235]

---

[229] 'The Dignity of Difference' saga was particularly revealing in which Sacks was forced by right-wing rabbinic pressure to remove controversial paragraphs in one of his books. A close associate described "the retreat as undignified and worrying." (It has even been suggested it was a potential resignation issue.)

[230] It has been harshly suggested in some quarters that a number of rabbis appeared to respect Jakobovits as a spokesperson and a rabbi; and that they respected Sacks only as a spokesperson.

[231] For example, "tsunami of antisemitism" (news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_4573052.stm)

[232] An interviewee dryly offered this non-attributable observation: "People would readily travel miles just to hear the Chief Rabbi read the weather forecast!"

[233] Sacks was unchallenged at the head of the *Jewish Chronicle* list of the 100 most influential and powerful British Jews in the two years in which it was compiled (Jewish Chronicle, 27th April 2007; 9th May 2008).

[234] Sacks's Chief Rabbinacy will also, unfortunately, be remembered for several highly public and damaging incidents where he was either misguided by others or misjudged his own course of action, the main examples of which occurred in the context of internal Jewish theological conflict with non-Orthodoxies. (Persoff (2010) mercilessly dissects each of these incidents in a book devoted to the subject (following in the tracks of his academic mentor, Alderman). See also New Moon, August 1995, p 24-27 (Matthew Kalman).

Interviewees freely shared their assessments of Chief Rabbi Lord Sacks with varying degrees of reverence and deference, often affirming their admiration for him, though not refraining from criticisms. Nevertheless, in many cases views were expressed with sufficient respect and/or reticence to insist that they should be non-attributable in this research. Interviewees did not express unanimity on the role that he played and, unsurprisingly, those with theological and other grievances tended to be the least restrained in their disparagement.[236]

Interviewees focused upon his leadership, powers of analysis, communication skills, personality and character traits and management skills. Generally, they acknowledged his genius and many considered him to be an inspirational leader with wide agreement on the high level of respect held for his intellect, oratorical and writing skills. Some interviewees were less generous with regard to personality and other traits and they readily identified alleged flaws; those with religiously-based disagreements did not refrain from accusing him, primarily through his writings, of being disingenuous[237] and patronizing;[238] some suggesting that he was naïve, whilst others characterised him as condescending. He was also accused by some of lacking courage in not taking on the Strictly Orthodox leadership. There was also a sense that he did not always take wise counsel even when offered. However, those closer to him have described him as somewhat shy and sensitive – sometimes overly so. Some suggested that his greatest strengths do not necessarily lie in a community pastoral role, displaying a degree of unease at that level of communal life – Bermant, (1996, p 203) described him: "Sacks, a slight, donnish figure, gives an impression of cold aloofness, but he is never completely at ease in company and is much happier in his study than in the drawing room. He has some of the Chief Rabbi's [Jakobovits] natural courtliness, but is more cerebral and less emotional – some find him a little too cerebral.")[239] Rabbi Bayfield drew attention to a cartoon by Salon that portrayed Sacks with two heads: Rabbi Jonathan, the bearded disciple

[235] Alderman and Persoff have argued that under both of the most recent two Chief Rabbis, the Office has suffered a diminution in its standing within the Jewish community. This is a question beyond the scope of this research.

[236] Sacks's initial primary backer, Sir Stanley Kalms, was to later turn on him and publicly call for his resignation: "Sir Stanley said the Chief Rabbi's much heralded agency for communal renewal and harmony, Jewish Continuity, is "isolated within a fractious ideology … and seems to accentuate the negative side of communal Jewry."" Jewish Chronicle, 26th January 1996 (and again in the Jewish Chronicle, 19th December 2003).

[237] Persoff (2010).

[238] Responses to his book: 'One People?' (Sacks 1993).

[239] In an October 1992 profile (New Moon, October 1992, p 28), Linda Grant wrote: "So there are gays and the women rabbis and the agnostics and the disaffected, all wanting to find a way of belonging. And there is the Chief Rabbi, beset by a tension he cannot resolve. An erstwhile professor of philosophy grappling with the most important ethical question, a good guy finding how hard it is to be good."

of the Lubavitcher Rebbe and Dr Sacks, the pipe-smoking Cambridge Philosophy Don, as an explanation of what Sacks was attempting to hold together. He continued: "I do not think that Jonathan Sacks is knowingly dishonest or duplicitous but I think that he has been intellectually and emotionally torn. Both Rabbi Jonathan and Dr Sacks are part of him. Holding them both together within the framework of Orthodoxy has been more than enough of a challenge." Finally, as two further non-attributable observations put it: "he was a genius that did not always understand ordinary people;" and that "he had a powerful mind but his grasp of people may be less profound than his grasp of ideas." These statements were recorded to capture a cross-section of views from Interviewees and others. However, importantly, it was Sacks who managed to move the community towards greater elevation of Jewish education as a priority – amongst his many considerable achievements.

There was no doubt that Sacks's ideas inspired many amongst the senior mainstream leadership of the Jewish community and they readily recognised his role in this regard. In late 1992, Michael Sinclair was asked by the Chief Rabbi to lead Jewish Continuity and was clearly motivated and enthused by the vision that Sacks had set out for the nascent organisation. Jonathan Kestenbaum was persuaded to return from Israel, enticed by the opportunity to work for the new Chief Rabbi who had courted him for the role of Director of his Office. There were a number of other willing followers amongst the philanthropic leadership and elsewhere across the community.

Sacks believed in the power of ideas and his own ability to deliver them – he was determined to set out a compelling, lucid and persuasive case. In addition, some Interviewees close to Sacks felt that he believed, perhaps somewhat naively, that good people would support him in a commendable project (such as Jewish Continuity) that could benefit all and that this would overcome attempts by minority interests to sabotage his efforts. However, he (and others) did not correctly gauge significant changes that were taking place in various parts of the community. The Orthodox right were taking a greater interest in Jewish community developments beyond their self-imposed segregation. In parallel, the Progressive left were becoming more confident and self-assured, as the Reform movement grew, and the Liberal and Conservative Masorti movements became increasingly assertive in their respective religious doctrines. However, it is worth noting and stressing that Sacks was not alone in failing to fully grasp the significance of these developments. (The situation was further compounded for Sacks by an increasing rumbustiousness within the Jewish press. Alderman

noted that Ned Temko took over as Editor in 1990 with the express intent of "generally adopting a less 'establishment' style." (Alderman, 1998, p 382).

Sacks was to face acute difficulties in a number of areas. His carefully crafted approach to inclusivism[240] failed to bridge the chasm that existed between the Orthodox and non-Orthodox sections of the community, and was to contribute to the downfall of Jewish Continuity.[241] He was unable to overcome the mistrust of the Orthodox right or the non-Orthodox left. The choice of leadership for the Jewish Continuity project proved, on balance, to be problematic. Sacks is undoubtedly the person for the big ideas and bold vision but not necessarily the minutiae of strategy, tactics and delivery.

After Jewish Continuity, the Chief Rabbi immediately reduced his profile in this area of work[242] and moved on to new projects.[243] He had been damaged by the Jewish Continuity experience and the cross-communal issues were to worsen immediately thereafter[244] – it was clear that there had to be distance between the UJIA and the Office of the Chief Rabbi. Another view suggested by a senior and respected community professional was that the Chief Rabbi also learned an important lesson: there was great merit in setting something up, passing it on to others and moving on – that he did not have to retain control over every project.[245] (Furthermore, he had the reassurance of Kestenbaum (his outgoing Director of his Office) leading the new organisation, UJIA). Either way, Sacks had a way out from Jewish Continuity via the Wagner Review – it was a well-managed exit and as elegant as possible under the circumstances.[246]

Perhaps he and his team were simply caught up in the exhilaration of the moment as his inauguration was triumphantly welcomed as a break with the past. However, he did not have

[240] His views on the subject were set out in his book, 'One People?' (Sacks, 1993).
[241] Discussed under 'Cross-communalism'.
[242] Though Sacks was consulted regularly by Kestenbaum and Ariel on UJIA developments.
[243] One example being Jewish social responsibility (Sacks, 2006), which also emerged within the work of UJIA Jewish Renewal: "Establish opportunities for young people to develop their Jewish identities by participating in innovative volunteer schemes." (UJIA 2001, p 30).
[244] The Masorti Letter (January 1995); The Hugo Gryn Affair (August 1996 and February 1997). (See Persoff, 2010, amongst others).
[245] Sacks himself observed: "Having had a share in its creation is one of the achievements of which I am most proud. But to be a parent requires three things: bringing a child into existence, nurturing it in its early years, and knowing when to let go. The time has come for Continuity to move to its next phase, and for me to move to the second half of the Decade of Renewal." (Jewish Chronicle, 29th March 1996, p 30).
[246] It was only under the later, steadying management of Syma Weinberg that stability was eventually restored to the Office of the Chief Rabbi, following the difficulties referred to above.

the political strength or guile, nor the religious stature, to break the shackles of the 'old order' nor manage the increasingly confident oppositional forces within the community. Nevertheless, he became a successful catalyst for change and yet a victim of it – he was wounded by the process he had set in motion. It remains to be seen whether his critics will be proven right (Alderman and Persoff amongst others) or, and perhaps less likely, as Taylor claims without offering evidence: "… not all the facts are in the public domain. … In time, what really happened will emerge and become clear – burying history is almost impossible – but the whole truth isn't yet available." (Taylor,[247] 2007, p 425). More likely, it may be the case that a longer historical perspective will eventually challenge and undermine his critics, and enhance the appreciation for his profound and lasting impact. During his Chief Rabbinate, there have been multiple signs of a Jewish revival across the community (including Limmud, religious outreach, accelerated growth in Jewish schools, expansion of adult Jewish learning, Jewish arts and culture; though his own United Synagogue had noticeably struggled during the first period of his term of office) – though again, the longer term impact of his initiative is left to future researchers. However, whilst the Chief Rabbi himself enjoys ever-growing international and national acclaim, paradoxically, it may be that the stature of the Office remains under challenge.

The Chief Rabbi was recently asked about his achievements, and his reply included:

> I'm proud of the transformation of British Jewry from a community which, in 1993, had 25 percent of its children in Jewish day schools to today's 66 percent.
> The result is that we will have a better educated and, hopefully, more committed generation of young people than before.

In the context of Jewish Continuity he added:

> It was the biggest challenge and first [sic] one we undertook. It took me two years to work out how to achieve our goals. In 1993, we launched "Jewish Continuity". The question that really turned the community around was: "Will we have Jewish grandchildren?"
> We had to turn Anglo-Jewry from a community proud of its past to one that cared equally about its future. That involved throwing several

[247] Taylor's account is verging on the sycophantic: "He [Sacks] is the acceptable face of Judaism and resembles a Victorian illustration of a biblical prophet." Alderman (2007) caustically wrote of Taylor's book: "Such a compendium might have a limited use, wither as a coffee-table volume or as a work of reference. But his British Chief Rabbis can serve neither purpose."

> large bricks into the pond, not just a few stones. This generated huge controversy but it also sparked huge activity as well.
> Nobody looking at Anglo-Jewry today would recognise it as the same community we had 20 years ago. It's more active and vital and has richer cultural, social and educational facilities.[248]
>
> Quoted in The Jewish News (21st April 2011, p 4)

Sacks was without doubt a significant agent of change and a leader – it was as if he had single-handedly placed his arms around the community and moved it forward. His intervention reframed the communal landscape to elevate Jewish education to a higher level. However, he achieved it at immense personal cost during his early years as Chief Rabbi in what was a difficult and challenging experience – that period was also deeply damaging for cross-communal relations.[249]

4.3.2 Jewish Continuity – Lay Leadership

As has been noted, the Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT) was led by a group of independent wealthy communal leaders who donated personal wealth and also sat at the decision-making table. Regarding Jewish Continuity, Kestenbaum had analysed the Jewish continuity work in America and had read 'A Time To Act' (1990) which set out the thinking behind a Mandel-led Commission. One lesson that Kestenbaum noted with particular interest and enthusiasm was the listing of key lay leaders who had been recruited in support of the initiative. They were a diverse group representing traditional supporters of Jewish education and cultural life, as well as leadership figures from the worlds of Israel and welfare philanthropy – it marked a critical shift as interest in Jewish education was broadened amongst the philanthropic elite. This was about big community change and Kestenbaum understood that "leadership is key". In addition, and at a different level, Danker observed that: "Jewish Continuity took pride in engaging lay leadership – a new army of believers in a new mission. It attracted activists." Wagner confirmed that: "… some see the new leadership which Jewish Continuity has attracted as a vital element in the progress made." (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 45).

[248] See also Sacks, 2009, p 52; Sacks, 1994, p 104). Sinclair had also indicated Jewish Continuity success criteria (Shalom, 3rd April 1996, p 18).
[249] The Stanmore Accords (1998) were established to try and retrieve civility in cross-communal religious affairs (Jewish Chronicle, 12th September 2008). (Text of the Accords to be found in Rigal and Rosenberg (2004, pp 335-7; Persoff, 2010, pp 125-144)

In late 1992 and early 1993, inspired by the Chief Rabbi's vision, a group of wealthy, committed lay people were brought together by the Office of the Chief Rabbi to address the practical dimensions of the project (the group was known as 'The Sounding Board' (see earlier references).[250] Under the Chair of Dr Michael Sinclair,[251] they began to assist the Chief Rabbi in thinking through priority areas for intervention – inspired by his writings. As noted earlier, the Sounding Board played an important role in shaping the skeletal framework for Jewish Continuity. Kestenbaum continued to work with Sinclair and the founding group of lay leaders but later retreated on the appointment of Clive Lawton as the Jewish Continuity Chief Executive. Lawton did expand the range of intervention areas and extend the focus but it appears that the Sounding Board played an early role and many of its members went on to become the new Jewish Continuity Board.

Michael Sinclair had undergone a personal journey towards greater Orthodox Jewish religious commitment before he became involved with Jewish Continuity (he was '*baale t'shuva*' (most literally understood as a returning or repentant Jew, to describe a secular Jew who becomes significantly more religious) – invariably with a particularly fervent commitment to a religious lifestyle). He had accumulated considerable personal wealth as a healthcare entrepreneur.[252] He was himself ready to commit substantial funding towards the Chief Rabbi's vision and had displayed a generous philanthropic spirit in his support of the Jewish community. Sinclair was driven by Jewish values of charity and his assistant Lira Winston described his view in the following way: "Dr Sinclair believed that if you were in the fortunate position of being able to donate to charities you had a responsibility to do this and to use your resources in a beneficial way."

Sinclair was very much the outsider and celebrated that fact. Though he held multiple synagogue memberships (Orthodox and Reform through his wife), he was not associated with

[250] Sounding Board Minutes, 31st March 1993: Membership: Richard Alberg; Michael Bradfield; Charles Corman; Allan Fisher; Michael Goldmeier; Barbara Green; Stephen Greenman; Henry Israel; Brian Kerner; Lynndy Levin; Daniel Levy; Steven Lewis; Clive Marks; Joshua Rowe; Dr Michael Sinclair; Leslie Wagner; Andrew Loftus; Michael Rose; Sir Harry Solomon. Staff: Lira Winston; Syma Weinberg; Michael Mail.
[251] Sacks had appointed Dr Michael Sinclair as the Chair of the Sounding Board after meeting him at the opening ceremony of the residential Sage Nursing Home for the Elderly in Golders Green in November 1992. Kestenbaum reported meeting him for the first time at the OCR offices on the evening of 24th December 1992. Clearly, Sinclair had entered the Jewish Continuity process at an early stage.
[252] He sold one of his major business interests in 1993.

any particular framework within the community.[253] He expressed surprise at the reception he received from the more established communal leadership whom he felt treated him as some kind of upstart and an outside intruder rather than as a new lay leader to be judged on the quality of his contribution. It was certainly the case that this relatively unknown figure on the British Jewish communal scene was seen as an outsider by the 'ruling elite' ('establishment') philanthropists – though Clive Marks described him as tall, a fluent speaker without notes, and greatly admired him. Marks also noted that he was "keen but could be abrasive". Chinn described him as extremely talented and creative and that "he was the driving force." He also added that Michael Sinclair was a natural partner for him. A fellow senior Jewish Continuity Trustee observed: "he was the leading person and imposed his own agenda." Alternatively, a senior JIA lay leader described him as "blinkered" with very strong religious and other views. Whatever fellow lay leaders may have thought of him, they invariably appreciated his generosity of time and money. Though a busy and successful business person, he was in the Jewish Continuity offices on a weekly basis and readily promoted the organisation whenever he was available. Those interviewees who referred to Sinclair's role admired his personal commitment – if not always his leadership style or his views. One senior figure summed him up as someone who had the ideas and the drive but did not understand or appreciate how to make it happen within the communal context.

Sinclair was a big personality, outspoken, and sought to impose his will on the new organisation – he defined his approach as the application of disruptive technology – as discussed earlier. He was not a 'committee person' (committees tend to be a dominant and often negative motif of Jewish community work) and sometimes rather autocratic; but he was also able to drive things forward. (Wagner tactfully noted that "What is seen as strong and effective leadership from one perspective is seen as autocratic and erratic from another." (p 39) and that the structure "leads to too much power being vested in the Chairman [Sinclair]" (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 44). Indeed, there were several projects apparently adopted by Jewish Continuity solely on the strength of Sinclair's authority, regardless of Board approval or whether or not they fitted the overall strategy. The Hebrew Reading Crash Course and the Rosh Hashanah[254] Guide were two such examples – the former was an outstanding success, even if not necessarily officially sanctioned by the due process of Jewish

[253] Though he did have a number of significant prior involvements, including the Jewish Learning Exchange (JLE).
[254] Jewish New Year festival.

Continuity decision-making – and were examples of disruptive technologies. He acted with passion and zeal and brought an entrepreneurial spirit, challenging the status quo – Danker described him as "the Richard Branson of the Jewish communal world with a licence to tear up the rule book" in the role of a maverick and an innovator intent on taking on the communal establishment. It was a role he assumed with alacrity – in his own view, he was acting as a 'change agent', a role he relished, in a community seriously in need of change. He came across as disdainful of sections of the existing leadership – both lay and professional, and in some cases, rabbinic (his negative attitudes to the non-Orthodox are discussed under 'Cross-communalism' but he also was reported to have had reservations about the effectiveness of some Orthodox rabbis) – as well as a number of pre-existing organisations.

Clive Marks was another ready recruit for Sacks and he became an initially enthusiastic sponsor of Jewish Continuity (together with other wealthy supporters). He was appointed its first Treasurer, providing significant funding through the Lord Ashdown Charitable Settlement which he represented.[255] However, as previously noted, Marks increasingly became "the leader of the internal opposition within Jewish Continuity" (as Simon Caplan termed it – Caplan[256] was a consultant to Marks). Marks eventually resigned. A Jewish Continuity staff member's perspective on Marks was that he was "persistently ambiguous on whether he thought the initiative was wonderful or dreadful." (He was later to become a supporter of UJIA.)

As already noted, Jewish Continuity intentionally enlisted numerous lay leaders who had little prior experience at the senior levels of communal leadership. It was particularly empowering for these people and a welcome alternative and addition to community leadership. However, there was subsequent disappointment at Task Group level:

- the Groups generated more work than the professionals were able to meaningfully service;
- the funding for their proposals was not forthcoming (with leading Jewish Continuity professionals holding JIA accountable for this whilst some of their lay people suggested that a number of the Task Groups were breaking down anyway);

[255] Marks also supported Jews College which later became the London School of Jewish Studies, another project that had attracted significant financial support from the Lord Ashdown Charitable Settlement as a result of Marks's close relationship with the Chief Rabbi.
[256] Caplan himself felt that Jewish Continuity needed to be on a more professional footing but did recognise some of the benefits that it brought to Anglo-Jewry, particularly the engagement of leading lay and professional figures.

- they were not empowered nor given the authority to lead;
- they themselves often lacked the skill set necessary for their Task Group specialist areas.

The Jewish Continuity enterprise began to run aground and some of the lay leadership were uncomfortable with the later relationship with the JIA. A number of these people did not continue their involvement within UJIA.

In summary, the other lay leadership appeared weak in the face of the dominance of Michael Sinclair. Clearly, this was in no small measure to the fact that he was a majorly significant donor to the organisation and a powerful personal presence. In similar vein, it was, therefore, not surprising to discover that another major funder in Marks led the opposition. A further element may have been that, as the appointed Chair, Sinclair was considered to have the ear of the Chief Rabbi (and the authority that would accompany it). Sinclair certainly led the organisation with personal commitment and dedication and headed Jewish Continuity's initial burst of active engagement amongst a new generation of volunteer leadership. However, unfolding events dissipated their enthusiasm. It also floundered on poor strategic management and financial difficulties. Sinclair could not carry the organisation and deliver on force of personality, religious conviction and the available funding alone. He could not overcome or manage other key community stakeholders and their interests, nor, together with Lawton, the strategic and tactical communal challenge. (Cross-communal issues are discussed later.)

4.3.3 UJIA – Lay Leadership

A profound change was occurring during the closing decades of the twentieth century as several influential Zionist lay leaders began to assert that the needs of Jewish education in the Diaspora were increasingly important. Essentially, the argument was that as the state of Israel had been established, a strong Diaspora could only become the source of future new immigrants to Israel or donors to its cause if there was serious Jewish education that established a meaningful relationship between Diaspora Jews and the Jewish state. In fact, the Zionist movement had always supported Jewish-Zionist education in the Diaspora through JAFI. As previously noted, Fred Worms had articulated the argument in a 1976 pamphlet. However, it was to take a further two decades and the emergence of the UJIA (established 1st

January 1997) before the idea was to materialise in the context of the British Jewish community institutional architecture. In practice, the JIA (as the main Israel-oriented community fundraising organisation) had always been a low profile funder of a number of UK-based education projects, including the JEDT.

Two major JIA lay leaders (who also took on positions within Jewish Continuity) Sir Trevor Chinn and particularly Brian Kerner, were to play pivotal roles in the merger process and both were committed to the twin campaign of 'rescue and renewal' – Jews in distress in Israel and around the world and Jewish education for British Jewry, particularly for its young people. Chinn had opened the door to the Jewish Continuity relationship by establishing the JIA funding arrangement with Jewish Continuity (Press Release, 8th July 1994). He had led the JIA for twenty-one years and was central to the deal with Jewish Continuity and also played an important role in the merger. He also provided both political and thought leadership and was rightly described as 'a prime mover'.[257] However, it was left to Kerner to take it forward (from December 1994). He was faced with strong resistance from the 'old school' JIA loyalists; for example, in Manchester there was particularly significant opposition (as well as elements amongst their London supporters). Kerner had also already learned the importance of taking the JIA leadership and rank and file with him after having initially run into difficulties over the initial JIA-Jewish Continuity funding agreement. However, Kerner's outstanding contribution was his ability to bring people together. Sir Harry Solomon was clear on who was key to the merger: "Brian Kerner made the merger happen. He was a moderate, unifying … the right person at the right time to bring people together. He understood the needs." Elkan Levy, President of the Orthodox United Synagogue, reported that Kerner was likeable and someone with whom he could work, and Rabbi Bayfield as a leading figure in the Reform movement recorded his "enormous respect and affection for Brian Kerner."

Brian Kerner had joined the JIA in 1966 and had been an active fundraiser during the 1973 Yom Kippor War. In 1982, he resigned over the Lebanon War (Peace for Galilee Operation) – Kerner did not feel it was a war to raise money for. He felt that Chinn saw the JIA as a fundraising group going back to the same old people. In 1988 (he sold his business in that

[257] George Weidenfeld described him: "[By the late 1970s]… a new generation of Anglo-Jewish activists was emerging, the most effective being Sir Trevor Chinn, a dynamic businessman with a flair for politics and a gift for reconciling feuding factions." p 402 and "… a forceful, almost obsessively devoted communal leader, animator, fundraiser and sophisticated lobbyist." p 432 Weidenfeld (1995).

year), he came back into the JIA, working on its programmes in Ashkelon, Dimona and the Galil, and later re-joined the Board. Kerner was not religious but described himself as "terribly Jewish." He had personal experiences of antisemitism, and Modern Jewish History was his hobby, studying in particular antisemitism and the Shoa (Holocaust) – of which his wife was a survivor. He recalled how the Chief Rabbi's book, 'Will We Have Jewish Grandchildren?' resonated with him. He saw "less commitment in the next generation and a huge increase in inter-marriage." He also asserted that: "I wanted Jewish continuity rather than religious continuity."

Brian Kerner took over as Chair of JIA and then became the UJIA Chairperson. Affable and a natural diplomat and 'peace-maker' (overwhelmingly confirmed in interviews), he was building relationships and offering reassurance.[258] (In 1999, on completion of his term,[259] a Jewish Chronicle Editorial (24th September 1999) commented: "Brian Kerner, without whose strong, steady, yet self-effacing leadership the reorientation of the old JIA might well have gone awry; ... Mr Kerner's rare ability to combine a public leadership role with sure-footed internal stewardship ...") Both Kestenbaum and Ariel appreciated his role: he gave them 'air cover' – Kestenbaum for fundraising (Kestenbaum did not have a fundraising background) and Ariel for partner relationship building and planning. Kerner was putting in two days a week to the nascent UJIA project: encouraging people; creating a good morale amongst the staff; speaking to groups around the country. He was bringing the two sides together and managing and integrating the JIA and Jewish Continuity personalities. Michael Sinclair joined the UJIA Board as his Deputy; Howard Stanton became Treasurer and brought good order to the financial management; Anthony Spitz headed up the Jewish Renewal side and was joined by Michael Goldstein, Anthony Warrens and others from Jewish Continuity.

The approach of the UJIA lay leaders was radically different to Jewish Continuity. They trusted their professionals who made a point of building a system in which lay people were fully and genuinely integrated into the decision-making system. However, one casualty of this new structure was the opportunity for wider lay involvement on the scale of Jewish Continuity. Nonetheless, each of the three departments (plus Research and Development, Lifelong Learning, JAMS and Youth Movement Allocations) had its own lay policy group

[258] Kerner himself compared it to "a firm that was trying to start trading again – in need of customers, funders, analysts – but it was not trading on much."
[259] He was succeeded by David M. Cohen in 1999-2000.

with active chair people who were directly involved with their professionals – the system generally worked well and it was more realistic and manageable than the Jewish Continuity Task Groups.[260] A UJIA professional felt that the Jewish Renewal lay leaders were decent, engaged people but lacking visionary movers and shakers. That was an overstatement at the policy-setting level but there was a sense that only a few of the leading UJIA Trustees were sufficiently invested in Jewish Renewal. However, the professionals were leading the way, in a professional manner, and implementing agreed plans and working well with their lay leaders.

Kerner and Sinclair each symbolised two of the defining movements in contemporary British Jewish philanthropic leadership: Kerner for the evolving neo-Zionist movement which retained the centrality of Israel but recognised the need to strengthen and unify the Jewish People through Jewish education and engagement; and Sinclair for the outreach movement of determined Orthodoxy seeking to bring Jews back to the fold of religious practice and commitment (for Sinclair, 'non-Orthodox Jews' were 'not-yet-Orthodox Jews'.) [261] Sinclair later drifted away from the UJIA.

Jonny Ariel had argued that lay leaders needed to bring a minimum of two of the following three elements to their lay leadership roles: wealth, wisdom and work (work defined as a willingness to actively engage with the project).[262] This provides a useful template for assessing the contribution of lay leadership and UJIA Jewish Renewal was able to find wise and willing workers. However, the challenge of raising funds for Jewish education was also to test the UJIA as they also struggled to achieve their fundraising targets. It is also important to note that women were chronically under-represented in the senior leaderships of both Jewish Continuity and UJIA. Finally, Gerald Ronson bluntly summed up the challenge: "Communal organisations become effective when the lay leaders and the professionals they employ work together as a team. Leadership quality is a key factor in the success or failure of any organisation. Having served on many committees over the years, I am constantly amazed by the number of communal leaders who although extremely successful in business leave their business experience and their brains behind them when they become active in the

[260] As examples, Anthony Warrens brought rigour to the Educational Leadership Policy Group and Andrew Gilbert brought guidance, insight, drive and an ability to engage other lay leaders in the Israel Experience work.
[261] Other movements might include, as examples, various non-Orthodox religious streams; 'tikkun olam' (lit. repair the world) Jewish social action-oriented and more liberal movements; Jewish cultural movements; traditional style, Zionist movements, etc. (as well as the ultra-Orthodox movements).
[262] This was a formulation that he attributed to the Mandel Centre – Ariel was a graduate.

community." (New Moon, December 1993, p 19.) (Ronson was overly simplistic: the problem may be more that lay leaders apply their business acumen and personal experience to communal frameworks and challenges, and lack the nuance and expertise for managing communal organisations and change – though it may also be fair to claim that some do not always apply the same rigour in their communal work.)

4.3.4 Jewish Continuity – Professional Leadership

Michael Goldstein was not alone in observing that the partnership between a lay Chair and the Chief Executive is crucial, arguing that they should have complementary rather than matching skills and attitudes. The choice of Clive Lawton as the Jewish Continuity Chief Executive was pivotal[263] – a professional leader whose approach and outlook was closely aligned with that of Sinclair (who supported the appointment), and the dynamics of their alliance was to shape the organisation. Essentially, in choosing Lawton, Jewish Continuity had appointed another radical, anti-establishment figure in the role of Chief Executive. This inevitably meant that the Chief Executive and his lay Chair would re-enforce each other in pursuit of more radical ideas. Lawton was not a restraining influence upon Sinclair: two maverick, independent-minded non-conformists let loose on the establishment was exciting and challenging but also a recipe for tension and friction. Once ensconced in their new roles, the Office of the Chief Rabbi was unable to restrain the Jewish Continuity pairing and increasingly winced at their excesses – despite initial encouragement. Each of Sinclair and Lawton were tremendously talented with much to offer but the combination proved, with hindsight, problematic**.**

Despite what was to occur, Lawton was clearly the outstanding candidate for the post of Jewish Continuity Chief Executive, with a curriculum vitae that suggested he had spent his career training for the role. Lawton was a highly respected Jewish educator – Jewishly-literate, a brilliant and witty public speaker and an experienced professional. He was flamboyant, dramatic and theatrical and was a passionate advocate for Jewish continuity, where he saw the need to shake up the system, experiment and introduce a fresh approach. (In *New Moon*, he was described thus: "His gift is the art of words …. He turns phrases as if on a

[263] There were other experienced and competent colleagues in his team but he was very clearly the lead and dominant professional.

spindle, weaving word pictures with the consummate ease of an actor, which is what he originally trained to be." (New Moon, July 1994, pp 42-46)). He was an Orthodox Jew who was comfortable in non-Orthodox settings; his own Orthodox conviction rejected Progressive Judaism, though he was far more adept at handling the cross-communal issues than many other Orthodox Jewish leaders. However, he was equally well-known for his bohemian approach which meant, as one colleague put it, that people were "as likely to be discussing his sandals as his ideas." A lay activist commented that: "He was lampooned both for his attire and his organisational weakness." One critic described his managerial style as being "the extension of his own charisma, and thereby lacking in strategic thinking; big on ideas but not a strategic thinker." A highly regarded Jewish Continuity lay leader suggested that Clive Lawton would have been okay in the Seventies or Eighties but not the Nineties. An insightful Jewish Continuity lay leader evaluated Lawton in the following way: "Clive was an educator – he could describe problems but was less strong on definition and solution." and another felt that "Clive was an educator not a Chief Executive; he did not fully grasp management."[264] At the same time, it is worth restating that Lawton was acknowledged and appreciated by various community activists as "a "phenomenal and inspirational voice", and "one of the outstanding and leading Jewish educators of his generation" – these were widely shared views.

As Jewish Continuity evolved, it was increasingly the case in various quarters that there was growing exasperation and frustration with Lawton – and also at the inability to control him. A senior Progressive professional observed: "Clive got it wrong. He placed too much energy and effort into being non-Establishment with the sarcastic view that the establishment would not enhance Jewish life. It failed – he failed to prove his own point and was the instrument of his own downfall."[265] One Jewish Continuity activist felt that Lawton "was too 'present' in that sometimes professionals need to shut up and allow lay leaders to engage with the issues; but this was not in Lawton's repertoire." A senior lay Trustee in Jewish Continuity who admired Lawton declared more generously: "Clive Lawton was engaging but irritated a lot of

[264] In fact, Lawton was a successful former Head Teacher of a Jewish secondary comprehensive school in Liverpool and from there had moved on to take a senior role in the local education authority. However, it seems that the managerial and leadership skill set necessary for successful school headship may be significantly different, given the school context and its lines of authority and the various roles assigned to deputies, bursars and others – and the fact that the goals are clearer and that the structure is rigid. There is room for creativity in school but it remains within a rigorously defined framework – in contrast to less sharply framed communal bodies.

[265] Kalman went much further when he noted what he defined as: "… the virtual unanimity of opinion that Lawton's running of the organisation has been a disaster." (New Moon, August 1995, p 27).

people – his dress and style – but he did not get a fair crack of the whip; though he was not as politically aware as he should have been for a Chief Executive" – and went on to suggest that he was naïve. The JIA and the Office of the Chief Rabbi were not going to tolerate the continued involvement of Lawton. Sinclair stood by him but it was apparent that Lawton was to be removed.[266] One lay leader admitted: "I did not realise the profundity of antipathy held towards Clive." Another seasoned Jewish Continuity leader admired Lawton and felt that just as Moses had not been allowed to lead the people into the Promised Land, so too was Lawton barred from leading Jewish Continuity into the merger with the JIA. This was a generous analysis – Lawton was clearly 'damaged goods'. (Lawton's approach was covered earlier.)

In summary, another commentator stated: "He was the fall guy for Michael Sinclair and the Chief Rabbi – the Chief Rabbi was not going to be tarnished and Michael Sinclair joined UJIA." (Lawton also had to defer to both Sacks and Sinclair.) Another put it this way: "If the only issue had been cross-communalism then Clive could have been kept on: cross-communalism did not sink Clive it sank the organisation." Lawton could not be held responsible for the problems of cross-communalism and to a limited extent the Jewish Continuity operational foundations were in place prior to his arrival. (Lawton was first referenced in the Jewish Continuity Minutes in August 1993.) Lawton would also maintain that the JIA funding deal was not of his own making (and that indeed he was deeply suspicious of it) – though questions remain over the deliverability of Jewish Continuity's prior plans for its own fundraising. However, Lawton was sunk by his failings in the organisational and strategic arenas. Lawton's defence was that he was overtaken by events beyond his control that affected the timetable and finances and led to unattainable demands within a reduced timeframe – and that was, in part, true. He would also claim a strong track record in managerial and organisational positions evidenced by his roles as Head of King David High School, Liverpool and as a Deputy Director within Liverpool Education Authority (and also an advocate of a more conciliatory cross-communal approach both within Jewish Continuity and beyond[267]). However, strategic planning and effective management and leadership are, to some considerable degree, the ability to navigate the strategic, tactical and political complexities in a rapidly changing environment – he was unable to do so and paid the price. Many noted that he was painfully wounded by the Jewish Continuity

[266] Furthermore, this later carried over to UJIA where no position was subsequently offered to Lawton.
[267] For example, he had been a leading figure in Limmud, which worked on a cross-communal basis.

experience and that it undermined the scope of his future professional role within the community.

4.3.5 UJIA – Professional Leadership

There was a dramatic change under the new UJIA team. Jonathan Kestenbaum was an accomplished and consummate Chief Executive – confident, professional and effective. He had been the Director of the Office of the Chief Rabbi and was instrumental in the initial establishment of Jewish Continuity. Perhaps surprisingly, he had managed to emerge relatively unscathed from the Jewish Continuity turmoil.[268] Worms (Worms, 1996, p 252) described him as: "A modern, Orthodox Jew who had made *aliyah* [emigrated to Israel], he represented the very best of Anglo-Saxon and Jewish culture. Bilingual, learned, determined yet tolerant, he was the prototype of the educated Jew." Sinclair and Lawton had taken Jewish Continuity off in directions unintended by the Office of the Chief Rabbi. Kestenbaum was then required to salvage, stabilise and reinvent the project. Furthermore, Kerner appointed Kestenbaum[269] to head up UJIA (May[270]-June 1996) and they were to prove a highly effective pairing, complemented by the appointment of Jonny Ariel (he and Kestenbaum were old friends and colleagues) – another strong choice. Kestenbaum was certainly not going to find a place for Lawton – though Ariel may have been more sympathetic had it been up to him.

Kestenbaum officially completed his role as Director of the Office of the Chief Rabbi towards the end of the summer, 1996.[271] After returning from holiday, he was able to focus on his new role, though with an autumn setback as the result of a serious football injury. He and Ariel engaged in an intensive planning process through the first half of 1997. (UJIA was

[268] It has not been within the remit of this research to investigate the inner workings of the Office of the Chief Rabbi but Kesternbaum emerged from it with his reputation undiminished.
[269] Bringing in Kestenbaum as the head of the new body was seen as a "considerable stroke" by many. Kestenbaum was brought up in London and had been head of the religiously modern Orthodox Bnei Akiva youth movement and later moved to Israel. During his Israeli army service he attracted some controversy when he published his personal diary relating to the moral challenges of military service in 'the Territories'. He was persuaded by Sacks to return to London to serve as Director of the new Chief Rabbi's office in 1991. Early in 1996, Kerner recalled that he had already tentatively asked Kestenbaum about staying on to take a leadership role in whatever was to emerge post-Jewish Continuity. However, he turned down the offer as he was due to return to Israel in 1996.
[270] Kestenbaum agreed to the appointment after the results of the Israeli elections were confirmed (29th May 1996).
[271] Kestenbaum was not in the Office of the Chief Rabbi at the time of the Gryn funeral.

formally launched 1st January 1997.) Kestenbaum was to become, by some distance, one of the most accomplished Jewish communal civil servants: he was Jewishly literate, a gifted public speaker, politically astute, with strong leadership and managerial qualities, who was also highly skilled in handling inter-personal relationships and was comfortable in dealing with wealthy communal leadership almost on equal terms. Rabbi Bayfield described the change of leadership as follows: "The transforming event was UJIA taking over and being able to work with Jonathan Kestenbaum." This was as true for him in the Reform Movement as it was true for many partners and stakeholders (though not all). Kestenbaum brought order and discipline. He was not going to take risks with UJIA and was an effective operator. A senior JIA lay leader observed: "Kestenbaum came on board [with UJIA] and had a background with the Chief Rabbi. He was a powerhouse: incredibly determined, tough and with connections." He was a remarkable talent and destined for bigger things – as has been proven by his subsequent career.[272]

Kestenbaum and Ariel had both worked at the Melitz Centre in Jerusalem under Avraham Infeld, an inspirational figure in the world of informal Jewish education.[273] Marlena Schmool described it as "a generational takeover – painful but necessary. They also brought a new philosophy." This was indeed the case: Kestenbaum and Ariel, both in their mid-thirties, heralded a generational shift in the professional leadership of the new organisation – and indeed the community. Another senior community professional summed up the pair as follows: "They were high performing, strong, charismatic personalities – both very good looking, charming, exceptionally personable guys. They broke the image of Jewish professionals and had a sense of knowing what they were about."

Kerner described how the senior Trustees were setting the direction and tone. However, Kestenbaum and Ariel operated as both senior professional civil servants and the leading practitioners in their field who were serving their lay leadership – but they were very much driving the process. Leslie Wagner observed that the UJIA professionals were stronger and that the lay leadership trusted them more. Andrew Gilbert, a Jewish Renewal lay leader, felt that there was reasonable strategic cooperation between the lay and professional leaders but operationally it was professionally led and the contrasts with the former administration

[272] Amongst other endeavours, Kestenbaum went on to head NESTA (the National Endowment for Science Technology and the Arts) before succeeding Lord Rothschild as Chair and Chief Executive of Five Arrows. He is now Lord Kestenbaum.
[273] See www.5leggedtable.org/en in tribute to Infeld.

(Jewish Continuity) could not have been more pronounced. Rabbi Saul Zneimer described the UJIA period as framed by "an interesting mix of the Chief Rabbi as the ideologue; Kestenbaum as the operator; and Ariel as the expert." In reality, the Chief Rabbi's profile was dramatically lowered and he took an increasingly reduced role – the inspirational figurehead receding into the background. (Jewish Continuity, March 1996 p 37).

A range of Interviewees from all categories in terms of both role and religious affiliation, generally released a cascade of compliments for Ariel, both in terms of his professional and personal attributes: "an outstanding 'reflective practitioner'"; "He was a 'one to one' mentor to a huge number of people."; "Jonny Ariel was a content educator – a genuine, credible educator."; "Jonny Ariel was a really good management consultant."; "Jonny Ariel valued your opinion. He also invested in his staff."; "Ariel was a great professional – something new for the old JIA: a quiet, quality professional."; "An exceedingly good manager; very bright; knowledgeable, witty, charming, urbane; full of wise counsel; particularly genial." "The partnership with Ariel was very exciting; no one of the quality of Jonny Ariel has emerged since." In terms of his role and presence in the field these complements clearly spoke for themselves.

Ariel was also a wordsmith. Jon Boyd pointed out how Ariel generated the language and tools for the Jewish Renewal programme that lasted for over a decade. He used language that inculcated the field: 'turn up the Jewish heat', 'critical friend' in support of partners and 'partnership', 'safe space' for cross-communal dialogue, taking a 'helicopter view' for broad strategic planning, and more. These phrases began, as Lewis explained, to permeate the educational discourse amongst the lay and professional leadership (though in fact, as she also noted, it was only a small inner circle who fully grasped what Jewish Renewal was about). 'The Next Horizon' was appreciated as a strong strategic plan and it effectively summarised all that Ariel and his colleagues had learned and brought to the Jewish Renewal programme.[274] He also stressed the importance of investing in people ("It's about people, stupid."[275]) and terms and conditions were also improved.

[274] An expert consultant close to the process asked: "to what extent it was a reflection of your thinking after the first four years rather than a blueprint for the next three years."
[275] Based on President Clinton's 1992 election catch phrase: "The economy, stupid." (credited to James Carvelle). (In 1997, Ariel also had the backdrop of the Labour Party slogan 'Education, Education, Education', and the teacher recruitment campaign launched in the same year: "No one forgets a good teacher.")

Ariel (with Kestenbaum's support) designed Jewish Renewal for a post-Jewish Continuity period in which lessons had been learned and limits set: experimentation and innovation were considered high risk (though Ariel himself may have been personally more pre-disposed towards innovation he was not going to take risks). Unlike Lawton, Ariel had the advantage of knowing where the mines were and the time to plot a route map around them. 'Worthy, but dull?' Worthy it was, though measured and deliberate and perhaps over-cautious – some argued that there should have been less time spent thinking and strategizing and more energy invested in action. Nonetheless, the Ariel contribution was a robust Jewish Renewal plan and way of working that stood the test of time remarkably well – it provided an outstanding model of its kind. One Interviewee usefully framed the two professional leaders: "Lawton wished to take the role of the 'sage on the stage'; whereas Ariel preferred the role of the 'guide on the side' – this may also have significantly coloured their influence on each of their respective organisational identities.

4.4 Challenges

4.4.1 Cross-communalism

For the purposes of the current research, there are several terms that require clarification: 'pluralism' meaning equal acceptance and recognition of all positions; 'exclusivism' meaning that only one position is right; 'inclusivism' in which it is possible to take an exclusivist position but be ready to find a conditional way of working with all Jews – this was the term adopted by the Chief Rabbi in his writings to define his position; 'Cross-communalism' is a term that suggests working across the community without judging any single group – by way of acceptance or otherwise. However, for some there is an overlap between inclusivism and cross-communalism and they tend to use the terms interchangeably. In the context of the period being studied, 'cross-communalism' is the term used by many to suggest working without prejudice across the mainstream community; however, it is also used as a general title for the whole issue. Furthermore, there are additional definitions of the term 'pluralism'. Unfortunately, it is difficult to achieve more precise definitions and demarcations. This section will only deal with the headline features of the cross-communalism issue without entering the theological complexities involved.

4.4.1.1 Jakobovits and Sacks

Finestein noted that Jakobovits's JEDT funding grants was not limited to Orthodox institutions nor were the funds raised limited to Orthodox sources (Finestein, 1999, p 281). The membership of the JEDT was described by Bermant as "what might be called a wall-to-wall board of trustees" from across the religious community (Bermant, 1990, p 194). That was misleading: Sir Trevor Chinn was directly involved with the JEDT and had a close association with the Reform Movement. However, neither the Movement nor Sir Trevor himself understood that he was involved with the JEDT as the official representative of the RSGB (Reform Synagogues of Great Britain) (reported in interviews with Andrew Gilbert and Sir Trevor Chinn – Chinn stated explicitly that he was not there as a representative of the Reform Movement) – he was there primarily with his JIA connections and as a supportive philanthropist and community leader. However, the JEDT was ready to provide conditional

support to some projects within the non-Orthodox world.[276] The Reform Rabbi Bayfield was part of the JEDT think tank that produced the Worms Report (JEDT, 1992, p vii). He reported a JEDT involvement "with limits" in its interaction with non-Orthodoxy. However, this was not without controversy and the Jewish Chronicle (19th April, 1991) reported that, as a result of Bayfield's involvement, "Mr Bernard Garbacz resigned as a trustee of the Jewish Educational Development Trust" and it was also implied that Sacks (then Chief Rabbi-elect) would not be actively involved for the same reason – though he apparently indicated his willingness to act as a consultant. The Report was not explicit on a pluralist approach but Worms's autobiography was approvingly so (Worms, 1996, pp 246-250) (as was the *Jewish Chronicle*, 4th September, 1992; though an article written by Worms on his report and its proposed "national council for Jewish education" in an Orthodox journal did not mention pluralism – perhaps understandably (L'Eylah September 1992, pp 31-32)). However, not all think tank members agreed and one right-wing central Orthodox member was quick to oppose any prospect of Orthodoxy working directly together with non-Orthodox on Jewish education.[277]

Jakobovits was from a staunchly Orthodox background but was able to work with the Reform Movement – though without recognising them.[278] Sacks's book, 'One People?' (1993), reflected his own efforts to bring about a major overhaul in the approach of the religious right but did not convince the Orthodox conservatives nor satisfy the aspirations of the religious

[276] In the grounds of the Reform Movement's Finchley (London) headquarters, there is to this day a plaque attesting to JEDT financial support.

[277] Henry Israel was a member of the Worms Report (JEDT, September 1992) think tank and his name was linked to the Hasmonean schools – located on the right of central Orthodoxy. In a *Jewish Chronicle* letter (18th September 1992) he was keen to explain the context and address the issue: "Our report is one of evaluation, to which views from all sectors of the community were sought and given. It includes recommendations, but these are of a managerial and promotional nature and do not cover educational activity." He noted that the Report was to return to the JEDT to decide on how to proceed and to set up a committee to explore the recommendations. But he continued: "we could not sit on a committee with others outside Orthodox circles since each sector of the community has it [sic] own needs and requirements and is best served by committees dedicated to its own philosophy." He (Israel) was setting the demarcation lines for any future developments emerging from the Worms Report – whilst there could be some cooperation of a "managerial and promotional nature", they could not work together on "educational activity", instead recommending that each sector should be "served by committees dedicated to its own philosophy." This was a positive 'spin'. What he actually meant was that his section of Orthodoxy would not in any way validate non-Orthodox Judaism by working together in the delivery of education – on Israel and welfare it was possible, but education was positioned along a decisive fault line within British Jewry that was not to be disturbed.

[278] Jakobovits was nonetheless withering in his criticisms of Reform Judaism (Persoff, 2002, pp 255-258) – Persoff provided a detailed analysis of the subject. Bermant (1990, p 188) argued (oft quoted): "His failures as a bridge-builder, in the last resort, arise not so much from his abhorrence of progressive doctrines as his conviction that the Orthodox have everything to teach and nothing to learn."

left – indeed, he inadvertently succeeded in alienating sections on both sides.[279] One non-Orthodox respondent presented the following paradox: it was as if Jakobovits was ready to work with them as separate but equal, whilst Sacks was ready to lump them together but as unequal. Neither was good for the non-Orthodox world but for some Jakobovits's approach was arguably more tolerable.[280] Bermant, having noted that Jakobovits only fought on his Left and not the Right, concluded: "The main question, therefore, is: will Sacks fight on two fronts? His ideas suggest that he might, but ideas aren't everything."[281] (Jewish Chronicle, 9th August, 1991, p 13.)

In broad terms, the right wing religious authorities considered Jakobovits to be 'safe' (in the context of their own rabbinic understanding and interpretation of these matters), being from a long and respected rabbinic lineage – one of their own. In contra-distinction, Sacks was considered rather more 'suspect' by those same authorities – lacking in rabbinic lineage, too much time in the 'outside' modern secular world, including secular university, and not, in their view, enough serious time spent in Yeshiva.[282] His writings did nothing to allay right wing disquiet. The situation was made even more complex by the fact that Sacks's immense intellect appeared to intimidate a number of his rabbinic colleagues and engendered further unease. (As previously noted, Kestenbaum was descended from a revered Orthodox Rabbi but did not hold a rabbinic post himself – this was to play out to his advantage.)

4.4.1.2 Jewish Continuity and Cross-communalism

Chief Rabbi Sacks and Kestenbaum had initially hoped that the cross-communalism issue would not undermine the Jewish Continuity organisation. Perhaps naively, as already discussed above, they seem to have believed that differences would be overlooked in favour of the greater communal good – that it would only be a problem if people chose to make it

[279] Sacks, 1991, p 155 "Pluralism at this primary level is impossible, even incoherent. There is, then, an asymmetry between Orthodoxy and Reform. Reform can concede legitimacy to Orthodoxy; Orthodoxy cannot do so to Reform." Sacks's position on 'pluralism' was already known and clearly not negotiable.
[280] Furthermore, Jakobovits's more dovish views on Israel further endeared him to sections of the religious left.
[281] In the same article, Bermant, with reference to Modern Orthodoxy, tellingly continued: "It plays with ideas, but eschews action; it eschews action because it lacks guts; and on most issues, it continues to take its orders from ancient Orthodoxy."
[282] Alderman, 1998, pp 392-393: "A philosopher rather than a theologian, Dr Sacks (unlike his predecessor, Lord Jakobovits) was not born within this world. He entered from the outside a world which is notoriously suspicious of outsiders and, to make matters worse, his loudly proclaimed policy of 'inclusivism', of entering into dialogue with Jews of every persuasion, served merely to deepen these suspicions."

one. There appeared to have been a rather optimistic belief that a big, powerful idea would generate a great wave of enthusiasm that would override cross-communal divisions. As Lawton put it: "The hope was that by travelling with such tremendous velocity, and thrust forward by the Chief Rabbi and Michael Sinclair, they hoped to break through the resistance." Hindsight suggests that this was indeed naïve but there was a sense of exhilaration surrounding the new Chief Rabbi's enterprise and he also held the view that he could intellectually manage the challenges. Furthermore, at the time, there were several reasons why the optimism of the Office of the Chief Rabbi was not necessarily misplaced:

- Jakobovits had, to some extent, engaged with the non-Orthodox community[283] and the JEDT had even funded some of their projects – a potential precedent;
- Chief Rabbi Sacks clearly possessed immense leadership qualities that were to be channelled into the achievement of the Jewish Continuity project – including his inclusivist approach to the management of religious divisions (Sacks, 1993);
- there was undoubtedly a powerful wave of optimism around the new Chief Rabbi and his proposal for a Jewish Continuity initiative had caught the mainstream communal imagination ('Renewal, year one' Jewish Chronicle, 11th September 1992, p 18);
- the non-Orthodox movements were previously weaker and had shown greater deference to the Chief Rabbi, only beginning to strengthen and become more assertive in the late 1980s and early 1990s (for example, the launch of the Reform Movement, 1994, with Rabbi Tony Bayfield as Chief Executive, (Kershen and Romain, 1995));
- the Strictly Orthodox were only just beginning to take a more serious interest in the rest of the Jewish community beyond their own perimeters;[284]
- a growing sense amongst elements of 'rank and file' Jews that tensions between different streams of Judaism should be more readily over-looked or at least better managed;
- the Jewish press had previously been more deferential to Jakobovits.[285]

Sacks wrote 'One People?' (Sacks, 1993), devoted to addressing divisions that he saw assailing the Jewish world. (Described by Alderman as "a brilliantly written exposition." (Alderman, 1998, p 391), before proceeding to describe what he determined to be Sacks's Jewish Continuity failure.) However, his argument promoting inclusivism over exclusivism and pluralism did not prove to be sufficiently compelling and he was also later to become embroiled in deeply uncomfortable controversy. Those further to his right were disdainful of his rabbinic authority and did not respect his teachings; the left despised his argument as demeaning and offensive. Even the secular culturist, Felix Posen, charged that he expected

[283] Including arrangements that attempted to accommodate weddings in Masorti synagogues – with conditions..
[284] Aside from the Lubavitch movement and their outreach work.
[285] In 1977, Geoffrey Paul became Jewish Chronicle Editor and was less controversial than his predecessor, William Frankel, who had openly supported Rabbi Louis Jacobs (in what became known as the Jacobs Affair).

Jewish Continuity to be "inclusivist – which many of us interpreted to mean pluralistic; that it would be in other words, community-wide and thorough." (Jewish Chronicle, 14th October 1994, p 28) – though it was rather spurious to suggest that Sacks could ever be 'pluralist'.[286] Finestein noted that "No language or structure under the direction of the Chief Rabbi could satisfy one party without antagonising another." (Finestein, 1996, p 293). Alderman (1998, p 402) declared: "The fate of Jewish Continuity proved to be the most spectacular example of Dr Sacks's[287] inability to reconcile his own inclusivist agenda with the exclusivist agendas of his orthodox opponents." (On another level, some amongst the non-Orthodox saw Jewish Continuity as 'Orthodox hard liners' in enlightened clothing; and the right wing of the Orthodox ('hard liners') saw Jewish Continuity as Orthodox radical liberals over-stepping the mark.) Wagner had concluded that: "The Chief Rabbi should be less directly involved in the second phase of Jewish Continuity which will follow this review. Any new role – as mentor, consultant or more symbolic – as in other communal organisations, must be accepted by all parties as non-controversial" (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 37). Sacks was certainly well-intentioned, possibly naïve, and ultimately unsuccessful in embedding his 'inclusivism' position. His book, (One People? (1993)) was a vehicle constructed by Sacks to try and keep the Jewish People together but the Reform Rabbi Bayfield read the book and found it insulting – treating Reform Jews as "the child brought up by idolaters" and those who simply "follow their fathers' customs" out of habit[288] and therefore not held culpable for their sins. The Progressive leadership had in some ways been seduced into believing that Sacks would be able to deliver more and they were becoming increasingly disillusioned.[289] [290] Regarding the reaction of the religious right, Kestenbaum stated: "I must have underestimated the ferocious response not just of the right wing but of the United Synagogue Rabbinate and I think I must have overestimated the sway that we would have." Those further to the right were even less forgiving. However, many of the 'rank and file' United Synagogue members were not troubled by funding going to the non-Orthodox sections of the community – even if

[286] Wagner had declared: "The language of pluralism should not be used as it can imply not just recognition of factual existence but legitimation and approval." (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 37).
[287] Alderman's insistence on referring to the Chief Rabbi as 'Dr Sacks' reveals his attitude (and indeed antipathy) to the Office of the Chief Rabbi. Rubinstein's (1999, p 349) review of Alderman (1998) provided a well-framed attack on his work stating "within the limitations of its perspective (which I believe to be misleading),is a landmark of masterful scholarship."
[288] *Tinok shenishbah* – a child brought up by gentiles gives rise to excusable ignorance; *minhag avoteihem beyadeihem* merely following their fathers' customs leading to habit, not belief. (Sacks, 1993).
[289] After his appointment, Sacks also stopped attending the cross-communal Limmud Jewish education conferences.
[290] In the Jewish Chronicle, 17th December 1993, it reported disquiet over the absence of the non-Orthodox on Jewish Continuity's policy-making board and in its Editorial it declared that this was "gratingly out of synch."

their leadership appeared to be vehemently opposed.

A Jewish Continuity insider reported that Sacks hoped that "the tensions could be managed" without tarnishing the role of the Chief Rabbi but this was not to be the case. A senior lay leader suggested that it appeared that the Chief Rabbi was seeking to lead the organisation and yet not be associated with policy decisions – it proved untenable. Other Jewish Continuity lay leaders were also unclear as to precisely where Sacks was on the cross-communal issue, indicating that they were far more liberal in their own approach. Sacks's efforts, nobly inspired, appeared destined for controversy and Jewish Continuity eventually derailed. Documents revealed that Sacks's inclusivism position was intended to be adopted by the organisation (Jewish Continuity, 3rd February 1993), but it was still being discussing in May 1993 and beyond.[291] [292]

The funding allocations made by Jewish Continuity were also complicating matters. As the tension rose over the grant-making and the need to show greater religious balance, and yet remain sensitive to the position of the Chief Rabbi, it was decided to set up a separate body called the Jewish Community Allocations Board (JCAB) (Jewish Continuity Board Minutes, May and June 1994). It was a determined attempt to resolve the controversy but too little too late. Led by the Chief Rabbi loyalist, Professor Leslie Wagner, and professionally supported by Lira Winston, JCAB attempted to demonstrate a more cross-communal criteria for grant-making.[293] Wagner claimed that it was "denominationally blind" and it had a broad cross-section of the religious community on its Board – but it was cross-communal with limits.[294] Sinclair described the JCAB as "a fudge and something that should not have happened." However, the arrangement evidently had the blessing of the Orthodox Beth Din led by Dayan Ehrentreu which empowered Jewish Continuity (and, presumably, the Office of the Chief

[291] Lawton is reputed to have suggested that Sacks should take a less visible role in the organisation; and Hype! its Communications company, had suggested that: "At all times, it will need to demonstrate its cross-community credentials if it is to succeed in gaining mass participation and attracting the necessary funding."
[292] See also: 'One People?, Sacks (1993); Sacks in Jewish Chronicle, 20th January, 1995, pp 24-25.
[293] According to the Wagner Review, the allocations (1994-5) broke down as follows: Non-denominational: £472,801; Cross-communal Under Orthodox Auspices: £124,310; United Synagogue and other Orthodox: £276,200; Non-Orthodox: £129,295 – a total of £1,002,606 (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 92).
[294] It was described by Wagner: "Although it receives its funding via Jewish Continuity, the Allocations Board is an independent body which has been mandated by Jewish Continuity to grant funds to applicants. Its role is to ensure that proposals from all sections of the community are treated fairly and objectively." (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 79) and in the Press Release announcing its creation: "The Board will be made up of individuals in the community whose capacity to make objective decisions will secure the confidence of the whole community that their ideas and proposals are being fairly considered." (p 58).

Rabbi) to press forward with it.[295] The Jewish Continuity personnel were desperately stressing that it was separate from Jewish Continuity – a less than compelling assertion as it emanated from their office with funds from the same income streams. However, it did help to calm things down a little – and organisations (including the Orthodox United Synagogue) remained interested in accessing funding. However, it could not solve the broader Jewish Continuity cross-communal issues. Andrew Gilbert, a senior Reform and Limmud leader, described it thus: "Reform did very badly – some grants were received but they were 'dressing on an Orthodox cake'." He continued: "It was as bad as the JEDT but Jewish Continuity was public." In other words, JEDT consisted of a small group of donors who had gathered together to allocate funds as they saw fit, whereas Jewish Continuity carried a higher communal profile and claimed to be acting on behalf of all Jews (even if only conditionally so). A Jewish Continuity document that was undated (but probably 1994-5) and entitled: 'Jewish Continuity: Common Objections and Standard Answers' stated under 'Religion' that it followed the Chief Rabbi's principle of 'inclusivism': "Is Jewish Continuity biased against any section of the community? The vast majority of our expenditure has funded projects where there is no denominational issue. We would not, of course, support a programme which would, for example, force people to break *kashrut* [laws of keeping Kosher] or *Shabbat* [keeping the Sabbath]. Nor would the Jewish Community Allocations Board." Wagner later reported that "The key issue here is not who gets the money but the process by which it is given." (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 37).[296]

Though the theological and other aspects will not be discussed here, it is important to note that there were three major incidents that dramatically heightened the tension: firstly, in January 1995, Sacks wrote a letter for publication in the Jewish Tribune (12th January 1995, p 5) attacking the Masorti movement (after considerable provocation). He declared that "An individual who does not believe in Torah min haShomayim [Torah from Heaven] has cut himself off from living connection [sic] with Shomayim." … "We know through long historic experience that there is only one way to secure Jewish continuity: through Torah and

[295] Neither Jewish Continuity nor the Jewish Community Allocations Board were ready to support any project that broke the Jewish laws of Shabbat (Sabbath) Observance or Kashrut (Jewish dietary laws of keeping Kosher). In one incident the Besht Tellers were asked to remove evidence of their grant from their advertising when it was discovered that they were to perform on a Friday night – a Shabbat observance issue.

[296] Wagner did go on to state: "Finally, however, there needs to be a will to succeed. Wise people can make the worst structures work and foolish people can wreck the most sublime of structures. Diplomatic behaviour must accompany diplomatic language to enable Jewish Continuity to operate across the religious spectrum." (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 38).

mitzvos." The article was taken to mean that the non-Orthodox "are bound to fail, and they deserve to fail." and therefore not worthy of Jewish Continuity support. This caused huge difficulties for Jewish Continuity, and JIA also declared that "funding dried up overnight" – though some in Jewish Continuity argued this was a convenient excuse. In the Jewish Chronicle, (20th January 1995, pp 24-28), the letter was reprinted together with several pages of discussion, including an article by the Chief Rabbi in which he reaffirmed in a rear guard action: "Let me be explicit. I launched Jewish Continuity as a programme for the whole community not the Orthodox community alone." (p 24) and he continued "It will be inclusive. It will work for all Jews, especially marginal Jews, and for the totality of Jewish life. But because it wants us to be able to work for Continuity together, it will observe standards we can all respect, even if we do not personally subscribe to them. Its programmes, where they have religious content, will be consistent with Torah and mitzvot, for these have always formed the overarching canopy of Jewish unity and continuity." He continued: "Almost every group in the community has respected this structure, recognising that in a perfect world we would not need it, but in our imperfect situation it is the one from which each gains most and has to sacrifice least. It would be a tragedy were it to be sabotaged." (p 25). The JIA and Sinclair on behalf of Jewish Continuity also had to declare publicly that Jewish Continuity was committed to working across the whole of the community. (JIA were relying on the JIA-Jewish Continuity Memorandum of Understanding (5th October 1994, paragraph 14) which stated: "Jewish Continuity is committed to working across the whole community." They stated: "It [JIA] will continue, as always, to work with all sections of the community whatever their political or religious affiliations." (Jewish Chronicle, (20th January 1995, p 26). On the same page, Sinclair wrote: "Jewish Continuity is a community-wide initiative and is "inclusivist". This means that, in carrying out our mission to make Jewish life more meaningful and relevant, we are addressing, and seek to engage, all Jews, irrespective of background or belief. We have endeavoured to be sensitive to the "denominational" strands within the community. To this end, we had created the Jewish Community Allocations Board as an independent and impartial body specifically to ensure that all applications for funding from whichever sector of the community are handled fairly and objectively." Secondly, in August 1996, the widely respected and admired Reform Rabbi, Hugo Gryn, passed away (18th August 1996) and Sacks did not attend the funeral, causing considerable distress in the Reform community. Thirdly, he did later attend a memorial service for Gryn (February 1997), though not before sending a private letter to a leading Strictly Orthodox rabbinic authority in which he attacked Gryn in very strong language

(albeit rabbinic language) – the letter was deliberately leaked and eventually published in the *Jewish Chronicle* (Jewish Chronicle, 14th March 1997, p 2[297]) resulting in major outrage and upset.[298] By the time of these incidents, Sacks had already taken a step back from Jewish Continuity and UJIA.

Meir Persoff (2010) has written a merciless and unrelenting book cataloguing all of Sacks's problems and constituting a highly critical and negative assessment of his tenure (there will, no doubt, be counter-balancing writings in the future.) Wagner, in defence of Sacks, has retorted: "Inside the community, Sacks has been involved in major controversies in his dealings with the other Jewish denominations despite an explicit desire to promote inclusivity. These controversies have been described in detail by Meir Persoff in his book *Another Time, Another Way* [sic], in what is, unfortunately, a flawed analysis of a complex issue." (Wagner, 2011). However, Wagner did not elaborate, and he and others are yet to present their case. The Persoff thesis is outside the current research purview, though a few observations are now included.

Persoff, a former senior *Jewish Chronicle* journalist, (together with Alderman in his Foreword to Persoff's book) challenged the relevance and need for the Chief Rabbinate, given the plurality of contemporary expressions of Judaism. It is reasonable to question whether Sacks's successor will succeed in maintaining the stature of the position, and Persoff and Alderman are certainly entitled to question the future of the Office. However, Alderman[299] is wrong to write: "In short, under Professor Lord Sacks, the office of Chief Rabbi has become an object of scorn across much of the Jewish world." (Persoff, 2010, p xiii) – even if he did continue: "But both he and the office survive – and, to some extent, thrive." (Persoff, 2010, p xiii) (and adds his explanation for this state of affairs). Sacks retains a strong reputation in many quarters (attested to by his huge number of high-level speaking invitations, the popularity of his writings and the wider appreciation across British Jewry and beyond – including the Commonwealth and North America) and that reflects vicariously upon the position – though it is the case that Sacks and the Office have been damaged at times during his term.

[297] There was substantial additional coverage in that issue of the Jewish Chronicle and subsequent editions.
[298] These events are covered in Persoff (2010) and elsewhere and are beyond the purview of this research.
[299] Alderman is described by his own publishers (Academic Studies Press) as "the leading authority on the Jews of modern Britain, a prolific and controversial scholar whose views have attracted warm support and sweeping condemnation in equal measure." (Alderman, 2009).

In the complex communal environment that was British Jewry, with its multiple fracture points and schisms, the Chief Rabbi's early efforts were seeking to generate something of a paradigm shift in communal life whilst at the same time avoiding further disintegration. Clearly, this required a subtlety of touch and creativity in the use of language. Persoff accused Sacks of saying "irreconcilable things to different audiences" (Persoff, 2010, p xvii). However, with specific regard to the Jewish Continuity period, there is surely a difference between that accusation and a policy of 'constructive engagement' and, in that context, 'constructive ambiguity', in order to attempt to achieve greater things. Sacks's aspirations were noble, though the process was indeed to expose his vulnerability and his difficulties. Persoff showed neither compassion nor, more importantly, context, in his coverage of Jewish Continuity (Persoff, 2010, pp 45-66 and pp 222-229). He consistently relied upon extensive source material (notably from the *Jewish Chronicle*), with lengthy quotations. However, in his coverage of Jewish Continuity, there is insufficient assessment of a range of other forces and developments relevant to its evolution, including the role of other leaders, the relationship with the JIA or the emergence of the UJIA; nor does he examine the educational and continuity strategy on its own merits i.e. the attempt to renew Jewish life notwithstanding the cross-communal controversy. Nor does Persoff adequately examine educational developments in the following two decades. Sacks did achieve progress in the shift to which he aspired, and the decade of renewal elevated the place of education in the hierarchy of communal priorities. Indeed, Kahn-Harris and Gidley (not in any sense aligned with Orthodoxy and the Chief Rabbi), cautiously remarked: "It might be seen as controversial to say this in certain quarters, but we are relatively positively inclined towards Jonathan Sacks, although the office of the Chief Rabbi cannot be seen as anything other than anachronistic. In the 1990s he raised an agenda which had to be raised and he raised it in very public and almost a brave way. He was not responsible for the change that occurred but he was a major factor in turning around the supertanker." (Keith Kahn-Harris, Jewish Chronicle, 28th July 2010). When Kahn-Harris stated that it "might be seen as controversial in certain quarters" he is surely referencing the Alderman/Persoff school of thought (amongst others).

Sinclair compounded the difficulties. He was intolerant of non-Orthodox Judaism and was unsuccessful in his attempts to engage positively with the non-Orthodox Jewish leadership, often having the opposite effect. He was ready to welcome their involvement as long as it

was on Orthodox terms. He was seen to have taken a more belligerent tone than other Jewish Continuity leaders.[300] Michael Sinclair stated the following:

> It [Jewish Continuity] produced a ferocious response [something which he had not anticipated]: individuals within the Jewish community and the Reform, Liberal, Masorti – the Masorti in particular – and the *Jewish Chronicle* decided that Jewish Continuity (the organisation) was the battleground on which to fight the Chief Rabbi and mainstream Orthodoxy. [Sinclair argued that they persuaded donors to stop funding and generally sought to obstruct and undermine Jewish Continuity's efforts.] … It was being characterised that funds were communal funds and should be distributed cross-communally. But it was an Orthodox organisation that could not support Reform, Liberal or Masorti settings. It was our view that Reform, Liberal and Masorti theology is a different religion – a religion of Jews with many laudable principles but because it is not based upon Torah min Hashamayim [Torah from the Heavens i.e. divinely inspired] … it was outside of what I would call the circle of normative Judaism.
>
> Michael Sinclair Interview

This was a forthright expression of the Orthodox position, with internal consistency and coherence and Sinclair maintained that: "Everyone knew my position. People know what I thought. People knew my view. I spoke publicly about it. Jewish Continuity was an Orthodox organisation and should never have been involved in funding the non-Orthodox" and that Jewish Continuity was "a means of exposing the broad Jewish population to 'normative Judaism', a Judaism based upon the immutable principles of Torah and Mitzvot." For him, Jewish Continuity was never going to be pluralist but if people were in a process towards a life guided by Torah and Mitzvot then ways could be found to involve them. Sinclair identified them as "not yet Orthodox Jews" with whom he was ready to engage – but not with non-Orthodox Judaism. He believed that "If you make available authentic Judaism, its magnetic force is such that people will gravitate towards it." However, he was clear that he could not "lend legitimacy to Reform or Liberal religions." Wagner's Review declared that there was 'ambiguity' over Jewish Continuity's religious direction. However, Sinclair responded: "I didn't and most of us at the time did not accept that – and I don't accept it now.

[300] Several interviewees felt that Sinclair had been 'got at' by the Strictly Orthodox community, particularly those based in Gateshead, upon his appointment as Chair of Jewish Continuity. However, Sinclair himself explained that he was already fully committed to his more strictly Orthodox views well before taking charge of Jewish Continuity (initially with Lubavitch/Chabad and later, Ohr Sameach). (see also: Jewish Chronicle, June 1993).

There was no ambiguity at all. It was absolutely clear. It may not have been accepted by a bunch of people but it was absolutely clear." In Sinclair's view, forces in the community deliberately decided to make Jewish Continuity the battleground on which to fight the Chief Rabbi. Furthermore, Sinclair felt that when the Chief Rabbi used the terms 'inclusivism' and 'cross-communalism' oppositional forces decided to hear it as 'pluralism'.

It appeared that Sinclair had only begrudgingly signed up to what became Jewish Continuity's cross-communalism and seemed disappointed that the "line was not held". He recognised that the Office of the Chief Rabbi needed to calm things down and noted that it was Dayan Ehrentreu who had apparently sanctioned the Jewish Community Allocations Board (JCAB) as a mechanism for managing the cross-communal complications; and on that basis he acquiesced. However, there appeared to be a sense of personal regret that he had neither withstood the pressure nor walked away to pursue his communal work in other ways – as he was later so to do. He appeared to be of the view that the net result was that the Office of the Chief Rabbi and those advising and supporting it had waivered under the pressure and that resultant re-positioning (as Sinclair saw it) altered the model. (His preference would probably have been not to set up the JCAB and instead maintain a position that said: "it [Jewish Continuity] is an Orthodox organisation and if you do not want to give money to it that is absolutely fine. But we are not going to let Reform teachers and rabbis go into the schools; we are not going to support Reform programmes because this is an Orthodox organisation.") Nonetheless, he stayed on and joined the UJIA Board (which he saw as a different organisation) – an avowedly cross-communal body openly engaging with the non-Orthodox. However, it must be noted that the whole question of Jewish Continuity's (i.e. the Chief Rabbi's) original intent on the question of cross-communalism is somewhat contested. The Chief Rabbi's position on 'inclusivism' was clear (he would have been working on his book 'One People?' (Sacks, 1993) well before it came out that year, and documentation revealed its application in Jewish Continuity was under on-going discussion at least as early February 1993, and continuing well into 1993 on how to translate the thinking into practical application.[301] Sinclair was consistent in his own thinking and its application but the organisation experienced a shift in the face of communal realities.[302]

[301] See also: Sacks, Jewish Chronicle, 20th January 1995, pp 24-25.

[302] An Office of the Chief Rabbi insider reported understanding that: "Jewish Continuity was to become the "holding operation" for the Orthodox box – it was going to be Orthodox, though with some money for the non-Orthodox but with rules." Together with Sinclair, it was both of their assessments that the Chief Rabbi then came under pressure to work more cross-communally and the shape of the organisation altered. (The insider also

Just about all non-Orthodox Interviewees found Sinclair to be challenging: One commented that "This man cannot be cross-communal" and another that: "he did not speak the same language" and that "he became very bunkerish" and that "he could not be trusted". Rabbi Bayfield observed: "There was lots of herring and vodka but enormous frustration – a feeling that we were being thrown sops." In turn, Sinclair was highly critical and no less derogatory of the Progressive leadership. He was particularly caustic when referring to the Reform Rabbinate who, he claimed, had defined the problem not as 'Who is a Jew?' but 'Who is a Rabbi?' – which he saw as a self-serving search for recognition (rather than a matter of policy and principle) and found it to be particularly galling and disgraceful. These were entrenched doctrinal positions on both sides, clearly unable to engage in a meaningful and sensitive exchange; and on the fundamental issues there was indeed no room for compromise amongst those who were unable to do so – through religious zeal or personal disposition. This was to muddle the cross-communal aspect of Jewish Continuity, as it clearly meant different things to different to people.

Sinclair undeniably contributed generous personal wealth, a great deal of work in terms of time and energy, as well as a passion and wisdom emanating from his particular perspective informed by an unyielding Orthodox outreach approach; but it did not sit comfortably with Jewish Continuity cross-communalism as understood by others. A senior lay colleague of Sinclair's noted his strong Orthodox views and did not find them to be constructive in the context of Jewish Continuity. A number of leading Jewish Continuity Trustees including Clive Marks, Brian Kerner, Sir Harry Solomon and later, Howard Stanton, amongst others, appeared to be of the view that the organisation had to be 'cross-communal' in the broader sense and were not troubled by the prospect of funding non-Orthodox projects. (One Interviewee argued, rather optimistically, that there were alternative Orthodox lay leaders who might have been better able than Sinclair to find a way for Jewish Continuity to negotiate the cross-communal minefield.) Michael Goldstein described the situation: Solomon, Stanton and Corman were "engaged: running behind to sort things out – a good group but always running behind." Undoubtedly, there was a simmering tension at the heart of Jewish Continuity within which it was very difficult to reconcile Sinclair's version of Orthodoxy with a more widely understood version of cross-communalism (a position that

---

opined that Sacks had indeed felt that Jakobovits had set a precedent by way of the JEDT's funding of Progressive projects.)

Lawton would probably have found more amenable). Winston reported that "Dr Sinclair said that Jewish Continuity would work across the community and he did not think this would be problematic." (Lawton also affirmed that this was Sinclair's view.) But Solomon felt that "Underneath, he was not really cross-communal", and this was the correct assessment (in terms of a broader understanding of cross-communalism). It appeared that the issue had not been fully thought through in a way befitting a new way of working in a newly emerging communal order. Sinclair attempted to talk the language of cross-communalism but it did not sound compelling and the Progressive leadership saw through it. However, it might also be said that Sinclair's candour demonstrated an authentic exposition of Orthodoxy that was both more candidly and outspokenly expressed.

Lawton was also a victim of the cross-communal struggle. Though Orthodox, he was not seen as 'safe' in the eyes of the religious right – including a number of United Synagogue Rabbis. This added to their sense that Jewish Continuity was inimical to Orthodox interests – of course, the incongruity was that Jewish Continuity was being delivered in the name of their own Chief Rabbi. The Progressive leadership had more of a mixed response to Lawton. Some reacted to his appointment with optimism, whilst others felt that Lawton was also fundamentally committed to the Orthodox view, though they did recognise that unlike Sinclair, he was "ready to spread messages of goodwill," even if he ultimately held to the "moral rightness" of the Orthodox position. Lawton's track record with organisations such as Limmud and other earlier cross-communal engagements did not appear to provide him with much protection from those on the religious left. (It appeared that all of Lawton's staff were Orthodox.[303])

Historically, Progressive Jews were generally respectful of the Chief Rabbinate. However, this began to waiver as the Reform movement in particular grew in strength, most notably at the latter end of the twentieth century (Kershen and Romain, 1995), (as well as Masorti) coinciding with Sacks's inauguration – though not because of him specifically. Indeed, there was great hope and expectation amongst many Progressive Jewish leaders that Sacks was 'someone with whom they could do business.' However, the Progressive community were not going to tolerate the approach of Sacks's inclusivism nor Sinclair's strident Orthodoxy. They found the whole Jewish Continuity attitude to be demeaning towards them. The Chief

[303] The senior staff was listed in the Wagner Review (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 60) and a staff list also appeared in the first Jewish Continuity leaflet (Jewish Continuity, December 1993).

Rabbi depicted his position as: 'my table is kosher and anyone may eat at it.'[304] In his interview, Rabbi Bayfield shared his Reform response which was provided in the form of a 'soup kitchen' metaphor:

> The Chief Rabbi wanted to make soup available as widely as possible – quite genuinely so. But one where the Orthodox controlled the soup kitchen and the soup had to be Orthodox soup. The Chief Rabbi pushed the notion of 'let all who are hungry come in' – but he was less generous over the control and nature of the soup. Clive [Lawton], Michael Sinclair and Jonathan Sacks were all united in genuinely wanting the soup to be shared as widely as possible but did not face up to the fact that we would want a share in the control of the soup kitchen and have more variety in the soups on offer. They did not face up to it. They did not think we would be so 'inconvenient'. They did not think it through. They thought that it was axiomatic that they would have control.[305]
>
> Bayfield, Interview

Michael Shire continued the metaphor: "some go for soup while others make the soup, and Sacks was willing to offer as much soup as was needed as long it was his soup recipe served in the way he wanted."[306]

The cross-communal issue undermined the whole Jewish Continuity enterprise.[307] However, there was no single decision or moment when it happened. There was simply a process under which theory was being translated into practice and those tasked with implementation experienced increasingly acute complications. Those who criticise the Chief Rabbi on this matter need to bring context and realism to their critiques: he was a Chief Rabbi operating within constraints that he was unable or unwilling to break but the bewildering complexity of the situation militates against the unbridled condemnation expressed by Alderman, Persoff (Persoff, 2010) and others.

---

[304] In the Jewish Chronicle, 20th January 1995, (when the Chief Rabbi was forced to defend his position after his article attacking the Masorti movement (Jewish Tribune, 12th January 1995), the Chief Rabbi had written in defence of Jewish Continuity: "It would mean in effect that individuals were saying: "because it is kosher, I will not eat it, nor will I allow others to eat it," and this even though a separate meal has been provided for by the Allocations Board. This would be a serious self-inflicted injury for Anglo-Jewry, and I believe we would long count the cost." (p 25).

[305] Evidence of this was provided by the fact that Jewish Continuity's project, the Hebrew Reading Crash Course, was not allowed to take place in non-Orthodox synagogues.

[306] The complex relationship between the non-Orthodox and the Office of the Chief Rabbi is beyond the remit of this research, see Persoff (2002) amongst others.

[307] Several months after the Jewish Continuity-JIA merger, Simon Rocker wrote: "In the shark-filled sea of religious politics, Continuity was trailing blood, too badly wounded to swim on its own." (Jewish Chronicle, 3rd October 1997).

4.4.1.3 UJIA and Cross-communalism

The sense amongst the non-Orthodox communities was that the JEDT and Jewish Continuity treated non-Orthodoxy as deviant. At the UJIA, Kestenbaum and Ariel were considered to have changed this dynamic. Ariel was not Orthodox and in that regard carried the trust of the non-Orthodox; though the Orthodox Rabbinic authorities were concerned over Ariel's religious affiliations. Regarding the Reform reaction to Kestenbaum, Rabbi Bayfield, noting that he was a highly committed Orthodox Jew, went on to report: "but we were able to share a vision of the community with educational development taking place across the community: no 'one size fits all'; no one way of bringing Renewal … it needed a variety of methods." Kerner and Kestenbaum, followed up by Ariel, worked very hard with the different streams. Ariel reported that one of the greatest fears was that UJIA would not succeed in creating communal calm going forward – the situation having dramatically worsened after the Hugo Gryn Affair.[308] However, with Kestenbaum at the helm as the Chief Executive of UJIA, having transferred directly from the Office of the Chief Rabbi, he was able to hold things together. The new organisation was no longer under the jurisdiction of the Office of the Chief Rabbi. Furthermore, as a merger with the JIA, it was able to openly declare that its policy was built upon a meaningful cross-communalism. Kestenbaum went out of his way to emphasise this. One of his first acts was to attend a dedication ceremony in Jerusalem for the Hugo Gryn Memorial Hall at the Hebrew Union College, Jerusalem (a high profile Reform Centre), and, importantly, ensure that he was publicly photographed at the event. Kestenbaum's strong Orthodox credentials, rabbinic descent and personal Jewish literacy, also gave him some considerable credibility with the Orthodox rabbinic authorities and it was made clear that he would not 'cross the line' – crucially, a line left deliberately intangible. Kestenbaum was considered 'safe': it was perhaps that there was simply reassurance amongst the rabbinic leadership that even though the new organisation was cross-communal, there was a leader in Kestenbaum with whom they could converse in their own language and according to their own values.

The UJIA position was clear: they would treat all sections of mainstream Jewry equitably in both their allocations and their professional and lay engagement in a manner that reflected their respective demographic strengths, their ability to contribute funding to the UJIA cause

[308] Paradoxically, the Gryn Affair had highlighted the desperate need for wider communal calm (a view also supported amongst the more moderate Orthodox leadership) and the need to subdue and avoid further disquiet.

and their willingness to cooperate in pursuit of educational aims and strategy. What was no longer a criterion was a differentiation based purely upon differing brands of Judaism. (Significantly, Kestenbaum was determined that the cross-communal approach needed to be addressed as an operational matter but not incorporated as an organisational core value (i.e. not to declare that UJIA was pluralist in its vision, mission and purpose), fearing that to do so would alienate sections of the right wing religious community. In this regard, he apparently overruled other senior UJIA leaders.) In this effort, the Kerner-Kestenbaum-Ariel team was successful. Ariel made up for his non-Orthodoxy through his knowledge, professional expertise and the guidance and the support he was willing to share with all – the Orthodox professionals respected him. Behind the scenes, some of the Orthodox Jewish education professionals were prepared to share the UJIA's 'safe space', out of the public glare, to address educational challenges of common concern with non-Orthodox colleagues (though they were often educators on the left of Modern Orthodoxy.). However, this did not stretch to the majority of the Orthodox Rabbis. It should not be assumed that the United Synagogue Orthodox authorities were engaging willingly. They did not hide their discomfort with the new cross-communal body and they did not accept the funding without a degree of antipathy.[309] On the Progressive side, Rabbi Bayfield noted: "Renewal was a very different way of operating. Much more professional and set in the context – much more cross-communal." David Lerner noted how "the UJIA seemed to overcome the challenge of cross-communalism: JIA had a tradition of working across the community and it could hide behind Israel – Israel provided a smokescreen."

Michael Goldstein was a member of an Orthodox synagogue and a Jewish Continuity leader, who went on to become a UJIA Trustee. He commented: "I still find it quite amazing; the religious stuff somehow disappears – the religious tension. Was it the conscious action of removing the Chief Rabbi or anything else?" He went on to state that it was funding the same things as its predecessor but on a cross-communal basis and that the UJIA had somehow made it much less sensitive. In fact, there were a number of factors that made this possible:

- the 'repositioning' of the Chief Rabbi undoubtedly eased tensions;

[309] The Orthodox agreement to take UJIA funding was characterised by some as 'taking the funding whilst holding their noses'.
By 2010-11, the situation had shifted and the United Synagogue skilfully engineered a rupture with UJIA, who in turn chose to disengage from the partnership.

- the JIA's traditional cross-communalism (under-pinning its Israel agenda) became the dominant guiding principle;
- Kestenbaum was at least able to keep open communications with senior Orthodox figures and Ariel was able to win the confidence of Orthodox professionals;
- there was a community-wide fear of another failure;
- UJIA strategy was extremely cautious and deliberately downplayed expectations – Kestenbaum and Ariel, were determined to calm things down;
- UJIA did not attract the same intense, negative media scrutiny as Jewish Continuity;
- Kerner was a superb diplomat and brought people together;
- the Sinclair-Lawton personalities were no longer heading the organisation;
- there was enough money available to give UJIA room for manoeuvre;
- UJIA emphasised partnerships with existing players in the field.

4.4.2 Relations with Communal Partner Organisations

The field of Jewish education included a number of communal organisations with a direct interest in the work of Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal. Many of these organisations were well-established and run by experienced Jewish education professionals. Some were denominationally aligned and others were able to work across the community. The emergence of the two central bodies presented both opportunity and threat: there was the possibility of additional funding and greater cooperation but there was also the concern that the new central bodies might choose not to work with them or place tight conditions on any partnership arrangements. In turn, the central bodies needed to investigate the potential of strategic partnerships that might leverage greater effectiveness and impact.

4.4.2.1 Jewish Continuity

In many ways, Jewish Continuity was attempting to circumvent the existing agencies and directly reach the Jewish public. As one seasoned community educational professional observed, it was seeking to bypass what it perceived to be ossified community institutions. (See earlier, for Sinclair's disruptive technologies approach.) A Jewish Continuity activist suggested that the pre-existing education system was no longer fit for purpose as it had been created for an earlier age. In a sense, this informed the Jewish Continuity approach to existing communal bodies and led, almost inevitably, to abrasive relationships.

It was abundantly clear from interviews that Jewish Continuity alienated a number of existing educational institutions involved in Jewish continuity work. (Wagner had concluded: "… it needs to operate more in consultation with others …" (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 28); a leading, senior educational professional felt that there appeared to be a clash within Jewish Continuity: some of its activists were interested in encouraging and enhancing existing organisations whereas Lawton appeared to want to compete.) The representatives of other educational institutions who were interviewed often reported a confrontational, difficult or disappointing relationship with the Jewish Continuity professionals (and lay leaders) – if not open hostility. This was not surprising, given that the Jewish Continuity Chair and Chief Executive, as has been noted, were deliberately seeking to shake up the existing framework. Jewish Continuity was only ready to engage the mainstream communal agencies if it fitted

their own strategy. Lawton was quoted by a leading professional in a partner organisation as saying: "Clive was dismissive of the existing framework and once asked: who are the five best Jewish educators in British Jewry? To which he provided his own answer: there aren't any!" Even if Lawton never said it, the perception was significant and damaging. Elements within the central Orthodox United Synagogue and the religious right ridiculed Jewish Continuity,[310] and Simon Goulden (a Modern Orthodox educational professional) noted: "There was a lot of cynicism within Modern Orthodoxy because it [Jewish Continuity] did not really appear to know what it was – nice new offices and furniture; lots of people having a good time; many being employed." All of which was taking place at a time when the United Synagogue was cutting back savagely and was preoccupied with itself – perhaps one of the reasons why Jewish Continuity was keeping its distance. The Progressive bodies, initially hopeful but cautious, rapidly became openly distrustful of Jewish Continuity. However, Jewish Continuity appeared to be a rich organisation ready to distribute funds to organisations that supported its aspirations and therefore prospective partner agencies on both religious sides were ready to work with it in the hope of securing additional funding. As Michael Shire summed it up: "We were seduced by Jewish Continuity and felt let down; disappointed, frustrated and real anger. They were prepared to offer titbits from their table. We had no say in their decision-making. They had priorities and strategies that we did not agree with. For example, funding individuals over organisations. Nonetheless, our organisation tried to leverage money." (Clearly, in this case the situation was exacerbated by Shire's Reform/Liberal (Progressive) organisational background but it does nevertheless reflect the prevailing attitude.)

Another widely held misperception was that Lawton was not committed to the Israel education and engagement agenda. It was over-simplistic and inaccurate to categorise him as negative but he was characteristically outspoken on the subject. Nonetheless, he was seen as unsympathetic by the Zionist-Israel-oriented educational advocates. Indeed, the relationship with the Jewish-Zionist education world provided an illustrative case study. Hasia Israeli was the Director of the Youth and Hechalutz Department[311] (1994-96) in London (a department of the Jewish Agency for Israel) and her Department benefited from substantial JIA funding. (She had built strong relationships with both JIA and Jewish Continuity influential lay

[310] One United Synagogue insider informed this researcher that Jewish Continuity was disparagingly referred to by some of his colleagues as 'Jewish Incontinency'.
[311] Noar ve'Hechalutz Department: literally translated as 'Youth and Pioneering Department.'

leaders.) As previously noted, Jewish Continuity made a significant allocation of £250,000 to the Joint Committee for Youth Allocations (JCYA) (effectively a JIA Committee to oversee its educational funding to the JAFI Youth and Hechalutz Department) and Michael Goldstein joined the JCYA representing Jewish Continuity. It allowed the youth movements to expand, increased subsidies for Israel Tours and to grow the Youth and Hechalutz resource centre (JPMP). The whole arrangement became the focus of a struggle for control in which Israeli and others blocked Lawton from establishing an over-arching youth framework and also from taking over the existing one. Her bosses in Israel were not happy with the arrangement involving Jewish Continuity funding. However, it proved to be wily and wise management by the accomplished Israeli, as she maintained her control of the youth movements and Israel Experience programming with additional, large financial investment from Jewish Continuity. Lawton had attempted to establish a new body (via a Partners Group of youth work and informal education practitioners) to direct the Jewish youth provision. However, the field organised an informal alliance against Lawton and his efforts were effectively derailed, undermining one of his central initiatives; they were not going to hand over control to a Jewish Continuity-led body – and Israeli had already secured its funding. (This development was also to have significance as the JCYA area of work "later morphed into UJIA Jewish Renewal" – according to Michael Goldstein, who was later to become the lay Chair of UJIA Jewish Renewal. Similarly, David Goldberg (who became Director of the JAFI Israel Experience Department in September 1998 – shortly after it was agreed between JAFI and the UJIA that Jonny Ariel would be responsible for the Department's professional, educational direction (JAFI-UJIA Agreement, 7th August, 1998)) remarked: "The £250,000 from Jewish Continuity to the JCYA may have propelled the two organisations together."[312] – perhaps an over-statement but nonetheless a useful observation.)

There was a further unintended consequence of the £250,000 grant from Jewish Continuity to the JCYA: Jewish Continuity publicly proclaimed their grants, whereas JIA continued to retain their low profile for UK-impacting JIA grants. The funding provided a significant uplift to the programme and Jewish Continuity was in a position to take the credit. The JIA could no longer ignore it and increasingly began to insist that their support be publicly recognised by their beneficiary partners.

[312] The 'two organisations' referring to Jewish Continuity and the JIA – with JAFI in tow.

Notwithstanding the negative partner experiences, there were a significant number of organisations that did benefit. The grant to Limmud (a large[313] inter-generational annual conference of Jewish learning – Lawton was one of its founders) received £30,000 (up from JEDT's £5,000 grant);[314] the Union of Jewish Students (UJS) also received an increased grant and, as already noted, the youth movements and the Israel Experience programmes also benefitted (through the increased JCYA budget).

In their own vernacular, Jewish Continuity aimed 'to light many fires' and 'let a thousand flowers bloom' by supporting a diverse portfolio of projects – some of which were controversial and, as already noted, some drew ridicule. In fact, an analysis of what they actually supported revealed several non-conformist type projects but also a significant investment in what might be defined as the 'mainstream' – though not always pursued through mainstream central agency partners.

As a Jewish Continuity professional later reflected: "With hindsight, Jewish Continuity probably lacked sensitivity to other organisations. … People commented afterwards that Jewish Continuity professionals went from being colleagues to grant-givers." This summarised the key difficulties: there was a heavy-handedness with partner organisations based upon professional, personal and strategic differences, further exacerbated by cross-communal strains. Furthermore, both organisations and individuals were encouraged to apply for Jewish Continuity funding but it actually set itself up for disagreement and acrimony. Jon Boyd (then working for the Jewish Agency in its resource centre) had successfully applied for funding but observed the reactions of others: "It invited ideas, valued your time and at the same time it could say 'Yes' or 'No' without ever really articulating criteria. It felt arrogant. "No, you do not know what you are doing"" The Jewish Continuity staff had not succeeded in maintaining or establishing strong collegial partnerships. This was to provide an invaluable lesson for UJIA Jewish Renewal.

4.4.2.2 UJIA Jewish Renewal

The United Synagogue was in a financial mess in the early 1990s facing "nasty and painful

[313] Attendances in recent years exceeded 2,000 by a considerable margin.
[314] UJIA was later to raise the grant further still to £50,000 by the end of the decade.

cutting" (Elkan Levy Interview) – still fire-fighting crises. By 1996-7, the difficulties were receding and there was a chance to build a new future. The UJIA offered financial and educational support: they funded the United Synagogue's Community Development Group (CDG) and rabbinic training and their support was appreciated. Elkan Levy (United Synagogue President (1996-99)) saw Jewish Renewal as an agency that was looking at the future of the Jewish community and that it could actually work: he felt that after the merger, UJIA had direction, with the potential to make a huge difference – and it had money. Levy was a more dovish Orthodox Jew[315] – his views were not unanimously shared across the United Synagogue leadership. However, a number of their professionals welcomed the engagement with Ariel and several of his colleagues – and, of course, the funding was certainly valued. However, they remained sceptical at the strategic level, and the more Orthodox were uncomfortable about working with a cross-communal body.

Jon Boyd worked for a Reform partner organisation and later joined UJIA Jewish Renewal. As noted, he described feeling that Jewish Continuity's attitude appeared to be: 'you do not know what you are doing so we will do it' and contrasted it with UJIA Jewish Renewal's approach which felt like: 'we do not exactly know but we are going to think about it with you.' However, Boyd went on to state: "But in truth, the people driving it [UJIA Jewish Renewal] were sophisticated thinkers and strategists – and more humble." and yet knew what they were doing and where they were leading their partners. This amounted to a rather harsh critique of Jewish Continuity professionals but Boyd was referring to the perceptions – and perceptions were crucial. Ariel gave the impression to partners that UJIA had collected funds from the community to serve the community and he attempted to demonstrate this through genuine engagement with partners. Boyd was of the view that UJIA was bold; repositioning itself; confident; professional. As a partner organisation colleague, he reported that he was taken more seriously by UJIA Jewish Renewal and felt invested in, talked to, valued, and encouraged to think and be reflective. He felt that the Reform professionals shared that view. UJIA became an important organisation for them as a 'critical friend' and a source of funds – they felt that they were being invested in. Shire suggested that: "In the area of shuls and schools it could have been stepping on our toes but we were partners to achieve leverage." On a more prosaic level, Goulden asserted that he was not fully aware of the detailed UJIA Jewish Renewal strategy and perhaps it did not matter to a client with a project looking for

[315] I.e. less dogmatic in the application of his religious approach and more prepared to work with organisations outside the United Synagogue.

funding – even if the partnership was more engaging than Jewish Continuity.

Nonetheless, at the practical level, UJIA Jewish Renewal worked extremely hard on building good relationships with partner professionals, investing in their professional development and engaging them in educational development conversations, and also was sure to provide funding to those organisations that were in strategic alignment (and/or political alliance) to affirm the relationship. As previously mentioned, the JAFI informal education and Israel Experience Departments (increasingly taken over by UJIA) were to serve across the community; and the Leo Baeck College-Centre for Jewish Education was to serve the non-Orthodox and Jews College[316]-Agency for Jewish Education was to serve the Orthodox – they focused upon central agencies that had capacities in educational leadership development. "If our funds can enable them to train more and better educators, rabbis and communal leaders, we will take an important step forward." (UJIA, 2001, p 15). In summary, it stated: "We hope that our partners will be willing to help us shape out [sic] future strategy and educational priorities. Certainly, we will invite them to be involved in our discussions, and we look forward to them playing their part in ensuring that we continue to stay sharply focused on the community's most important issues." (UJIA, 2001, p 16). Led by Ariel, they were considerably more successful than their Jewish Continuity colleagues. (Nonetheless, reservations later emerged as to the capacity of the partners to deliver the change envisaged by UJIA Jewish Renewal.)

[316] Later renamed the 'London School of Jewish Studies' (LSJS).

4.4.3 Funding

4.4.3.1 JEDT

The JEDT was established by Chief Rabbi Jakobovits in the early 1970s. His Director of the Office of the Chief Rabbi was Moshe Davis, who was credited with having brought together a group of wealthy lay leaders who agreed to fund the Trust for the purposes of Jewish education (Bermant, 1990, p 194; Taylor, 2007, pp 411-412).[317] This supplied a reasonably secure funding base from a group of Chief Rabbi loyalists. The JIA was also discreetly funding the JEDT. Finestein noted that the JEDT brought in "leading figures in Israel-funding and fund-raising" in an Anglo-Jewish educational institution (Finestein, 1999, p 281). As previously noted, the JEDT adopted a low key approach, reliant upon a small group of wealthy donors – as opposed to a community-wide appeal – and was, therefore, not open to public scrutiny. It was in sharp contrast to both Jewish Continuity and the UJIA. Towards the end, the JEDT ran into severe financial difficulties through its attempts to establish Immanuel College. The project began to spiral way beyond initial financial projections and the JEDT's fundraising capacity was unable to keep pace. The College was its final major project and it was only completed when a group of wealthy Jewish communal philanthropists (including Gerald Ronson) stepped in to see it through (Worms, 1996); Ronson, 2009).

4.4.3.2 Jewish Continuity

There was much speculation amongst Interviewees concerning the potential fundraising capacity of Jewish Continuity. The optimistic view expressed by some members of Jewish Continuity's senior leadership was that it had everything in place and was sailing with a favourable wind. Lawton claimed: "It was moving at speed – it could fundraise on the back of the excitement" and with the Chief Rabbi's active involvement. He stated that he never doubted that it would succeed and that significant money had already been committed, and that Mail was already starting work and making bookings for a major fundraising dinner, and that "Jewish Continuity fundraising was building up – it was already in seven figures" and that "Jewish Continuity had a lot of goodwill." Sinclair (and Winston and others) felt that

[317] The fundraising was probably interrupted and delayed by the more pressing needs of the Yom Kippor War, October, 1973.

Jewish Continuity would have been able to successfully conduct its own fundraising. Lawton summarised: "Who knows if we would have succeeded or not."[318] However, Sinclair (together with other Jewish Continuity leaders and activists) saw the logic of a long term relationship with the JIA for funding and raising the educational agenda. It was clearly preferable not to have to duplicate the fundraising efforts but it must also have been something of a relief. Wagner guardedly concluded: "It is doubtful however if it [Jewish Continuity] will be able to match on a regular basis the funds potentially able to be generated through a successful partnership with the JIA." and also raised other concerns (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 31).

The alternative view was captured by those interviewees who were sceptical as to Jewish Continuity's ability to fundraise effectively. An experienced Jewish community fundraiser believed that although Michael Sinclair was a big funder and a few others pitched in (including Marks through the Lord Ashdown Charitable Settlement and Michael Bradfield), it nonetheless never secured on-going large donations – there may not have been a wide enough base of major donors. When Marks resigned as Jewish Continuity Treasurer (March 1995) his place was taken by Howard Stanton. Stanton was a no nonsense, straight talking, highly experienced senior accountant and consultant who had developed an expertise in advising wealthy philanthropists on tax efficient charitable giving. He had been introduced into Jewish Continuity by Sir Harry Solomon and was exactly the person an organisation needed to sort out its financial affairs. He had been led to believe that all was well with the Jewish Continuity finances. However, in interview, he queried assertions made by Jewish Continuity professionals that they had a sound fundraising strategy in place ahead of the agreement with the JIA. Jewish Continuity leaders were of the view that the organisation had guaranteed committed funding for its first four years. However, if the funding was indeed guaranteed and committed then it certainly did not all materialise – the funding agreement with the JIA should not have led to the withholding of such funds as most of those potential Jewish Continuity donors should still have been in place. Another senior Jewish Continuity insider's assessment was that Jewish Continuity did not have the capacity to conduct effective independent fundraising and that they were not raising money from the community and that there were only a few major donors (such as Sinclair and the Lord Ashdown Charitable Settlement). Kerner also noted how difficult it was to raise funds for Jewish Continuity and

[318] Mail was already working on a detailed fundraising strategy certainly as early as February 1993.

went further: “Jewish Continuity fundraising was difficult and badly organised. It was in financial difficulty and did not have the funds – even before the JIA deal.”

Perhaps this Jewish Continuity senior leader summed up what might be claimed to be a dominant, if contested, view: “Jewish Continuity may have had plans but the money was not in place: it was a struggle – the JIA was a convenient way out.” (However, as was previously noted, JIA funding was to have a constraining impact on the Jewish Continuity modus operandi.)

One observer raised a further complication that accrued from Jewish Continuity’s performance: in order for Lawton to have had any serious prospect of driving the project forward he would have needed even greater sums of money than initially projected for the organisation. Another Jewish Continuity and later UJIA lay leader also observed: “Inter-religious issues and fundraising were negatively impacting on each other.”

4.4.3.3 JIA

As noted above, Fred Worms had long argued the case for the Israel-fundraising strength of the JIA to be exploited for the benefit of Jewish education in the UK. He presented the case both from a practical viewpoint that the JIA had the skills to fundraise and access to the major donors, but also set out the ideological case: namely that Israel was growing in economic strength and that it was also in Israel’s interest to have strongly identifying Diaspora Jewish communities that would support Israel both financially, politically and with potential new immigrants (Worms, 1996).

In fact, the JIA, the leading body raising funds for Israel, was already discreetly funding the JEDT as well as the Zionist Federation Education Trust (ZFET) which supported a number of Jewish primary schools. It was also supporting a portfolio of informal education projects including Jewish youth movements, the Jewish student movement and Jewish central educational resource centres, as well as other educational projects (JIA Executive Minutes). It also worked closely with JAFI (including through its London Education office), as part of its broader JIA-JAFI relationship.

The JIA had an effective fundraising structure in place. However, the JIA leadership recognised that they were in an increasingly competitive fundraising environment, particularly with the restructuring of the welfare field and the emergence of Jewish Care. Furthermore, their fundraising had plateaued and they were in decline.[319] The emergence of Jewish Continuity appeared to have two apparently somewhat contradictory effects: it both unsettled JIA's fundraising confidence as they feared donors would be more likely to transfer their 'Israel funding' to education rather than their 'welfare funding' and, at the same time, it played to some of the JIA leaders' own ideological support for Jewish-Israel education in the Diaspora. A Jewish Continuity insider argued that the JIA came in with the early funding offer due to their nervousness (though he did believe that they genuinely wanted to support it), without being clear on the denominational issue; but, he argued, the JIA later became nervous about losing donors.

Lawton asserted that he had been against the funding agreement with the JIA. However, he held out for binding, public assurances from the JIA to ensure their commitment to the funding agreement (with the amounts and payment schedule publicly specified) and he hoped that these would be sufficient guarantees. (The arrangement also elicited some disquiet and alarm within the ranks of Jewish Continuity: a leading Jewish Continuity lay leader was reported to have said: "Don't do it; don't trust the bastards." Another that Jewish Continuity "would live to regret it" and others said it was not deliverable. More positively, others described themselves as being "blown away … by the mind-boggling deal" with its scale and boldness. Similarly, there was some significant dissatisfaction amongst some JIA activists over the arrangement with Jewish Continuity and how they were being handled.)

Understandably, Sinclair and Lawton did not anticipate that the JIA might break or otherwise seek to renege on the agreement. Lawton was also deeply critical of the JIA for not seriously engaging with the Jewish Continuity message and its promotion amongst potential donors. He asserted that "the JIA did not know how to articulate the Jewish Continuity story" nor translate it into an effective fundraising campaign, and that was clearly the case. As previously noted, however, the JIA held Jewish Continuity responsible for dragging them into the cross-communal melee – an area in which they had little experience, understanding nor

[319] It was reported in *New Moon* (September 1992, pp 30-32): "When told that *New Moon* was investigating how the recession had affected the Jewish community Mr Jaffe's (JIA Communications Director) response was quizzical. "Has it?" he asked." He knew full well it had – including the JIA.

capability to manage it. The JIA leadership declared that that the controversy surrounding the Chief Rabbi had seriously compromised the JIA's cross-communal fundraising activities on behalf of Jewish Continuity – undoubtedly there was also an element of truth in that view as well. In regard to the Jewish Continuity-JIA funding agreement as a whole, a well-placed senior JIA lay leader conceded:

> the JIA had always informally supported education. … Jewish Continuity was constrained by the Orthodox issues and it needed broadening. … The JIA leadership was cross-communal which was a strength. For me: 'Jewish Continuity is JIA'. Jewish Continuity was struggling to raise the ante and deliver the right message. It decided on the funding agreement. But JIA couldn't fund it. Brian Kerner was coming in as the new chair – we thought it was a good thing for the community and Israel BUT there was no consultation with our constituents. Naively we felt we would set alight the community and JIA fund raising would now go into over-drive. But it did not bring stakeholders on board – it did not work. The Chief Rabbi, Clive Lawton, Michael Sinclair, Trevor Chinn and Cyril Stein were all trying to raise money. In the mid-1990s, it needed to communicate the message: it was about Jewish continuity not education. … We did feel we had a commitment to honour which was not deliberately broken. … Jewish Continuity was possibly right that they did not have access to the JIA fund raising process. JIA was very possessive of its donors but Jewish Continuity was very weak at fund raising – Jewish Continuity had not been pro-active. Jewish Continuity did not succeed in getting money in to meet expectations. Jewish Continuity needed JIA as a fundraiser.

Nonetheless, the cross-communal issue was a serious challenge for the JIA. It was a cross-communal organisation in terms of its approach to Jewish community divisions – Israel cut through community differences. (Notwithstanding that elements on the liberal left of the religious spectrum were increasingly uncomfortable with what they saw as JIA's uncritical support for Israel.) Therefore, Jewish Continuity's growing difficulties around the cross-communal question were to cause serious tensions. As previously discussed, in January 1995, the Chief Rabbi became publicly embroiled in a difficult cross-communal feud with the Assembly of Masorti Synagogues (AMS). It triggered a bitter dispute and acrimonious rows between Jewish Continuity and the JIA, as the latter failed to deliver the committed funding. The JIA held the Chief Rabbi and Jewish Continuity responsible for the problems in fundraising for Jewish Continuity. At the Jewish Continuity Executive Board meeting of the 6th October 1995, the following was recorded in the Minutes: "Brian Kerner explained the

JIA position, commenting that the JIA had found it extremely difficult to raise money for Continuity since the Chief Rabbi's article in the Jewish Tribune [concerning the Masorti, 12th January 1995]. He felt that Continuity had not provided a clearly defined "product" to sell and had failed to communicate its aims and activities within the wider community. However, he stressed that the biggest problem related to the "pluralism" issue namely, the widely held view that Continuity was not working across the community nor collaborating with all religious groups." At the same meeting, Sinclair noted that the JIA funding agreement remained a binding commitment on the JIA. A senior Jewish Continuity leader also argued that: "JIA's problems were not about the Chief Rabbi; they just did not have the money." He asserted that JIA's claims about the Chief Rabbi were "one big red herring". By the summer 1995, Jewish Continuity was seriously struggling with its finances.

In summary, a senior Jewish Continuity professional asserted that: "The JIA did not engage. It had over-committed itself – it wanted it but it could not afford it."[320] Of course, the case for Jewish Continuity's potential fundraising capacity was at very best, unproven.

It exposed five flaws in the Jewish Continuity-JIA agreement:

- the JIA was not the powerful fundraising facility that it claimed to be – neither on behalf of Jewish Continuity nor itself (and the JIA had also failed to secure the 'buy-in' to Jewish Continuity of some of its own activists on the ground);
- Jewish Continuity's claims of having already lined up additional willing funders rang a little hollow - the claims by some that it would have been able to establish its own strong, long term fundraising capability were also doubted by knowledgeable insiders;
- The JIA had little grasp of the cross-communal complications that were attached to Jewish Continuity, and the Chief Rabbi's difficulties in this area certainly made the situation far more complicated;
- Jewish Continuity appeared not to have fully appreciated the operational constraints that the partnership carried;
- The increasing realisation by both parties that it was not so easy to raise funds for Jewish education or Jewish continuity.

It was a mess and the eventual merger was a way out of it.

[320] (Though from the Jewish Continuity side, both Marks and Stanton (as Jewish Continuity Treasurers) raised serious concerns over Jewish Continuity's spending projections ahead of actual receipt of JIA funding i.e. that they were committing to expenditure with funds not yet received, and Stanton acted entirely responsibly when he assertively opposed the expansion of the programme until JIA funds were handed over.)

A senior insider summed up the position as follow: The JIA diehards felt that the JIA should never have got involved with Jewish Continuity; the Jewish Continuity diehards felt that it was a wretched deal and that they would have been better off doing their own fundraising. What was clear, however, was that once the JIA funding began to stall, Jewish Continuity was in increasing trouble and in the end, it could not survive independently.

4.4.3.4 UJIA

One of the major fears held by UJIA was that they might lose their income stream from wealthy Israel supporters. This had to be managed with the utmost delicacy and was not always successful. Concessions needed to be made, for example, in Manchester where the UJIA leadership were more 'old-school Israel first' people and the community was more Orthodox and where the Orthodox rabbis held greater influence. The funding in Manchester was weighted in favour of the schools – which were all Orthodox. (The influence of the leading local philanthropist, Joshua Rowe, was also important: a leading funder, Orthodox Jew, and the dominant force behind the Manchester King David Schools where he personally led the transformation with remarkable success.)

There was also a strong residual sense across the community that UJIA was simply a new version of JIA – indeed, to this day, people still refer to 'UJIA' as 'JIA'. This reflected an understanding that the new organisation was still primarily about fundraising for Israel. As noted earlier, David Lerner argued that, in that sense, there remained a residual smokescreen of Israel fundraising to cover over the cross-communal complications.

The UJIA never really achieved the communal paradigm shift necessary for Jewish education fundraising. Essentially, UJIA donations, after an allowance for overheads, could be categorised into: ear-marked donations for Rescue (Israel and Jews in distress around the world); ear-marked donations for UJIA Jewish Renewal; unrestricted donations available to the organisation for either its Rescue or Renewal programme; donations ear-marked for particular named projects. The Jewish Renewal budget was only covered by taking up a significant component of the unrestricted funds. The dramatic growth in fundraising income for Jewish education in Britain was not achieved (though with the notable exceptions of a

very limited number of sizable donations[321]). However, in the new, merged operation, there was a significant increase in the funding made available for Jewish education, reaching an annual £3 million per annum by 2000. This was, indeed, the transformation in fundraising that Worms (and others) had advocated twenty years before.

Brian Kerner commented on UJIA: "We set out on a completely different path to JIA. Set out to break the image of a 'rich man's club'" – though in practice that was always what it was (and in many ways continued to be – albeit in the context of a community-wide appeal). At best, as Kerner noted, it could bring in new, younger people, be more inclusive, more transparent (they instituted annual public meetings) and altogether more engaging. He went on to note: "Strategically, it was the sensible way forward: it read the pulse of the community at the time. … Thank goodness it was not as exciting as a war [in terms of raising money for Israel] … but it did not bring in huge new money." Bayfield also took a favourable view: "I thought that the way he [Kerner] took over the JIA from being this 'rich man's club' focused on Israel into being something much more for the community and recognising the need of significant retention of funds here – he did really well."

A very experienced and senior Jewish professional addressed the question of UJIA and fundraising: the UJIA "believed that by waving the flag of education and Israel it could secure the same aggregate amount of money and significantly catapult further money raised …" and went on to claim that in that sense it had failed. However, that is an exaggerated and overly harsh criticism: one way or another, the UJIA managed to provide sufficient funds to elevate the importance of Jewish education amongst communal priorities whilst maintaining its Israel support. Nonetheless, income did not meet expectations – and largely remained that way thereafter. (Additional research would be required to measure the overall growth in levels of financial support for Jewish education (and Israel) across the community.)

[321] The Jewish Chronicle Editorial (31st October 1997) noted a £1.5 million gift from the Lord Ashdown Charitable Settlement announced by the Trust Director, Clive Marks.

4.4.4 Communications and Expectations

In the modern era, communications, marketing and expectation management emerged as more prominent concerns. Furthermore, the message had to be communicated to the wider community when the organisation was seeking to present itself as a community-wide body. This required specialist skills; however, though the professionals and consultants may have been more highly specialised, there was insufficient serious market research to demonstrate their impact.

4.4.4.1 JEDT

As previously noted, the JEDT operated in a low key manner, answerable primarily to its own backers and Jakobovits. There was no public fanfare and communications strategy – it was not relevant. Their Worms Report secured positive *Jewish Chronicle* exposure on its release, but there was insufficient organisational apparatus to ensure its delivery – it was soon superseded by Jewish Continuity.

4.4.4.2 Jewish Continuity

The Sacks appointment to the post of Chief Rabbi triggered huge expectations, and a wave of enthusiasm engulfed the community as these expectations ran wild. The anticipation and hope around the new Chief Rabbi obviously encouraged his Office to plan even more confidently for the future – it felt like the time was right for radical change and they were duly emboldened. [322] Ensuing developments led to disappointment as these expectations were neither met nor effectively managed – to some extent, the Chief Rabbi and his associates appeared to have been caught up in the euphoria of the moment, and with their perspective distorted, they failed to grasp the changing realities of British Jewry and the limitations of the Office – a lack of insight shared by many. Not unreasonably, however, they were stoking up the expectations in the belief that this would create a growing momentum that would carry their plans forward, whereas, with hindsight, expectation management should also have been a concern.

[322] At least one observer went further and harshly accused the Office of the Chief Rabbi of "empire-building beyond the limitations of the Office."

As previously discussed, Jewish Continuity was launched with a striking fanfare and supporting budget. The publicity was eye-catching and sparked communal debate. Hype! was the communications agency hired to deliver the message and was led by two people with a background in Jewish communal life. They set out to cause a debate and the advertisements were controversial – and impactful. Hype! generated a series of monthly advertisements with eye-catching messages that commenced with 'Today We'll Lose Another Ten Jews' (*Jewish Chronicle*, 17th December 1993) – it was also the same copy as on their first publicity leaflet. The advertisements were full page and were purchased at considerable expense. Nonetheless, it certainly achieved the goal of placing Jewish Continuity at the centre of communal attention. It was claimed by the marketing agency that their campaign had directly triggered the JIA response to Jewish Continuity – it had certainly helped. In many ways, it also heralded the realisation that communications was essential to deliver the organisation's message effectively. Lawton summed up the approach: "We needed to bring the Jewish Continuity agenda into the eyesight of the community – launch fast with a rapid impact. A more academic approach would have delayed it for two to three years." It was in stark contrast to the JEDT. Wagner identified the problem: "At its heart is a communications problem. Jewish Continuity announced itself with a series of provocative advertisements. These made it noticed but oversold the organisation." (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 39).[323]

The advertisements were strong and controversial; they upset some people but they were heavily debated. A senior Jewish Continuity professional reported that "it captured a sense of crisis; of losing young people who were not interested in their heritage, religion or faith and that it threatened the future of the Jewish community. The big challenge was how could the Jewish community be transformed?" When Hype! went to present the second year plan it was rejected as too expensive.[324] There was an attempt on the one hand to present a positive image of Jewish life yet sell it with negative images. But even the message was informed by a particular perspective. A previously noted, the most remembered was the first advertisement that showed young adult Jews walking off the end of a road and falling into an abyss with the caption: "we lose ten Jews every day". Schmool argued that it was blatant scare-mongering and that it was based on spurious statistical interpretations. The messages may have played

[323] Wagner continued: "Ever since, communications has been confused with public relations so that increasingly its claims of success have been received with greater and greater degrees of scepticism." (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 39).
[324] Jewish Continuity later adopted a cheaper and lower key approach.

well with Orthodox and traditional Jews who were the targets for fundraising, but for the Progressive movements it was rather different: they were often trying to reach out to Jews who were already somewhat detached from the community (and/or married to non-Jewish partners) and indeed their Judaism, and portraying them in this way was not necessarily helpful in reaching out to them – a point evidently lost on the Jewish Continuity leadership. Nonetheless, Jewish Continuity's communications strategy appeared to capture the community's attention in this way, with the intention of becoming more upbeat at a later time.

Despite Jewish Continuity's extensive commercial advertising in the *Jewish Chronicle*, the newspaper closely followed its progress and covered all of the travails faced by the organisation. It did not hold back in highlighting the difficulties faced by the Chief Rabbi and Jewish Continuity.

4.4.4.3 UJIA

Kestenbaum and Ariel, ably supported by their Communications Director, Anthony Wagerman, were sharply aware of the need for expectation management. They dampened down expectations of immediate transformation and the message went out that it was going to be a longer process – after the traumas of Jewish Continuity, it was a message that few in the community were ready to challenge.

Jewish Continuity had succeeded in being noticed – drawing communal attention to both the challenges of Jewish education and Jewish continuity. A great deal of thought went into how UJIA was to be packaged as it rebranded both JIA and Jewish Continuity. However, in contrast to the excitement of Jewish Continuity, UJIA Jewish Renewal's platform presented a real marketing challenge. The outcome was a professional image with a new logo and a different style in its advertising. It attempted to move away from a message of crisis and to promote a more positive tone in its communications – though it too entangled fundraising crisis messages of rescue with positive education messages of renewal, and struggled to blend its twin messages of 'rescue and renewal' in Israel and Britain respectively. Furthermore, the communications messages did not appear to translate into a significant and transformative increase in ear-marked income for Jewish education in Britain. However, Wagerman's

competent brand management accentuated the view that it was a responsible and worthy organisation.

Ariel reported that one of their greatest fears was that the *Jewish Chronicle* would turn on the UJIA. However, the UJIA worked hard on their relationship (through consultation, relationship building and the supply of advertising revenue). A UJIA senior professional reported: "there was hardly a peep of criticism – it was astonishing." However, neither was there much positive coverage, raising the question of whether or not there was simply little to report that would attract the media's interest – with its inbuilt appetite for the more sensational. UJIA was certainly less controversial and there was no public involvement from the Chief Rabbi. UJIA was highly risk averse when it came to public criticism and took a more conservative and cautious approach – generally, it worked. A leading, senior educational professional countered that it controlled its public relations and played safe at the expense of creativity and innovation.

Finally, the project was still not sufficiently well understood by enough people: many continued to refer to the UJIA as the JIA, and many were unaware of the full scope and aspiration of the UJIA's Jewish Renewal enterprise. For example, it never managed to communicate effectively its impact and contribution in Jewish schools – such as it was – and 'Jewish renewal' never managed to resonate as powerfully as 'Jewish continuity'.

5 CONCLUSION

The following practical Framework[325] (or Checklist) has emerged from the research process, providing the template for presenting the Conclusion of this inquiry. It was formulated as a result of:

- a methodical review of the chronological evolution of each initiative (see Appendix One);
- the categorisation of the main developmental stages that emerged across the various initiatives that were examined within the research study (see Appendices Two);
- a consideration of the research Findings;
- thereafter, they were brought together in a Framework that was built upon a strategic analysis approach.

The Framework has been constructed through the application of fundamental principles around strategic thinking and articulation, planning and mobilisation, and management implementation. It serves two purposes: to provide a structure for presenting the research and also as a template for the examination of similar or related initiatives – it is intended for use by researchers and practitioners in this field.

5.1 A Framework for the Conclusions

PHASE ONE – STRATEGIC THINKING AND ARTICULATION

1. Develop a convincing critique of the current situation (including the identification and understanding of the target population and the problems and challenges to be addressed) and identify further research and information-gathering needs as appropriate.

Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits warned of the perils posed by growing assimilation within British Jewry and the dire consequences of inaction. His critique was sufficiently persuasive to underpin his initiative. Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks similarly addressed the assimilation threat, and provided a far broader historical analysis and assessment of contemporary British Jewry, defining the problems and setting out the challenges in an intellectually compelling argument. It was effective in providing a firm foundation for both Jewish Continuity and

[325] The researcher acknowledges the influence of Eugene Bardach (2000) 'A Practical Guide to Policy Analysis – the Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving'.

UJIA Jewish Renewal in their aspirations to transform the community, though UJIA Jewish Renewal evinced a more upbeat message.

2. Offer an inspiring and realisable vision (including a description of what success will look like) and sense of purpose presented with passion and vigour.

Jakobovits ardently promoted the view that exposure to formal Jewish education was the antidote to the problems facing the community, and he established a concrete purpose: to build more Jewish schools to achieve increased enrolment of Jewish youth. Sacks's writings presented a captivating vision which embraced the importance and value of safeguarding the Jewish future and support for the elevation of Jewish education as a priority for the community (through Jewish Continuity). UJIA Jewish Renewal broadly inherited Sacks's vision but was itself more mission-driven and focused upon the delivery of the programme and practical and achievable aims.

3. Ensure there are clear and compelling messages which are well-thought through and cogently articulated (including a well-constructed narrative and language to support the implementation of the initiative) – and a strong marketing and communications strategy.

Jakobovits's initiative was entitled 'Let my people know' and carried a focused message: build schools and improve teacher development and resources. The plan was not complex and its success relied upon its ability to engage a number of key philanthropists. It was reasonably successful in this regard. Sacks framed a question for the community: 'Will we have Jewish grandchildren?' and it was both impactful and an outstanding example of the effectiveness of a well-framed articulation of the message. His presentation of the challenge played a crucial role in building a persuasive case for action – to the benefit of both Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal. Jewish Continuity was launched with a provocative advertising campaign which stressed the assimilatory dangers facing the community. However, its strategic thinking lacked sufficient intellectual rigour. UJIA Jewish Renewal was far more deliberative in its own strategic thinking and, in addition, Jonny Ariel developed a language to communicate the Jewish Renewal plan and a vocabulary for practitioners to articulate and illuminate the delivery processes and mechanisms. However, UJIA Jewish Renewal was less well known or understood across the wider community.

PHASE TWO: STRATEGIC PLANNING AND MOBILISATION

4. Engage, excite and motivate key community leadership.

Jakobovits initially struggled to muster the resources to realise his scheme. However, with the support of Moshe Davis he was eventually able to recruit individuals who could be harnessed to the delivery of the JEDT aspirations. Sacks (with the effective support of Jonathan Kestenbaum) brought together key lay leadership to back Jewish Continuity. They were clearly motivated and mobilised by the Chief Rabbi's vision and included a number of new leaders, amongst whom Dr Michael Sinclair was the outstanding example. Sacks himself was the initial inspiration and was immensely influential – a powerful example of community leadership. It also had a consequential effect on the JIA and rapidly formalised the institutional involvement of leading donors to Israel with Jewish education in Britain; it precipitated a major reassessment and repositioning of the JIA and its leadership (led by Sir Trevor Chinn). However, the instigation of radical change was to prove costly to Sacks's personal leadership status – particularly in the matter of cross-communal affairs. The challenge faced by UJIA Jewish Renewal was different: it had to maintain the support of the JIA leadership, retain the involvement of the Jewish Continuity leadership and mould them around a revised, common project – they succeeded sufficiently well to establish and develop the new organisation but there were less people involved in leadership roles.

5. Estimate the costs involved and develop an effective fundraising strategy and mechanism (this will include identification of potential donors and development of the campaign storyline).

Jakobovits was prescriptive in setting out a costed plan, though it took him longer to raise funds and did not fully achieve the original targets. Jewish Continuity's independent fundraising capacity was unproven, though the balance of the Interviewee responses tilted in favour of the view that they would have struggled. The funding agreement with the JIA (with its Israel funding priorities) marked a momentous shift in the communal philanthropic landscape of the Jewish community – it proved a fateful decision for both partners. The JIA deal was later to have debilitating consequences for Jewish Continuity, and revealed the limitations of the JIA's own fundraising abilities and its failure to fully comprehend the cross-communal issues within the community. Nevertheless, it marked the fulfilment of Fred Worms's premature advocacy of three decades earlier for a re-balancing in the allocation of communal funds between Israel and Jewish education. UJIA Jewish Renewal was able to benefit from this transformation. Though UJIA was not itself able to fully achieve its own fundraising targets, it succeeded in providing its Jewish Renewal division with sufficient

funds to establish an effective operational framework from which to implement its programme.

6. Assemble and invest in the right personnel to deliver it (including lay and professional leaders) and establish the leadership, governance and decision-making frameworks, whilst framing the lay-professional relationships.

Jakobovits, ably supported by Davis, assembled a capable group around the JEDT who contributed significantly to the realisation of the Jakobovits initiative. His successor, Sacks, undoubtedly provided visionary and inspirational leadership underpinned by his impressive communications skills and unquestionable intellectual ability. He created Jewish Continuity in a move that transformed the community. However, in Michael Sinclair he recruited an outstanding communal leader who, nonetheless, was not an ideal match for the communal environment in which Jewish Continuity found itself (with his 'disruptive technologies' approach and his views on cross-communalism); and he, in turn, supported the recruitment of one of the outstanding, inspirational educators in Lawton but he too struggled in his role – the Sinclair-Lawton combination exacerbated the difficulties. Nonetheless, they did succeed initially in recruiting significant numbers of new and passionate lay leaders. UJIA benefitted from the respected and effective leadership of Brian Kerner who brought people together – certainly the right person in the right post at the right time – and the outstanding professional talents of Jonathan Kestenbaum. Together with Ariel, they patiently engaged the best available teams, placing lay leaders in appropriate governance structures and investing in the recruitment and professional development of their staff.

7. Act with political and tactical sophistication and subtlety within the community, pre-empting and addressing potential obstacles and challenges (including expectation management and communications)

The communal context was critical. Jakobovits functioned in an age where 'deference' still prevailed. The authority of his Office and his personal religious leadership and prestige afforded him greater freedom and less constraint. Furthermore, his more limited initiative raised fewer objections or concerns. Sacks was acutely compromised by the cross-communal issue and his inability to address and successfully negotiate the challenge. Whilst he was initially immensely successful in winning support and enthusiasm for his new project, the practical operational delivery through Jewish Continuity was fraught with difficulties and soon ran aground. In addition, expectations were not properly managed. The partnership with

the JIA became a seriously problematic complication. UJIA had the massive advantage of having witnessed the difficulties experienced by its precursors and learning the lessons. UJIA Jewish Renewal was manifestly cautious and deliberative – at times overly so. However, given the circumstances, UJIA Jewish Renewal's measured interventions were, generally, suitably calibrated for the context within which it was positioned.

8. Identify the key stakeholders (for examples, those organisations and individuals in the same field of activity, future partnerships, potential funders, interested media) and work out strategies for engagement and/or management.

Jewish Continuity did not manage the field effectively. It was entitled to take the view that the existing communal apparatus was deficient; it was also acceptable to hold the opinion that it was beyond repair and that comprehensive change was required. However, the change process needed far more careful and sensitive management. UJIA Jewish Renewal again had the significant advantage of learning from the Jewish Continuity experience and was able to develop partnerships with far greater success – Ariel excelled in the educational arena, effectively handling the political challenges, pursuing suitable strategic partnerships and establishing meaningful collegiality. UJIA's management of a broad range of stakeholders also secured their involvement in Jewish Renewal's development and patience during its progression.

PHASE THREE: STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

9. Establish the organisational identity (and 'brand') including its operating principles, culture and values (including the primary function and mode of operation of the central agency e.g. foundation, development agency, enabler of others, service provider, or an authority; also addressing questions of innovation, experimentation, approach to existing infrastructure, etc.; and examining and applying the relevant theories of educational efficacy), with a commitment to becoming a learning organisation.

This was an area of significant weakness and difficulty for Jewish Continuity. Clive Lawton attempted to create a learning organisation to enhance the understanding of what would create effective Jewish continuity. However, 'let a thousand flowers grow' and 'light many fires' were increasingly not compatible with the environment in which the organisation was functioning. Furthermore, if the first phase was to be built around experimentation, research and learning it still needed to be carefully and rigorously framed in a coherent strategic plan, indicating the theory and practice upon which it was based. There was no clarity on what Jewish Continuity was; and if it was to create a new and original model that too had to be

unambiguously defined for its multiple audiences. Clearly, this was severely compounded by the cross-communal complications. Of course, much of this only became clear with hindsight. The JIA involvement (plus the cross-communal issues) precipitated a ruinous breakdown for the Sinclair-Lawton model. It caused a punishing acceleration of the timetable and resulted in unmanageable pressure on the planning and development process. (The absence of committed funds then effectively incapacitated Jewish Continuity.) UJIA Jewish Renewal had a far stronger sense of what it was and what it was doing (though not always understood externally). It weighted its enabler-provider balance in favour of the former (enabling others over the provision of central agency programmes) and restricted itself to central projects that it felt only the centre should and could deliver. However, it invested heavily in central operations and services to support its external partners. It worked hard on propounding its operating principles and role in the educational field.

10. Develop a rigorous and effective strategic development and implementation plan, covering evidence-based strategic planning, realistic, timetabled targets and measures of success and evaluation mechanisms.

Jakobovits espoused an unpretentious and arguably naïve conviction that formal school-based Jewish education worked. Consequently, he did not enter into deeper analysis. However, the Worms Report (JEDT, 1992) was a strong piece of educational thinking and planning. Sacks developed his approach to Jewish continuity in a way that fused educational, sociological and theological thinking. He also set out guidance on the headline aspects of the practical implementation of Jewish Continuity – though more focused around broad concepts and ways of working. Lawton came into post after the operational parameters of Jewish Continuity had been loosely sketched out and partially established. He led an organisation that he anticipated would have more time and more money and less of the distraction triggered by cross-communal discontent. However, there was a lack of strategic coherence that suffused the organisation. UJIA Jewish Renewal was meticulous in its strategic planning – its strategic plan (UJIA, 2001) was exemplary. However, they had the luxury of an extended time period during which to develop it.

11. Construct appropriate organisational structures and capacities for the effective operational delivery of the plans and programmes (deciding on the most appropriate intervention areas for examples school-building, teacher training, curriculum development, early years, bursaries, the place of the synagogue, the home, family education, Israel experience trips, informal education for youth and students, Jewish activities in mainstream (non-Jewish) schools, young adults, adult education,

community development, leadership development, arts and culture, outreach, innovation, research and planning, etc.) and develop robust organisational procedures (for examples, financial accountability and management, human resources, etc.)

Jakobovits had a contained plan and therefore only needed a relatively straightforward infrastructure built around the JEDT. Jewish Continuity was massively ambitious and constructed a wide ranging set of interventions. It set up a number of Task Groups in its priority areas, was developing its own central initiatives and working with partners on agreed projects. It planned for a slower role out but events soon dictated otherwise and it was overrun by communal developments and the framework became unwieldy. UJIA Jewish Renewal developed a narrower operational base and invested far more resource in its central capacities. It identified three main areas, two of which were already operating – though on a smaller scale – within the Jewish Agency for Israel framework. It also invested in two partner educational agencies (one Orthodox and the other non-Orthodox) which only went part way to achieving its goals. It was a more limited operating platform which may have made more sense in the context of available funds and the post-Jewish Continuity situation.

12. Nurture and enthuse people to champion the initiative (including the promotion of an engaging and successful 'storyline')

Jakobovits relied upon a small group of communal philanthropists and worked primarily with education professionals in the school sector. It did not need a community-wide campaign to succeed. In contrast, Sacks launched his initiative with tremendous fanfare in the context of the exhilaration and raised expectations of his inauguration. Similarly, Jewish Continuity's communications promoted an attention-grabbing narrative of the serious dangers of assimilation unless the community was ready to act. They also succeeded in exciting people around the initiative and elevating Jewish education as a communal priority. However, the support soon dissipated in the face of subsequent difficulties. UJIA Jewish Renewal took a deliberately much lower key approach to diffuse tensions and give itself time to establish a new framework. It successfully engaged a smaller body of activists and encouraged people to support a narrower and more focused programme. Amongst communal professionals there was greater collegial appreciation and the storyline implicitly carried the message of a worthy and more successful organisation restoring calm after the turmoil that surrounded its immediate precursor.

5.2 Overview of the Research Process and the Contribution to the Literature

This research report has addressed the historiographical challenges in assembling compelling evidence to support credible analysis, findings and interpretation. The researcher has also paid attention to the ethical challenges involved in conducting the study. What emerged from the research is a detailed examination of the history of what happened and an interpretation of the findings, providing an historical narrative accompanied by a discourse around Jewish community educational work.

The wider perspectives on the administration of central Jewish community educational planning initiatives in British covering the Jewish Educational Development Trust, its Worms Report, Jewish Continuity and UJIA were addressed in this research; by bringing them together for analysis, the research presented a broad overview of developments in this field. The detailed examination of Jewish Continuity provided an insight into a pivotal, catalytic process for British Jewry within which several transformative trends evolved. Firstly, and most crucially, a turning point in the contemporary history of British Jewry at which attention to Jewish education took on greater significance. Secondly, though the elevation of Jewish education in the form of a central organisational framework was an important development in itself, the merger with JIA, the leading Israel fundraising organisation, reflected an ideological and philosophical paradigm shift: the mainstream Zionist narrative more publicly embraced Diaspora Jewish education, recognising mutual interdependence. It was the readjustment advocated by Fred Worms. Finally, the British Jewish community was able to gain further experience and develop expertise in the delivery of Jewish educational central agency services. Though some of that experience was painfully acquired, the expertise had been accumulated and deployed by the UJIA and this research has sought to study and present key aspects of it. There is very little literature on UJIA: this research will provide a platform on which to assess its value as a subject for further investigation.

This research has examined a pivotal decade in the contemporary history of British Jewry from the perspective of Jewish education (understood in its broader role of ensuring that Jewish identity and commitment is passed on to future generations who remain connected to the Jewish community and the Jewish people). The significant development has been the elevation of Jewish education to the level of importance of Israel and welfare (and security

provision). The research has examined the processes involved in the emergence of Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal. It offered an insight into the important role played by prominent personalities and philanthropic leadership and revealed the individual roles played by lay and professional leaders.

The research recorded the key developments (1991-2000) and analysed their evolution: tracking the main thrust of former Chief Rabbi Jakobovits's initial work – primarily on Jewish schools and the establishment of the Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT) – through the contribution of Fred Worms and his JEDT Think Tank Report, and onto the formation of Jewish Continuity and its wider view of Jewish identity building, and culminating in the merger with the JIA to form UJIA. The focus has been on the vision and planning, organisation and implementation and leadership in the context of the complexities of British Jewry. This research report adds to the literature in the fields of contemporary British Jewry, Jewish community educational planning and leadership, as well as the wider field of ethnic minority communities in modern Britain. As an historiographical research, it offers an insight and analysis of specific events, both to provide a better understanding of what happened and also to identify lessons and implications for those currently operating in similar or related fields.

This research will assist the historian seeking a deeper understanding of the events and personalities discussed; the sociologist seeking to better understand the Jewish community; educationalists with an interest in this area; and those concerned with ethnic and religious community education and development. It will be less helpful to those with a theological focus who will find more useful material elsewhere. On a more practical level, it will assist Jewish community leaders to understand: how broader currents and practicalities impact on decision-making in terms of bringing the vision to reality; unintended and unpredicted consequences and outcomes; the importance of planning and the resources required. Jewish educators and community development specialists in this field will certainly find resonance for their own work.

5.3 The Place of the Chief Rabbi and Jewish Community Education in the Literature

Chief Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks announced a 'decade of renewal' at his inauguration in September 1991. Understandably, the attention of commentators has been on the Chief Rabbi, with particular reference to the cross-communal issues that have beset both him and the Jewish community in general, and also his clashes with the more Orthodox establishment. However, though this is entirely legitimate, it has distracted and clouded the subsequent study and understanding of developments in the field of Jewish community education. It was the Chief Rabbi's Jewish Continuity initiative that changed the status quo and altered the constellation of the communal infrastructure. However, when the Chief Rabbi moved on, the Jewish education work continued and was worthy of further exploration. This research adopted the perspective of 'the history of education' and examined community organisational frameworks and leadership. By following Jewish community educational developments as the 'critical path', rather than dwell exclusively on the individual role of the Chief Rabbi and the immediate surrounding issues, wider educational developments were revealed and analysed. The result is an academic study providing insight into the major issues and influences that determined the evolution of central Jewish community educational development, with resonance for practitioners and leaders in the present and the future.

This research did not avoid a consideration of the important role played by the Chief Rabbi and cross-communalism but it provided far more detail on the developments and inner workings of Jewish Continuity. Furthermore, it also extended to cover UJIA as a continuation of the Chief Rabbi's vision – or at least of the processes he had triggered – albeit in different form. It is argued here that a thorough assessment of the contribution of the Chief Rabbi requires an understanding of the Jewish Continuity merger and its outcome, UJIA. Overall, it is important to present the vital historical and community context for those who otherwise focus more narrowly in their studies on the Office of the Chief Rabbi. Much of the existing literature and commentaries on the Chief Rabbi are critical and partial – driven by religious doctrinal differences or other resentments. However, this research will offer the opportunity for future scholars to at least appreciate a more vivid picture and understand the broader milieu within which these educational events unfolded – thereafter, they will, inevitably, take sides.

As already discussed, most assessments of Jewish Continuity understandably shine their spotlight on the Chief Rabbi and, notwithstanding the above noted observation that his role has thereby distracted from the study of the wider developments in Jewish education, he has played a central role. It is worth recording that there are essentially three schools of thought on the Chief Rabbi's role in the Jewish Continuity field (and the related area of cross-communalism): the first is the deeply critical school led by Geoffrey Alderman with secondary support from Meir Persoff and Geoffrey Short and others. The Alderman School critique is consistent with his deep-seated antipathy towards the Office of the Chief Rabbi, based upon both his historical appraisal and personal animosity.[326] The Alderman stable is expanding: his student, Persoff (for whom he was the doctoral tutor), has published a deeply critical book on Sacks through the American Academic Press (where Alderman is a Board member).[327] It is to Alderman's credit that he writes on this subject in a challenging and interesting manner, often seeking to champion the cause, as he sees it, of the Jewishly disadvantaged in the community. However, in the interest of introducing wider perspectives, others need to contribute more to this area of study. Alderman's monopoly is, therefore, through no fault of his own; however, his hegemony in the field needs to be contested.[328] As the Sacks era draws to a close (in 2013) a more rounded debate is essential. The second and more sympathetic school recognises the enormous talents and contribution of Sacks and seeks to explain his difficulties in a more understanding manner, emphasising the challenges he faced as well as the tremendous contribution he has made under difficult circumstances. The third school takes a position somewhere in between: more favourably disposed to the Chief Rabbi and recognising his strengths but essentially alleging specific weaknesses such as a lack of courage in not taking on the Orthodox establishment and/or the non-Orthodox movements. It is more moderate and temperate than the critical Alderman School. Though beyond the scope of the current research, there is at least a wider context presented herein.

[326] For example, Alderman has accused those communal leaders behind the Office of the Chief Rabbi of "a breathtaking example of intellectual dishonesty and mischievousness, applied to the preservation of the myth." – the alleged myths that support the need for and validity of the Office of the Chief Rabbi (Alderman, 1995/6, p 41).

[327] More recently, towards the end of the current research process, Meir Persoff released a book on Chief Rabbi Sacks. (Persoff, 2010). The book presented an analysis of the difficulties faced by the Chief Rabbi, chapter by chapter, and was featured in the *Jewish Chronicle* under the headline: 'Should he be the last Chief Rabbi?' (Jewish Chronicle, 12th March 2010, p 25). The book was based on his Middlesex University doctorate but access to the doctoral thesis was limited to Middlesex University students.

[328] Alderman also has a regular weekly column in the Jewish Chronicle.

Sacks's retirement from his current post, and his release from the constraints it carries, promises to reveal more about his thinking and, in some areas, may allow him to have a greater influence and impact. It remains to be seen whether the Office of the Chief Rabbi will see the appointment of a successor able or willing to sustain the Chief Rabbinacy along the lines he and his predecessors have pursued and, in turn, whether there will be a subsequent diminution of the Office. If that happens, it is more likely to be a reflection on the decisions of the United Synagogue leadership rather than on the contribution of Chief Rabbi Sacks himself.

5.4 Leadership

The research findings revealed the challenges faced in the delivery of a dramatic vision. Many critics of the leaders involved accuse them of incompetence, naivety, narrow-minded inflexibility and raise personality issues. A major contribution of this research has been to provide a richer, deeper and more nuanced assessment of the thought, actions and beliefs of key players and present them in their historical context. All of the well-intentioned, Jewishly-committed leaders held a passionate devotion to their cause; yet they were often confronted by challenging and sometimes bruising encounters with practical realities. Readers may still be critical but they will at least have the benefit of an analysis that provided the context – and be better placed to assess leadership successes. Furthermore, the research, viewing through the prism of historical perspective, indicated that which was not fully grasped by the leading players at the time as they set out on their odyssey, discovering how challenging the translation of vision to reality so often becomes (and the unpredictability of developments and unintended consequences). Fundamentally, with regard to leadership, this history seeks to situate major trends and developments within the mechanics and machinations of Jewish communal life.

5.5 Further Research

Finally, this researcher would welcome future in-depth research on the measurement and evaluation of the impact of various educational initiatives, institutions and programmes on Jewish identification and involvement (as well as research updating developments in the field to the present day). This should include the macro central communal initiatives discussed in

this research, as well as the micro impact of Jewish schools, synagogue activities, youth programmes and a range of other community educational endeavours. As discussed above, the ‘disruptive technology’, ‘sustaining innovation’ and ‘strategic enabler’ conceptual models may provide an interesting starting point.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alderman (1994) 'British Jewry: Religious Community or Ethnic Minority?' in Webber, J. (ed) *Jewish Identities in the New Europe*, pp 189-192. London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilisation.

Alderman, G. (1995) 'Anglo-Jewry and its Present Discontents' in *The Jewish Quarterly,* Summer 1995 No 158 pp 21-25.

Alderman, G. (1995/6) 'The Chief Rabbinate – An Excursion into Myth-Making' in *Judaism Today,* No 3 Winter 1995/6.

Alderman, G. (1996) 'The Disunited Synagogue – Public Quarrels, Fragmentation and Disarray' in *Judaism Today,* No 4, Spring 1996.

Alderman, G. (1997/8) 'That Letter …… Rabbinical Politics and Jewish Management' in *Judaism Today,* No 8 Winter 1997/8.

Alderman, G. (1998) *Modern British Jewry.* (Revised paperback ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Alderman, G. (2007) 'Orthodox Judaism and Chief Rabbis in Britain' (review article) in *Jewish Journal of Sociology,* 2007 Vol 49 pt 1/2.

Alderman, G. (2008) *Controversy and Crisis: studies in the history of the Jews in modern Britain*. Brighton MA: Academic Studies Press.

Alderman, G. (2009) *The Communal Gadfly – Jews, British Jews and the Jewish State, Asking the Subversive Questions.* Brighton MA: Academic Studies Press.

Altholz, J.L. (1996) 'Lord Acton and the Plan of the Cambridge Modern History' *The Historical Journal*, Volume 39, 3: pp. 723-736.

Arksey, H. and Knight, P. (1999) *Interviewing for Social Scientists – an Introductory Resource with Examples*. London: Sage Publications.

A Time to Act – see under 'Mandel' and 'Commission on Jewish Education in North America'.

Bardach, E. (2000) *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis – the Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*. New York: Chatham House Publishers.

Bauer, Y. (1978) *The Holocaust in Historical Perspective*. London: Sheldon Press.

Beilin, Y. (2000) *His Brother's Keeper – Israel and Diaspora Jewry in the twenty-first Century.* New York: Shocken.

Bermant, C. (1990) *Lord Jakobovits – the Authorized Biography of the Chief Rabbi*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Bermant, C. (9th August 1991) in Jewish Chronicle, Will new Chief Rabbi fight on two fronts?' p 13.

Bermant, C. (2008) *On the Other Hand*. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Board of Deputies of British Jews (2007) *Accountability through Inspection: Monitoring and Evaluating Jewish Schools. London*. Board of Deputies of British Jews. (Pikuach Report)

Board of Deputies of British Jews (2009) *Connection, Continuity and Community – British Jewish Women Speak out.* London: Board of Deputies of British Jews.

Brichto, S. (1993) 'Liberal welcome for Sacks's 'inclusivism'' Jewish Chronicle, 7th May 1993, p 15.

British Sociological Association, (March, 2002) *Statement of Ethical Practice,* http://www.britsoc.co.uk/equality/Statement+Ethical+Practice.htm

Brook, S. (1989) *The Club – The Jews of Modern Britain.* London: Pan Books Ltd. (Update in Paperback Edition 1996 published by London: Constable.).

Bryman, A. (2008) (3rd Edition) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bunt, S. (1975) *Jewish Youth Work in Britain, Past, Present and Future*. London: Bedford Square Press of the National Council of Social Service.

Carr, E.H. (1961) *What is History?*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Chazan, B. (1978) 'Models of Ethnic Education: The Case of Jewish Education in Great Britain' in *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol XXVI No 1 February 1978 pp 54-72.

Chazan, B. (2003) 'The philosophy of informal Jewish education' in the encyclopedia of informal education www.infed.org/informaleducation/informal_jewish_education.htm.

Chazan, B. (2005) 'Toward a Critical Study of Jewish Education' in *Journal of Jewish Education*, Vol 74 No 1 pp 95-105.

Christians, C. (2000) 'Ethics and Politics in Qualitative Research' in Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2000) (2nd Edition), pp 133-155. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc..

Cohen, E. (2010) 'Jewish Identity Research: A State of the Art' in *International Journal of Jewish Education Research*, 2010 (1) pp 7-48.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) (5th Edition) *Research Methods in Education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Cohen, S. and Kotler-Berkowitz, L. (May 2004) *The Impact of Childhood: Jewish Education On Adults' Jewish Identity: Schooling, Israel Travel, Camping and Youth Groups*. United Jewish Communities, Report Series On The National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01. New York: United Jewish Communities.

Cohen, S. and Kahn-Harris, K. (2004) *Beyond Belonging.* London: United Jewish Israel Appeal.

Commission on Jewish Education in North America, A Report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America (November 1990) (Convened by the Mandel Associated Foundations, JCC Association, and JESNA in Collaboration with CJF) (1991) *A Time to Act*. Lanham: University Press of America.

'Continuity Connects' – see under Jewish Continuity Connects Newsletter and date.

Cooper, H. and Morrison, P. (1991) *A Sense of Belonging – Dilemmas of British Jewish Identity.* London: Wiedenfeld and Nicolson (in association with Channel Four).

Davis, M., ed. (1971) – see Jakobovits (1971).

DellaPergola, S. (2010) (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem). *World Jewish Population, 2010* Current Jewish Population Reports, 2010 No 2). Mandell L. Berman Institute – North American Jewish Data Bank.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2000) (2nd Edition) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Eaglestone, R. (2001) *Postmodernism and Holocaust Denial*. Cambridge: Icon Books.

Elazar, D. (n.d.) 'A Statement on Jewish Continuity.' Jerusalem: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs.

Elton, G. (1967) *The Practice of History*. London: Fontana Press.

Endelman, T. (2002) *The Jews of Britain, 1656-2000.* London: University of California Press.

Evans, R. (1997) 'The Future of History' in *Prospect*, Issue 23 (October 20th, 1997).

Finestein, I. (1999) 'A Community of Paradox: Office, Authority and Ideas in the Changing Governance of Anglo-Jewry', in Troen, S. (ed.) *Jewish Centers and Peripheries - European Jewry between America and Israel Fifty Years After World War II.* London: Transaction.

Finestein, I. (2002) *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry 1800-2000.* London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Finestein, I. (2008) *Studies and Profiles in Anglo-Jewish History from Picciotto to Bermant*. London: Vallantine Mitchell.

Fishman, I. and Levy, H. (1964) 'Jewish Education in Great Britain' in Gould, J. and Esh, S., Eds. *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Fogel, R. and Elton, G. (1983) *Which Road to the Past? – Two Views of History*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J. (1998) 'Interviewing – the Art of Science' in Denzin, N. and

Linclon, Y. (eds) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Material*, pp 47-78. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J. (2000) 'The Interview from Structured Questions to Negotiated Text' in Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds) (2000) (2nd Edition), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, pp 645-672. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc..

Fox, S. and Scheffler, I. (2000) 'Jewish Education and Jewish Continuity: Prospects and Limitations.' Monographs from the Mandel Institute. Jerusalem: Mandel Institute.

Fox, S. Scheffler, I, and Marom, D. (Eds) (2003) *Visions of Jewish Education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Freedman, H. (Autumn 1996) 'The Philosophy of Jewish Continuity – What does Jewish continuity really mean?' in *Judaism Today*, No 5 Autumn 1996, pp 23-26.

Freud-Kandel, M (2006) *Orthodox Judaism in Britain Since 1913 – An Ideology Forsaken*. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Gardner, M. (2011) 'CST and the History of Jewish Self-defence' in Levy, E. and Taylor, D. (Eds) *The Jewish Year Book 2011* (5771-5772) pp xxv-xxx. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Geyl, P. (1949) *Napoleon: For and Against*. London: Cape.

Gillham, B. (2000) *The Research Interview*. London: Continuum.

Goodkin, J. and Citron, J. (1994) *Women in the Jewish Community – Review and Recommendations*. London: Office of the Chief Rabbi. (Also known as the Preston Report (1994)).

Green, A. and Troup, K. (eds) (1999) *The houses of history – A critical reader in twentieth-century history and theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Graham, D. (Spring 2003) 'So how many Jews are there in the UK? The 2001 UK Census and the size of the Jewish population.' *Jpr/news* Spring 2003. London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research

Graham, D. and Boyd, J. (July 2010) *Committed, Concerned and Conciliatory: the Attitudes of Jews in Britain Towards Israel*. JPR Report July 2010. London: Institute of Jewish Policy Research.

Graham, D. and Vulkan, D. (February 2007) *Community Statistics 2005*. London: Board of Deputies of British Jews (Report of the Community Research Unit) [Also available at: www.boardofdeputies.org.uk]

Graham, D. and Vulkan, D. (November 2008) *Britain's Jewish Community Statistics 2007*. London: Board of Deputies of British Jews (Report of the Community Research Unit) [Also available at: www.boardofdeputies.org.uk]

Graham, D. and Vulkan, D. (May 2010) *Synagogue Membership in the United Kingdom in 2010*. London: Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Institute of Jewish Policy Research.

Gutmann, J. (2006) *Taking Minutes of Meetings*. London: Kogan Page.

Harris, A. (April 1995) 'Still waiting for the earth to move', Jewish Chronicle, 28th April 1995, p 30.

Hart, M. (2007) 'The Unbearable Lightness of Britain' in *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* Vol 6, Issue 2 July 2007 pp 145-165.

Hart, R. 'Jewish Demography and Jewish Education in the UK: The continuity crisis and Jewish renewal efforts.' (n.d. 2006 est. – article largely on schools).

Hart, R. and Kafka, E. (2006) *Trends in British Synagogue Membership 1990-2005/6.* London: Board of Deputies of British Jews.

Hart, R., Schmool, M. and Cohen, F. (2007) 'Jewish Day Schools in Britain 1992/3 to 2003/4' in *Contemporary Jewry*, 2007 pp 137-155.

Hodder, I. (2000) 'The Integration of Documents and Material Culture' in Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2000) (2nd Edition), pp 703-715. Thousand Oaks: Sage publications, Inc..

Holman, C. & Holman, N. (2002) *Torah, worship and acts of loving kindness: Baseline indicators for the Charedi community in Stamford Hill.* Leicester: De Montfort University

Hunter, A. (1995) 'Local Knowledge and Local Power – Notes on the Ethnography of local Community Elites' in Hertz, R and Imber, J (eds) *Studying Elites Using Qualitative Methods*, pp 151-170. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications..

Institute of Education (n.d. possibly 1995) *RESQUJE – Professional Growth for Quality Education in the Community*. London: Institute for Education.

Institute for Jewish Policy Research (No 1, February, 1996) *Social and Political Attitudes of British Jews: Some Key Findings of the JPR Survey.* London: Institute of Jewish Policy Research.

Institute for Jewish Policy Research (March 2000) *A Community of Communities: Report of the Commission on Representation of the Interests of the British Jewish Community.* London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Institute for Jewish Policy Research (December 2003) *Long-term Planning for British Jewry: Final report and Recommendations.* Institute for Jewish Policy Research, Planning for Jewish Communities, No 5, 2003.

Jacobs, B. (2005) 'What's Wrong with the History of Jewish Education?' in *Journal of Jewish Education* (2005) Vol 71 No 1.

Jakobovits, I. (1971) *Let my people know – Proposals for the Development of Jewish Education* (Booklet). London: Office of the Chief Rabbi.

Jakobovits, I. (1991) *Address Delivered at the Installation of Rabbi Dr Jonathan Sacks* (Media Pack Rabbi Dr Jonathan Sacks Installation, Sunday 1st September 1991). London: Office of the Chief Rabbi.

Jenkins, K. (1991) (2009 edition), *Re-thinking History*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, K. (1995) *On 'What is History?' From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, K. (1997) *The Postmodern History Reader*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, K. (1999) ''After' History' in Jenkins, K. *Re-Thinking History* 3:1 1999 pp 7-20. London: Routledge.

Jewish Agency for Israel-UJIA Agreement, 7th August 1998.

Jewish Chronicle, Editorial, 5th November 1971, in Freud-Kandel (2006) p 172 – see under Freud-Kandel (2006).

Jewish Chronicle, 19th April 1991, covering Orthodox fallout over Reform Rabbi Bayfield's involvement with the JEDT's think tank that led to the Worms Report (JEDT, 1992).

Jewish Chronicle, 9th August 1991, p 13, Chaim Bermant, 'Will new Chief Rabbi fight on two fronts?'

Jewish Chronicle, 1st May 1992, pp 15-17: Rocker, S. and Kossoff, J., 'Special report: the funding debate'/'Charities and fund-raising priorities'; p 15 'Recession forces new look at domestic and Israeli priorities'.

Jewish Chronicle, 4th September 1992, on the release of the Worms Report: p 1 'Chief Backs Moves to Safeguard Education'; p 12 Rocker, S., 'Report's lessons for future learning'; p 18 Editorial: 'Now, the Hard Part …'.

Jewish Chronicle, 11th September 1992, p 18, Editorial, 'Renewal, year one'.

Jewish Chronicle, June 1993, 'Sinclair's long road to Continuity' (Simon Rocker).

Jewish Chronicle, 17th December 1993, 'Today, We'll Lose Another Ten Jews' (Jewish Continuity Advertisement).

Jewish Chronicle, 17th December 1993, report on Jewish Continuity.

Jewish Chronicle, 21st January 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'For Decades We've Supported Every Jewish Cause Except One: Our Future'.

Jewish Chronicle, 25th February 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'To Work On Our Strategy, We Called in Some Experts'.

Jewish Chronicle, 25th March 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'You Didn't Stop Thinking When You Were 13, So Why Did You Stop learning?'.

Jewish Chronicle, 22nd April 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'At Synagogue, Just Who is it Who Gets Worshipped?'.

Jewish Chronicle, 20th May 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'As some Suspected, We're Giving Money to People Who are Intent on Manipulation'.

Jewish Chronicle, 24th June 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'Naturally, This Jewish History Course Includes a Study of Marxism'.

Jewish Chronicle, 15th July 1994, p 1, article quoted Trevor Chinn.

Jewish Chronicle, 15th July 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, For Many Jewish Teenagers, the Summer's a Chance to Visit the Sources that Shape their Lives'.

Jewish Chronicle, 2nd September 1994, pp16-17, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'Looking Forward to Shul This Rosh Hashanah?'.

Jewish Chronicle, 7th October 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'Our Adult Education programme'.

Jewish Chronicle, 11th November 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'Have the Kids Programmed'.

Jewish Chronicle, 16th December 1994, p 24, Michael Sinclair, 'Nothing less than the Jewish Future'.

Jewish Chronicle, December 1994, Simon Rocker, 'Multi-million strategy to reach teens to 35s' (Community Chronicle page).

Jewish Chronicle, December 1994, Jewish Continuity Advertisement, 'We're Using a Sophisticated Strategic Tool'.

Jewish Chronicle, 20th January, 1995, Sacks attack on Masorti Judaism and responses.

Jewish Chronicle, 28th April 1995, pp 28-29, Simon Rocker, 'To be continued?'.

Jewish Chronicle, 26th January 1996, for Sir Stanley Kalms's call for Sacks's resignation.

Jewish Chronicle, 21st June 1996, pp 8-9, Jenni Frazer, 'Marriage of ideals'.

Jewish Chronicle, 15th November 1996, p 2, Jenni Frazer, 'New approach, new style and a new cast as merger takes shape'.

Jewish Chronicle, 14th March 1997, coverage of Chief Rabbi Sacks's leaked letter concerning Rabbi Hugo Gryn.

Jewish Chronicle, 3rd October 1997, Simon Rocker, 'UJIA seeks to balance old causes in

Israel with new anxieties at home'.

Jewish Chronicle, 31st October 1997, Editorial on the UJIA.

Jewish Chronicle, 15th January 1999, p 25, Letters, Rabbi Naftali Schiff.

Jewish Chronicle, 24th September 1999, Editorial.

Jewish Chronicle, 10th November 2000, Editorial, 'Now, the good news'.

Jewish Chronicle, 19th December 2003, p 20, Stanley Kalms, 'Time for the Chief Rabbi to step down?'.

Jewish Chronicle, 27th April 2007, 'Power 100'.

Jewish Chronicle, 25th June 2010, p 34, Letters (Dr Michael Sinclair).

Jewish Chronicle, 12th September 2008, 'Stanmore Accords'.

Jewish Chronicle, 28th July 2010, Simon Round, Interview: Keith Kahn-Harris and Ben Gidley.

Jewish Chronicle, 18th and 25th November 2010, coverage of Mick Davis (UJIA Chair) criticising the Israeli government.

Jewish Chronicle, 21st April 2011, Alderman's attack on the CST.

Jewish Continuity – see also under 'Lawton'.

Jewish Continuity (24th December 1992) 'The Council for Jewish Continuity – The New Central Body For Jewish Education (Draft Timetable To Launch) (Strictly Confidential).

Jewish Continuity (December 1992) 'Jewish Continuity: Creating A Learning Community'.

Jewish Continuity (3rd February 1993) 'Presentation Paper Prepared For Mandel Institute Consultation' (incorporated a paper: Kestenbaum, J. (21st January 1993) 'Anglo-Jewish Education – the Nature of the Problem.').

Jewish Continuity (3rd February 1993) 'Jewish Continuity: Religious Principles – A Discussion Document'.

Jewish Continuity (Michael Mail) (16th February 1993) 'Jewish Continuity – Update On Progress' (Confidential).

Jewish Continuity Lay Leaders Informal Meeting, 17th February, 1993, 'Draft Chairman's Notes' 11th February 1993.

Jewish Continuity Lay Leaders Informal Meeting Minutes, 17th February 1993.

Jewish Continuity Sounding Board Meeting Minutes, 17th March 1993.

Jewish Continuity Sounding Board 'Jewish Continuity – Targets and Tasks' (26th March 1993).

Jewish Continuity (29th March 1993) Internal Briefing Note.

Jewish Continuity (May 1993 and June 1993) 'Jewish Continuity – Building the Jewish Future' (Strictly Confidential).

Jewish Continuity (21st May 1993) 'Jewish Continuity: Briefing Meeting for Lay Leaders and Professionals'.

Jewish Continuity (n.d.) Common Objectives And Standard Answers (Found discarded in UJIA offices).

Jewish Continuity Steering Committee (formerly the Sounding Board) Meeting, Minutes 8th June 1993.

Jewish Continuity (16th July 1993) 'Certificate of incorporation of a private limited company JEWISH CONTINUITY.'

Jewish Continuity (Summer 1993) 'Jewish Continuity: Mission Aims and Tasks'.

Jewish Continuity (August 1993) 'Task Forces'.

Jewish Continuity Executive Board (formerly the Steering Committee) Meeting, Minutes 27th September 1993.

Jewish Continuity Executive Board Meeting, Minutes 7th November 1993.

Jewish Continuity (7th December 1993) 'Jewish Continuity: Application Guidelines For Funding Requests - Criteria'.

Jewish Continuity, First Leaflet (n.d. thought to be December 1993) 'Today We'll Lose Another Ten Jews.'

Jewish Continuity Executive Board Meeting, Minutes 7th January 1994.

Jewish Continuity Executive Meeting, Minutes 23rd February 1994.

Jewish Continuity-JIA Press Release (8th July 1994) – embargoed to 15th July 1994.

Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 8th March 1994.

Jewish Continuity (April 1994) 'Jewish Continuity – First Project Awards'.

Jewish Continuity Executive Meeting, Minutes 11th May 1994.

Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 24th May 1994.

Jewish Continuity Executive Meeting, Minutes 23rd June 1994.

Jewish Continuity (29th June 1994) 'What is Jewish Continuity?'.

Jewish Continuity Chief Executive Briefing Note 30th June 1994.

Jewish Continuity Board Meeting, Minutes 4th September 1994.

Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 12th September 1994.

Jewish Continuity Board Meeting, Minutes 21st November 1994.

Jewish Continuity (22nd December 1994) 'Supporters' Update'.

Jewish Continuity (22nd December 1994) 'Jewish Continuity Strategic Direction 5 Year Goals And 1995 Programme'.

Jewish Continuity Executive Meeting, Chair's Notes, 23rd February, 1995.

Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 27th March 1995.

Jewish Continuity (Early 1995) 'Supporters' Update'.

Jewish Continuity Executive Meeting, Minutes 18th May 1995.

Jewish Continuity Annual General Meeting, Minutes 19th June 1995.

Jewish Continuity, (September 1995 (first edition)), 'Continuity Connects News Update'.

Jewish Continuity 'Mandel Institute Consultation,' 1 and 2 October 1995.

Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 2nd October 1995.

Jewish Continuity Executive Meeting, Minutes 30th November 1995.

Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 22nd January 1996.

Jewish Continuity Connects Newsletter (February 1996).

Jewish Continuity (March 1996), 'Change in Continuity'. (Also known as The Wagner Review).

Jewish Continuity (1996) *Change in Continuity – Report of the Review into Jewish Continuity.* (Also known as 'The Wagner Review').

Jewish Continuity Connects Newsletter (May 1996).

Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 13th June 1996.

Jewish Continuity Executive and Trustees Joint Meeting, Minutes 13th June 1996.

Jewish Continuity Executive Meeting, 16th June 1996.

Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 16th September 1996.

Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 7th November 1996.

Jewish Continuity Connects Newsletter (December 1996).

Jewish Educational Development Trust (1978) *Report on the Findings of the Committee on Teacher-Training and Career Structure*. London: JEDT.

Jewish Educational Development Trust (1981) *Jewish Education 1981/82* (Editor: Derek Taylor). Aylesbury: Hazell Watson and Viney Ltd (for JEDT).

Jewish Educational Development Trust (n.d.) *This is the JEDT* (Leaflet). London: JEDT.

Jewish Educational Development Trust (no authorship is stated but it is probably Mail, M. and Weinberg, S.) 'Securing Our Future – JEDT Think Tank Report Follow-Up', 5th October 1992a.

Jewish Educational Development Trust (Mail, M. and Weinberg, S.), 'Establishing the "National Council for Jewish Education [NCJE]"' 5th October 1992b.

Jewish Educational Development Trust (n.d. but released 1992) *Securing Our Future – an inquiry into Jewish Education in the United Kingdom*. London: JEDT. (also known as *The Worms Report* (1992)).

Jewish Educational Development Trust Trustees Meeting, Minutes 29th March 1993.

Jewish Educational Development Trust Trustees Meeting, Minutes 6th December 1993.

Jewish Leadership Council (2007) *The Commission on Jewish Schools: The Future of Jewish Schools – Consultation Document*. London: Jewish Leadership Council.

Jewish Leadership Council (2008) *The Future of Jewish Schools*. The Commission on Jewish Schools. London: Jewish Leadership Council.

The Jewish News, 25th May 2007, Michael Sinclair, 'The JC's agenda blinds it to the reality of our community', p 12.

Jewish Tribune, 12th January 1995, p 5, (Sacks on Masorti)

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 9th March 1993.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 13th May 1993.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 14th December 1993.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 9th February, 1994.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 13th February 1994.

JIA Executive Board Meeting, Minutes 23rd February 1994.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 21st April 1994.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 2nd June 1994.

JIA Reporter, September 1994.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 5th October 1994.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 8th December 1994.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 9th February 1995.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 12th April 1995.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 5th July 1995.

JIA Trustees Meeting, Minutes 5th October 1995.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 16th November 1995.

JIA Board Meeting, Minutes 17th April 1996.

JIA Trustees Meeting, Minutes 12th June 1996.

Joint Israel Appeal-Jewish Continuity (5th October 1994) 'Memorandum of Understanding Between The Joint Israel Appeal and Jewish Continuity'.

JIA-Jewish Continuity Merger Implementation Group Meetings, Minutes 8th July 1996.

JIA-Jewish Continuity Merger Implementation Group Meetings, Minutes 15th July 1996.

JIA (20-21 January 1997), 'JIA Vision Setting' (Documents).

JIA (June 1997), 'JIA Vision for Our Future' (for JIA Board meeting, 9th June 1997).

Jones, C. (1991) 'Qualitative Interviewing' in Allan, G. Skinner, C (eds) (1991) *Handbook for Research Students in the Social Sciences* (Chapter 17: pp 203-214). London: The Falmer Press.

Journal of Jewish Education, 'A Special issue Dedicated to the Memory of Professor Seymour Fox', 2008 Vol 74 Supplement 1.

JPR – see under 'Institute of Jewish Policy Research'.

Kahn-Harris, K. and Gidley, B. (2010) *Turbulent Times – The British Jewish Community Today*. London: Continuum.

Kalman, M. – see under 'New Moon'.

Kalms, S. (September 1992) *United Synagogue Review – A Time for Change. A Report on the Role of the United Synagogue in the Years Ahead*. London: published and funded by the Stanley Kalms Foundation. (Also known as the Kalms Report (1992)).

Kershen, A. and Romain, J. (1995) *Tradition and Change – A History of Reform Judaism in Britain*. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Kochan, M. and L. (1996) 'Great Britain' in *American Jewish Year Book*, 1996.

Kosmin, B., Goldstein, S., Waksberg, J., Lerer, N., Keysar, A. and Scheckner, J. (1991) *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations.

Kosmin, B., Lerman, A. and Goldberg, J. (1998) 'The Attachment of European Jews to Israel: The British Experience' in *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Vol. 74, part 2-3, pp. 108-111.

Kvale, S. (1996) *Interviews – an Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Lawton, C. 'Joseph, the Jews and Us' ('Supporters' Update', 22nd December 1994).

Lawton, C. (22nd November 1995), 'Reflections on Jewish Continuity's future directions' (Confidential).

Lawton, C. (1995) 'Great Britain Tackles "Jewish Continuity"' in *Avar ve'Atid – a Journal of Jewish Education, Culture and Discourse*, Vol 2 No 2 (Issue 4) December, 1995 pp 18-23

Lerman, A. (2003) 'A Framework for Considering European Jewry's Challenges' in *Journal of Jewish Communal Service,* Vol 79 Parts 2/3 pp 131-135

Leviton, M. (2007) *The Added Dimension – Jewish Primary Schools and Their Effect on Family Life*. York: York Publishing Services.

Levy, M. (2008) *A Question of Honour*. London: Simon and Schuster.

Lipman, V. (1990) *A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858*. Leicester: Leicester University Press (Printer Publishers Ltd).

Lipstadt, D. E. (1993) *Denying the Holocaust – the Growing Assault on Truth and Memory.* London: Penguin.

London Jewish News, 14th March 1997, on Chief Rabbi Sacks's leaked letter concerning Rabbi Hugo Gryn.

London Jewish News, 26th September 1997, 'Charity's new look'.

Mandel: Convened by the Mandel Associated Foundations, JCC Association, and JESNA in Collaboration with CJF, (November, 1990). *A Time to Act - The Report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Mandel Institute Consultation (with Jewish Continuity), Notes, 1st-2nd October, 1995.

Marwick, A. (1981) (2nd Edition) *The Nature of History*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Marwick, A. (1993) '"A Fetishism of Documents? The Salience of Source-based History' in Kozicki, H. (ed) *Developments in Modern Historiography,* pp 107-138. London: The Open University Macmillan Press Ltd.

McCulloch, G. and Richardson, W. (2000) *Historical Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Mendelsson, D. (2003) PhD *Between Integration and Separation: A History of Anglo-Jewish Education 1944-88*. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Mendelsson, D. (2009) 'Embracing Jewish Day School Education in England, 1965-1975' in *History of Education* Vol 38, No 4, July 2009, pp 545-563.

Miller, H. (2001) 'Meeting the Challenge: the Jewish schooling phenomenon in the UK' in *Oxford Review of Education* Vol. 27, No. 4, 2001.

Miller, H. (2007) See: Board of Deputies of British Jews (2007) (for Pikuach Report).

Miller, S. (1988) 'The Impact of Jewish Education on the Religious Behaviour and Attitudes of British Secondary School Pupils' in *Studies in Jewish Education* Volume 3, pp 150-165

Miller, S. (1990) 'Responses to Anglo-Jewish Demography' in *L'Eylah* September 1990.

Miller, S. (1994) 'Religious Practice and Jewish Identity in a Sample of London Jews' in Webber, J. (Ed) *Jewish Identities in the New Europe*. London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

Miller, S. (1998) 'The Structure and Determinants of Jewish Identity in the United Kingdom' in Krausz, E. and Tulea, G. (1998) *Jewish Survival – the Identity Problem at the Close of the Twentieth Century.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Miller, S. (2002) 'Changing Patterns of Jewish Identity among British Jews' in Gitelman, Z., Kosmin, B. and Kovacs, A. (Eds) (2002) *New Jewish identities: Contemporary Europe and Beyond*. Budapest: Central European University Press. (Published 2003).

Miller, S., Schmool, M. and Lerman, T. (February, 1996) *A Social and Political Attitudes of British Jews: Some Key Findings of the JPR Survey.* JPR/Report No.1. London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Miller, S.V. (1998) *Talkback Survey*. London.

Morris, N. (1947-48 approx.) *Jewish Education in the Time of Total War*. London: Central Council for Jewish Education in the United Kingdom and Eire.

Murray, L. and Lawrence, B. (2000) *Practitioner Based Enquiry – Principles for Postgraduate Research.* London and New York: Falmer Press.

New Moon, July 1991, pp 12-15, Dina Rabinovitch, 'Immanuel Can'.

New Moon, September 1992 p 30 and p 32, Jack Shamash, 'Pennies from heaven',

New Moon, October 1992, p 28, Linda Grant, 'In Search of Good Sacks'.

New Moon, July 1993, p 19, Saul Bitensky, 'Jonny in the Beach Bag?'.

New Moon, December 1993, pp 18-19, 'The Future of Anglo-Jewry 1, The Money'. (Ronson interview.)

New Moon, July 1994, pp 42-46, Matthew Kalman, 'Friday Night Clive'.

New Moon, August 1995, pp 24-27, Matthew Kalman, 'Can Sacks Survive? Religion, Revolution and the Red Brick Rabbi.'

Norris, C. (2000) 'Post-modernism: a guide to the perplexed' in Browning, G. Halcli, A. Webster, F. (Eds) *Understanding Contemporary Society – Theories of the Present*. London: Sage Publications.

Office of the Chief Rabbi (1971) – see Jakobovits (1971).

Office of the Chief Rabbi (Kestenbaum, J.) 'The Chief Rabbinate and Education – An Enabling Unit for Anglo-Jewish Education' October 1992 (typed up 3rd November 1992).

Office of the Chief Rabbi (1994) – Women in the Jewish Community: see Goodkin and Citron; Schmool and Miller S.

Office of the Chief Rabbi (1991-2000) – see also under 'Sacks'.

Oliver, P. (2008) *Writing Your Thesis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Oppenheim, A.N. (1992) *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement* (New Edition). London: Continuum.

Persoff, M. (2002) *Immanuel Jakobovits: A Prophet of Israel*. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Persoff, M. (2008) *Faith Against Reason – Religious Reform and the British Chief Rabbinate, 1840-1990.* London: Vallantine Mitchell.

Persoff, M. (2010) *Another Way, Another Time – Religious Inclusivism and the Sacks Chief Rabbinate.* Brighton MA: Academic Press.

Platt, J. (1981) 'On interviewing one's peers' in *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol 32, Number 1 (March 1981): pp 75-91.

Pomson, A. (2008) 'Building the Field of Jewish Educational Research' in *Journal of Jewish Education*, Vol 74, No 3, pp 241-244.

Posen, F. (October 1994), *Jewish Chronicle*, 14th October, 1994, p 28.

Posen, F. (Autumn 1996) 'Judaism is Jewish Civilisation – Examining routes of secular return' in *Judaism Today*, No 5 Autumn 1996, pp 33-35.

Posen, F. (1997) 'Another Chance for Jewish Continuity? Guidelines for the Future' in *Judaism Today*, No 7 Spring 1997, pp 29-30.

Preston Review (1994) – Women in the Jewish Community: see Goodkin and Citron; Schmool and Miller S.

Putnam, R.D. (2000) *Bowling Alone – the Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks.

Rawidowicz, S. (1986) (Ravid, Benjamin C. I., Ed.) *State of Israel, Diaspora, and Jewish Continuity.* Hanover NH: Brandeis University Press/University Press of New England.

Report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America (The) – see under 'Mandel'.

RESQUJE – Professional Growth for Quality Education in the Community (n.d., probably 1995).

Rigal, L. and Rosenberg, R. (2004) *Liberal Judaism – the first Hundred Years.* London: Liberal Judaism.

Rocker, S. (2010) 'Do our schools make us better Jews?' Jewish Chronicle, 23rd April 2010, p 26.

Ronson, G. (2009) *Leading From the Front – My Story*. Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing Company (Edinburgh) Ltd.

Rosman, M. (2007) *How Jewish Is Jewish History?*. Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (2005) (2nd Edition) *Qualitative Interviewing – The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc..

Rubinstein, W.D. (1999) 'Review of Alderman. G.' (1998) in *Journal of Jewish Studies* Vol. 50 Issue 2 Autumn 1999, p 348.

Sacks, J. (1988) 'Jewish Education: Some Recent Research' *L'Eylah*, April 1988, pp 32-35.

Sacks, J. (1991) *Arguments for the Sake of Heaven – Emerging Trends in Traditional Judaism.* London: Jason Aronson Inc..

Sacks, J. (September 1st 1991) *A Decade of Jewish Renewal* (Installation Address, pamphlet). London: Office of the Chief Rabbi.

Sacks, J. (1993) *One People? Tradition, Modernity, and Jewish Unity*. London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

Sacks, J. (June 1993) *From Integration to Survival to Continuity – the Third Era in Modern Jewish History.* (Pamphlet: Studies in Renewal 1). London: Office of the Chief Rabbi.

Sacks, J. (July 1993) *The Crisis of Continuity – the Third Era in Modern Jewish History.* (Pamphlet: Studies in Renewal 2). London: Office of the Chief Rabbi.

Sacks, J. (August 1993) *The Secret of Jewish Continuity.* (Pamphlet: Studies in Renewal 3). London: Office of the Chief Rabbi.

Sacks, J. (September 1993) *Rethinking Priorities.* (Pamphlet: Studies in Renewal 4). London: Office of the Chief Rabbi.

Sacks, J. (October 1993) *From Jewish Continuity to **Jewish Continuity**.* (Pamphlet: Studies in Renewal 5). London: Office of the Chief Rabbi.

Sacks, J. (1994) *Will We Have Jewish Grandchildren? Jewish Continuity and How to Achieve it.* Newbury Park: Vallentine Mitchell.

Sacks, J. (Sacks's Attack on Masorti Judaism), Jewish Tribune, 12th January 1995.

Sacks, J. (March 1996) 'Why is this people different?', *Jewish Chronicle*, 29th March 1996, p 30.

Sacks, J. (2000) *Radical Then, Radical Now – On Being Jewish.* (Reprinted 2007). London: Continuum.

Sacks, J. (2002) *The Dignity of Difference: How to Avoid the Clash of Civilisations*. London: Continuum.

Sacks, J. (2006) *To Heal a Fractured World – the Ethics of Responsibility*. London: Continuum.

Sacks, J. (2009) *Future Tense: A Vision for Jews and Judaism in the Global Culture*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Sarna, J. (1994) 'The Secret of Jewish Continuity' in *Commentary*, 98:4 (October 1994), pp. 55-58.

Schmool, M. (September 1986) *Towards a Community Programme*. London: Board of Deputies of British Jews, Statistical and Demographic Research Unit)

Schmool, M. (1998 approx) *British Jewish Women: Issues of Identity and Community.*

Schmool, M. (1999) 'British Jewry: Prospects and Problems' in Troen, S. (ed) *Jewish Centers and Peripheries – Europe Between America and Israel Fifty Years After World War II*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Schmool, M. (2002/3) 'Population and Education in the British Jewish Community' in *Sociological Papers* 2002/3 Vol 9/10 pp 1-26.

Schmool, M. and Cohen, F (1998) *A Profile of British Jewry – Patterns and Trends at the Turn of a Century.* London: Board of Deputies of British Jews

Schmool, M. and Cohen, F. (2001) *Jewish Education at the Crossroads*. London: Board of Deputies of British Jews.

Schmool, M., Hart, R. and Cohen, F. (2003) *The Relaxation of Community?* London: Board of Deputies of British Jews.

Schmool, M. and Miller, S. (1994) *Women in the Jewish Community – Survey Report*. London: Office of the Chief Rabbi.

Schlesinger, E. (2003) *Creating community and accumulating social capital: Jews associating with other Jews in Manchester*. (JPR Report No 2 2003). London: Institute for Jewish Policy Research.

Scott, D. and Usher, R. (1999) *Researching Education*. London: Continuum.

Shalom, (Fortnight ending 3 April 1996, p 18), Michael Sinclair, 'Changing for Continuity'.

Sheskin, I. (June 2009) 'Local Jewish Community Studies as Planning Tools for the American Jewish Community' in *Jewish Political Studies Review* 21:1-2 (Spring 2009).

Short, G. (2005) 'The role of education in Jewish continuity: a response to Jonathan Sacks' in *British Journal of Religious Education* Vol 27, No 3, September 2005, pp 253-264.

Sinclair, M. (1994) 'Nothing less than the Jewish future' Jewish Chronicle, 16th December 1994, p 24.

Sinclair, M. (1996) 'Changing for Continuity' Shalom, 3rd April 1996, p 18.

Sinclair, M. (Autumn 1996) 'Making Judaism Essential – A Reply to Harry Freedman' in *Judaism Today*, No 5 Autumn 1996, pp 25-28.

Spradley, J. (1979) *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stewart, D. (1984) *Secondary Research – Information Sources and Methods*. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications.

Stone, D. (2006) *History, Memory and Mass Atrocity – Essays on the Holocaust and Genocide*. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Taylor, D. (2007) *British Chief Rabbis 1664-2006*. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Telushkin, J. (1991) *Jewish Literacy*. New York: William Morrow and Company Inc.

Tosh, J. (1991) *The Pursuit of History*. London: Longman.

Tosh, J. (2008) *Why History Matters*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

UJIA Strategic Planning Group (Professional) Meeting, Notes 19th, 20th and 27th February and 14th and 17th April 1997.

UJIA Professional Advisory Group Meeting, Minutes 23rd June 1997.

UJIA Planning Document (June 1997) 'JIA Vision for Our Future'.

UJIA Planning Document (PowerPoint) (July 1997) 'The New Organisation – Vision for Our Future'.

UJIA Strategic Planning Group (Lay) Note 1st July 1997.

UJIA (n.d.) 'The Role of UJIA in Jewish Renewal'.

UJIA Professional Advisory Group Meeting, Minutes 8th September 1997.

UJIA Programme Book (Draft), 21st September 1997.

UJIA (8th October 1997) 'Draft Budget 1998'.

UJIA (1998) '"Every Student Matters" – A review into the British Jewish community's provision for Jewish students' (December 1998). London: UJIA Strategic Planning Unit.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Renewal Communications document, 25th November 1997.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 25th November 1997.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 11th February 1998.

UJIA update document, 27th July 1998.

UJIA-Jewish Agency for Israel Agreement, 7th August 1998.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 15th September 1998.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 8th November 1998.

UJIA Strategic Planning Group (Lay) Meeting, Minutes 24th November 1998.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 11th February 1999.

UJIA Executive Retreat Notes 6th May 1999.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 16th May 1999.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 14th September 1999.

UJIA (Autumn 1999) Presentation to the Jewish Chronicle (PowerPoint).

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 21st November 1999.

UJIA (November 1999) 'UJIA Jewish Renewal – 2000 Programme'.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 13th March 2000.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 14th June 2000.

UJIA Staff Planning Meeting, Notes 15th June 2000.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 12th September 2000.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive Meeting, Minutes 12th November 2000.

UJIA (2001) 'The Next Horizon – the Jewish Renewal three year plan'.

UJIA Jewish Renewal Meeting, Minutes 26th March 2001.

United Synagogue Review (1992) – see Kalms Report (1992).

Valins, O., Kosmin, B. and Goldberg, J. (2001) *The Future of Jewish Schooling in the United Kingdom. A strategic assessment of a faith-based provision of primary and secondary school education.* London: Profile Books Ltd. (Institute for Jewish Policy Research)

Vital, D. (1990) *The Future of the Jews – A People at the Crossroads?* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Vulkan, D. and Graham, D. (June 2008) *Population Trends Among Britain's Strictly Orthodox Jews.* London: Board of Deputies of British Jews (Report of the Community Policy Research Group) [Also available at: www.boardofdeputies.org.uk]

Wagner Report – see Jewish Continuity (1996).

Wagner, L. (1996) *The Wagner Review* – see Jewish Continuity (March 1996).

Wagner, L. (15th February, 2011) 'On the Challenges Facing British Jewry'. Institute for Global Jewish Affairs – Global Antisemitism, Anti-Israelism, Jewish Studies, No 65, 15th February 2011.

Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education.* London: UCL Press.

Walford, G. (2001) *Doing Educational Research – A Personal Guide to the Research Process*. London and New York: Continuum.

Warren, J. (1998) *The Past and its Presenters*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Wasserstein, B. (1996) *Vanishing Diaspora.* London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd (Penguin Group).

Webber, J. (ed.) (1994) *Jewish Identities in the New Europe*. London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilisation.

Webber, A. (2001) 'A Perspective on Jewish Education' in Massell, S. *The Jewish Year Book* (2001). London: Valentine Mitchell.

Weidenfeld, G. (1995) *Remembering My Good Friends – An Autobiography*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.

Wellington, J. (2000) *Educational Research – Contemporary Issues and Practical Approaches*. London: Continuum.

Wertheimer, J. (2001, August) *Talking Dollars and Sense About Jewish Education*. New York: Avi Chai Foundation.

Wertheimer, J. (2005, December) *Linking the Silos: How to Accelerate the Momentum in Jewish Education Today.* New York: Avi Chai Foundation.

White, H. (1973) *Metahistory – the Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

White, H. (1999) *Figural Realism – Studies in the Mimesis Effect*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Winston, L. (2009) A case study of leadership development in action: the UJIA Ashdown Fellowship 2000-2007 in *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 23 Iss 5, pp 404-412.

Woocher, J. (1994) 'Towards A 'Unified Field Theory' of Jewish Continuity' in Aron, I et al *A Congregation of Learners: Transforming the Synagogue into a Learning Community*. New York: UAHC Press, pp 14-55.

Woocher, J. (1999) 'Jewish Leadership And The Jewish Renaissance: New Challenges for Leadership Development' in *Journal of Jewish Communal Service,* Vol. 75, Part 2-3, pp.131-135.

Woocher, J. (2001) 'A Jewish Education Strategy for the 21st Century' in *Torah at the Center*, Vol 5 No 1 Fall 2001, pp 26-35. Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Department of Jewish Education.

Worms, F. (1992) *The Worms Report* – see Jewish Educational Development Trust (1992).

Worms, F. (1992) 'Education: the Orphan of the Community', *L'Eylah – A Journal of Judaism Today*, September 1992 pp 31-32.

Worms, F. (1992) 'Are Jewish Schools a Waste of time?', *L'Eylah – A Journal of Judaism Today*, September 1996 pp 17-19.

Worms Report – see Jewish Educational Development Trust (1992)

Worms, F. (Autumn 1996) 'Jewish Continuity: The Road to Confusion – An extract from a forthcoming autobiography' in *Judaism Today*, No 5 Autumn 1996.

Worms, F. (1996) *A Life in Three Cities: Frankfurt, London and Jerusalem*. London: Peter Halban.

Worms, F. (December 1996) *'Anglo-Jewry and Israel – Do We Need the Diaspora for Jewish Survival?'* Limmud Lecture, December 1996.

Yerushalmi, Y. (1982) *Zakhor: Jewish History and Memory.* New York: Shocken Books.

Yin, R. (1994) (2nd Edition), *Case Study Research – Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

7 APENDICES

7.1 APPENDIX 1

A DOCUMENT-BASED CHRONOLOGY: JEWISH CONTINUITY AND UJIA JEWISH RENEWAL

Introduction

Appendix 1 is a chronology based upon primary documentation and capturing the major developments. The focus is upon planning and organisational processes and issues rather than educational impact. The use of documents, particularly those of the main organisations at the centre of this research (Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal), demonstrates:

- the evolution of the organisational frameworks
- the impact of important developments
- when and how policies emerged
- when and why tensions appeared
- when and why problems were caused and/or addressed
- when, why and where decisions were taken
- the consequences of trends, decisions and actions

Appendix 2 is an overview of the main organisations and initiatives – Appendices 1 and 2 complement each other and capture the historical background.

As discussed in the Findings and Conclusion, recurrent key themes and issues emerged from the history of the various central Jewish educational planning initiatives – each taking different forms and approaches in attempting to improve the quantity and quality of Jewish education. The themes that emerged from the inquiry included:

- the challenge of crafting and promoting an educational vision and guiding principles, and translating it into planning and development;
- effecting an organisational and operational model for implementation with a clear strategic direction;
- leadership, personalities and decision-making;
- navigating sensitive and contentious issues within the British Jewish community, including cross-communal religious tensions, funding, partnership and stakeholder management and communications and expectations.

Overview

Between 1971 and 2000, there were four major, central Jewish community educational initiatives that had significance for this research. Each one addressed the challenge of sustaining the Jewish community through a central Jewish educational enterprise as an antidote to assimilatory tendencies understood to be eroding the Jewish community (for more details of each see Appendix 2).

Let My People Know 1971-1993 Former Chief Rabbi Lord Jakobovits's 'Let my people know' initiative (Jakobovits, 1971), led to the formation of the Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT, 1971-1993).[329] It was under the direction of the Chief Rabbi; focused primarily on school-building and to a lesser degree on other educational projects such as teacher training; raised funds from a limited number of targeted, wealthy individuals (and institutions) who were also involved in allocating the funds; employed a limited number of educational professionals; also provided a small amount of conditional funds for non-Orthodox educational projects.
Securing Our Future (1992) – The Worms Report The Worms Report (JEDT, 1992) was the result of a JEDT think tank that was never formally implemented. It sought to overcome what it described as the "fragmentation" within the Jewish education system by proposing the establishment of "a representative, umbrella body for Jewish education advised by professional educators and those engaged in communal planning and research" (JEDT, 1992, p xii) and understood by some to mean working across the community; and it had a focus on personnel development. However, it was superseded (and overtaken) by Chief Rabbi Sacks's Jewish Continuity.
Jewish Continuity 1993-1998 Sacks's initiative, Jewish Continuity (1993-1998), was an ambitious community education programme comprising a wide range of intervention areas supported by a team of professionals; it had active lay involvement in both central projects and grant-making to partners. It ran into problems (including strategic planning, funding, cross-communal issues, leadership, governance, expectation management, and in late 1996 it agreed to merge with the Joint Israel Appeal (JIA) to form the UJIA.
The United Jewish Israel Appeal, Jewish Renewal 1997-to date United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA) Jewish Renewal[330] (1997 to date) replaced Jewish Continuity and operated within narrower and tighter parameters: it worked cross-communally; focused primarily on youth in the areas of Informal Jewish Education (including a Lifelong Learning Unit), Israel Experience (educational travel to Israel), Educational Leadership (school teachers and educators) and Research and Development;[331] and was funded as part of a community-wide appeal on behalf of Israel and Jewish education.

[329] The JEDT continued to function past this date but only to complete pre-existing projects.

[330] UJIA eventually became the name for the new merged entity (between Jewish Continuity and JIA), and Jewish Renewal was the department within it that replaced Jewish Continuity; the rest of the work came under 'Rescue' and was involved in supporting projects in Israel and Jews in distress around the world. (In 2006, the Jewish Renewal name was replaced with 'UK Programme', and 'Rescue' became the 'Israel Programme'.)

[331] This research examined UJIA Jewish Renewal 1997-2000; other work areas were added at a later date.

Chief Rabbi Jakobovits's Approach: 'Let my people know' (1971) and the Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT) (1967-1991)

April 1967, Chief Rabbi Jakobovits Inauguration Speech
Prioritised Orthodox Jewish education in the community ("I am resolved to preserve … the predominantly traditional character of our community"[332] (Bermant, 1990, p 87)).

November 1971, Jakobovits published 'Let my people know – Proposals for the Development of Jewish Education' (Jakobovits, 1971)[333]
Main purpose: promote the growth of Jewish faith schools – capital 'bricks and mortar' projects with a smaller investment in teacher training and professional development bursaries.[334] [335]

Early 1970s, Jakobovits's vision inspired the creation of the Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT)
The JEDT was to be the vehicle for implementing his ideas.

6th-25th October 1973, Yom Kippor War

1970s to date, expansion in Jewish schools provision
Jakobovits, working through the JEDT, met with some success in encouraging school-building (notwithstanding pre-existing plans for Jewish school expansion and continued work through to present day); other influential factors included parental demand and pressure and crucial government support for faith schools.

1978, 'Report on the Findings of the Committee on Teacher-Training and Career Structure' (JEDT)

[332] Another dominant theme was communal unity in the aftermath of the 'Louis Jacobs Affair'. Rabbi Jacobs was a candidate to become Principal of the Orthodox Jews' College and a possible future candidate for the Chief Rabbinate, but whose advancement was blocked by Jakobovits's predecessor, Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie, due to his 'heretical' views – questioning "the nature of divine revelation" (Bermant, 1990, p 69). Persoff (2002).
[333] At this time, there was already a communal campaign throughout the Jewish western world called 'Let My People Go', campaigning for the right of emigration for Soviet Jewry – his pamphlet title was surely a deliberate play on that campaign slogan.
[334] Jakobovits also correctly identified the personnel problem: "There is a dearth of fully trained and qualified teachers of Hebrew and Jewish knowledge at all levels and, with anticipated growth and expansion of schools, this shortage will be even more marked. Unless decisive action is taken now, this may be a gravely restrictive factor, affecting all levels of educational development. Without an adequate supply of competent teachers new schools will fail to achieve their purpose." (Jakobovits, 1971, p 16). His own Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT) generated a paper in 1978 entitled 'Report on the Findings of the Committee on Teacher-Training and Career Structure' on the unmet needs of Jewish teachers but the report made little impact (JEDT, June 1978).
[335] Jakobovits avoided the curriculum content issue, and as Freud-Kandel noted: "In an editorial in the *Jewish Chronicle*, following the launch of this initiative, it was noted that the Chief Rabbi's accompanying statement of purpose, entitled *Let My People Kno*w, [sic] contained the shocking statement that, 'no attempt is made to evaluate the contents of the Jewish education'. The editorial asked: "But is this not the fundamental question to be answered before any plans can be envisaged? … It would be instructive to know what the Chief Rabbi thinks Jewish children should be taught to equip them for living as Jews in Britain on the threshold of the twenty-first century." Jewish Chronicle, 5th November, 1971, quoted in Freud-Kandel, 2006, p 172. The full quotation from Jakobovits went on to read: "But, by including proposals for Teacher Training and for the setting up of Headmasters' and Educational Experts' Conferences, the machinery will be created for promoting greatly improved standards and methods; better co-ordination between the schools; and pooling of resources for text-books, seminars and other common interests." (Jakobovits, 1971, p 3). It appeared that Jakobovits – rightly or wrongly – was ready to entrust practitioners (Orthodox) with delivery of the content.
However, there was more success in teacher training than curriculum development.

This did not lead to effective follow-up. (In general, other than school-building, JEDT educational projects were less impactful, including development of the Jewish Studies teachers profession, resources and innovation).

Spring 1991, JEDT think tank launched, led by Fred Worms
Report presented September, 1992.[336]

Chief Rabbi Sacks, 1991-to date

1st September 1991, the Inauguration of Chief Rabbi Sacks
In his inaugural address, Sacks set out his priorities: education, leadership and spirituality. (Sacks, 1st September 1991). It would begin with a 'decade of renewal'.
He also indicated his determination to ameliorate the schisms within Jewry (Sacks, 1st September 1991) – also a subject of one of his books (Sacks, 1993).

11th September 1992, Jewish Chronicle Editorial: 'Renewal, year one'
It noted the aim of the Chief Rabbi to advance a decade of renewal: "It was an ambitious aim, but one on which in many ways he made an impressive start." (Jewish Chronicle, 11th September 1992, p 18).

The Worms Report (JEDT, September 1992)

September 1992, 'Securing our Future – an inquiry into Jewish Education in the United Kingdom' (JEDT, 1992) (Also known as 'The Worms Report')[337]
It was set up to examine the situation for "the eighteen and under age group" (JEDT, 1992, p iii), and "to develop a strategy for Jewish educational renewal. The report does not seek to be narrowly prescriptive, but rather to identify priorities and to propose some principles for effective educational change." (JEDT, 1992, p viii) – the whole think tank report process lasted 15-18 months.

4th September 1992, Jewish Chronicle on Worms Report
The Jewish Chronicle front page news feature on the Worms Report (Jewish Chronicle, 4th September 1992, quoted in Worms, 1996, p 248): "The proposals include the creation of a national council for Jewish education, combining Orthodox and Progressive groups,[338] and were drawn up by the Jewish Educational Development Trust's Think Tank.

4th September 1992, Jewish Chronicle quoting Sacks on the economic situation
Sacks on the state of the national economy and the acute recession of the time: the ""economic crisis is forcing the community to decide its priorities," he said. "Education must come at the top."" Jewish Chronicle, 4th September 1992 p. 1.[339]

---

[336] Another JEDT project was the Immanuel College building programme – a private Jewish secondary school later named in honour of Jakobovits (and others). The building programme ran into acute financial difficulties and dominated the attention and efforts of the JEDT in the Trust's final years.

[337] The document itself is undated, but the *Jewish Chronicle* attested to its release in September 1992 (The Jewish Chronicle (4th September, 1992) – a year after Sacks's inauguration.

[338] This was a contested claim. See Henry Israel (a Worms Report think tank member) letter (Jewish Chronicle, 18th September 1992, p 22) in which he declared that the Orthodox would not work together beyond coordination and management issues.

[339] Indeed the Worms Report itself observed that: "The length and depth of the economic recession has had a serious effect on the finances of many of our institutions, threatening the very fabric on which the community has been relying." (JEDT, 1992, p iii).
(Simon Rocker also provided a summary of the report (Jewish Chronicle, 4th September 1992, p 12).)
A four pages feature appeared in the Jewish Chronicle, 1st May 1992, pp 15-17; noting the financial crisis (particularly the "collapse of the commercial property market" p 15), it observed that: "Jewish education is most in the firing line." (p 15).
In the September 1992 edition of the *New Moon* magazine, it noted: "Although no-one at the US [United Synagogue – Orthodox] was available to give complete figures, at least nine full-time and 30 part-time posts

Worms Report – Follow-up

5th October 1992, 'Securing Our Future – JEDT Think Tank Report: Report Follow-Up' (JEDT, 5th October 1992a) and 'Establishing the "National Council for Jewish Education [NCJE]'" (JEDT, 5th October 1992b) [340]

The two JEDT professional staff members, Michael Mail and Syma Weinberg, suggested a Conference that "will become the working group on organisational structure and will ultimately become the National Council for Jewish Education" (NCJE).

October-November 1992, **momentum and direction swung over to the Office of the Chief Rabbi**[341]

In his letter dated October, 1992 (though typed up 3rd November, 1992),[342] Kestenbaum (on behalf of the Office of the Chief Rabbi) set out the position, opposing the national 'representative body' (the 'National Council for Jewish Education' (NCJE) - JEDT, 1992, p 43), arguing that it was not fully aligned with the Chief Rabbi's thinking and planning. It was clear that the Chief Rabbi's goal was to lead and indeed 'own' the next major strategic initiative in the field of Jewish education.

16th February 1993, Jewish Continuity (Michael Mail) 'Update On Progress'[343]

Kestenbaum was identified as being responsible for the "conceptualisation of Jewish Continuity."

Jewish Continuity – Intellectual Underpinnings

1988, Commission on Jewish Education in North America established

Mandel Institute led the process consisting of research and consultation committees.

November 1990, 'A Time to Act', Commission on Jewish Education in North America Report (1991)

1990 National Jewish Population Study[344] **(American Jewry)**

This decadal survey of American Jewry revealed a 52 per cent rate[345] of out-marriage[346] amongst American Jewry – it unsettled the leadership and was the catalyst for a number of subsequent initiatives.

---

have been shed in the US education department." The article also recorded a briefing given to the Board of Deputies meeting (July 1992) at which a senior youth work professional was quoted: "Asher Eisen of the Maccabi Association pointed out that over a quarter of Jewish youth posts had been cut in the last three years, and that there was no-one catering for the needs of young Jews who gather on the streets of places such as Hampstead and Edgware. He asked for £50,000 to pay for outreach workers. No money has yet been found." (New Moon, September, 1992, p 31). It continued: "Even the major educational charities are in financial straits. According to Fred Worms, a trustee of the Jewish Education [sic] Development Trust, the JEDT normally gives away one million pounds to educational causes. This year, it will give only half that sum." (New Moon, September 1992, p 32).

[340] 'Securing Our Future – JEDT Think Tank Report Follow-Up'– no authorship is stated but it is probably Mail and Weinberg, 5th October 1992a; 'Establishing the "National Council for Jewish Education [NCJE]"' (Mail and Weinberg), 5th October 1992b.

[341] At the JEDT Trustees Meeting 29th March 1993, Sacks spoke explicitly about Jewish Continuity succeeding the JEDT. The Minutes also recorded that: "He [Sacks] commented on the recommendations of the JEDT's Think Tank Report and stressed that a new way forward for Jewish education was required which included the need to: a) look at education in its broadest sense i.e. beyond purely day school education; b) reach out to the unaffiliated; c) promote education as the "third arm" of the community (alongside Israel and welfare) with a broad base of donors; d) break through the communal ambivalence towards Jewish education."

[342] Office of the Chief Rabbi (Kestenbaum, J.) 'The Chief Rabbinate and Education – An Enabling Unit for Anglo-Jewish Education' October 1992 (typed up 3rd November 1992) .

[343] Jewish Continuity (Michael Mail) 16th February 1993, 'Update On Progress'. This was a Jewish Continuity document in which Mail regularly made recommendations and/or reported progress against the earlier 'Stages to Launch – Critical Path Analysis' (commencing December 1992).

[344] Kosmin et al (1991).

Sacks noted developments in North America in his own writings (Sacks 1988[347]; 1993; 1994 pp 17-25).

Summer 1991, Chief Rabbi held formative discussions on Jewish Continuity
Clearly the issues and ideas were already well-developed but he met leading figures in Jerusalem[348] to assist his thinking and practical implementation.

June-October 1993, Chief Rabbi's five pamphlets released: 'Studies in Renewal'
Set out the intellectual underpinnings of his analysis and theory of Jewish continuity and renewal (Sacks 1993abcde) as a means of promoting the debate.[349]

1994, 'Will We Have Jewish Grandchildren?'[350] (Sacks, 1994)[351] published

---

[345] The 52 per cent figure was later revised slightly downwards by some to the mid-forties but was nonetheless troubling to American Jewish leadership.
[346] I.e. Jews marrying non-Jews – in Orthodox Jewish Law, children are only considered Jewish if born to a Jewish mother (recognised as such by Jewish Law) and many believed that there was strong evidence that the children of mixed marriages were less likely to be brought up Jewish nor retain a strong Jewish identity (e.g. Sacks, 1994, pp 24-25).
[347] In a 1988 Sacks article, after considering the American experience and research, he asked: "Can we incorporate these ideas into Anglo-Jewry? There are many questions to be asked. Can salaries and the status of the teaching profession be raised? Is there an effective career structure? Can our mainstream synagogues undergo the philosophical reorientation needed to turn them from providers of services into loci of family education? Can we undertake the necessary dialogue between synagogue and educational lay-leadership, teaching professionals and rabbis? How do youth groups, adult education and residential retreats fit into the pattern? Is co-ordination possible between the wide variety of competing interest groups in this fragmented field?" (Sacks, 1988, p 35). It is clearly evident that Sacks was already beginning to think through the practical outputs for Jewish continuity – though the organisational framework had yet to materialise – and he had also identified the problem of fragmentation that Worms highlighted. He also used the term 'Jewish continuity' in his closing paragraph: "The messages that emerge from recent research and from the Jewish historical experience are that education is the most potent guarantor of Jewish continuity, that Jewish education works best in closely orchestrated harmony with the other key institutions of Jewish life – the home and the synagogue – and that there is no short-cut to its proper resourcing. The question-marks hanging over Diaspora Jewish survival are sufficiently strong to make a coherent, collective, community-wide educational strategy our most immediate priority." (Sacks, 1988, p 35).
[348] Acknowledgements in the book note that in 1991, the then Chief Rabbi elect, Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, took a four months summer sabbatical in Jerusalem (in the sedate enclave of Yemin Moshe just outside the walls of the Old City). There, early discussions took place around the broad theme of Jewish continuity and renewal (confirmed in interviews) and in Sacks's Acknowledgements section he particularly noted the involvement of Simon Caplan (a former director of the JEDT and then playing a prominent role in writing the Kalms Report on the future of the United Synagogue), Professor Seymour Fox, Alan Hoffman and Annette Hochstein (the latter three of the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem) (Sacks, 1994, Acknowledgements). (Jonathan Kestenbaum was also present at these gatherings (Sacks, 1994, Acknowledgements)).
[349] Pamphleteering was a classic mode of intellectual discussion whose heyday had long preceded the 1990s. However, the method did indeed capture attention and interest (Sacks, 1994). However, see: Saul Bitensky: "The Chief has a good message, but a booklet (with no pictures) just isn't the way to get it out." New Moon, July 1993, p 19) – he was writing for a predominantly young adult audience.
(The more practical efforts to develop the Jewish Continuity organisation were already underway.)
[350] In 1992, the American Journal of Jewish Communal Service had run a series of articles under the title: Jewish Continuity – Will Our Grandchildren Be Jewish?'.
[351] Sacks pointed out that he was preparing the final draft of the book as Clive Lawton was appointed Chief Executive of Jewish Continuity, August 1993 (Sacks 1994, Acknowledgements). Elsewhere in the book, he noted: "It is less than a year since the words 'Jewish Continuity' first coalesced in my mind as an idea, a problem and the glimmerings of a solution." (Sacks, 1994, p 110). The book incorporated the pamphlets (Sacks, 1993abcde (June-October 1993)) almost verbatim, though the pamphlets do appear in a different order in the book, and with several additional chapters added. Indeed, a close comparison between the pamphlets and the book reveal few changes and most of those are of a grammatical and editing nature i.e. the occasional choice of an alternative preferred word. It would appear that the consultation process did not significantly impact on the

The book set out Sacks's views and had a significant impact amongst Jewish leadership and others.

Jewish Continuity – Developing a Framework

24th December 1992,[352] 'A 'Draft Timetable to Launch' (of what was to become Jewish Continuity)
Proposed launch date for new organisation of 15th November 1993.
Kestenbaum met Sinclair (after Sacks first met him in November 1992).

3rd February 1993, 'Presentation Paper Prepared for Mandel Institute Consultation', included: 'Anglo Jewish Education – the Nature of the Problem' (21st January 1993), written by Kestenbaum (Office of the Chief Rabbi)

17th February 1993, first informal meeting of lay leaders (initially known as the Sounding Board) [353]
Sacks defined their role as the ""Sounding Board" Group – providing the key initial input into the formulation of Jewish Continuity." After his introductory remarks, Sacks handed over the Chair to Sinclair. (Kestenbaum was also present.)

31st March 1993, first Sounding Board Meeting

December 1992-June 1993 Working Papers
Working strategy papers went through a number of consultations and further iterations.[354] One noted that Jewish education was "no longer restricted to day schools or formal education for children. Rather, a Jewish approach to education must include all age groups, informal and formal contexts, in a holistic way." In part, it restated Kestenbaum's earlier documents.

8th June 1993, first Steering Committee (formerly the Sounding Board)

4th July 1993 Activists Retreat, Runnymede Hotel (Egham)
Held as part of a wider consultation process (with the Sounding Board, community professionals, young activists, etc.)

Summer 1993 'Jewish Continuity: Mission, Aims and Tasks'
Sacks described education "as part of a process whose ultimate aim is the transmission of Jewish life across the generations." (p 3)) but the approach remained broadly consistent with earlier iterations of the working papers (though Personnel Development and Innovation were enhanced).[355]

16th July 1993, Certificate of incorporation of a private limited company: Jewish Continuity

---

original text, though there may have been some input to the more practical details and subsequent tactical decision-making – and perhaps the additional chapters.

[352] A number of papers were prepared ahead of Kestenbaum's meeting with Michael Sinclair, who had been invited to chair the new organisation, which took place on the evening of the 24th December 1992.

[353] Sounding Board Members: Richard Alberg*; Michael Bradfield*; Charles Corman*; Allan Fisher*; Michael Goldmeier; Barbera Green*; Stephen Greenman; Henry Israel; Brian Kerner*; Lynndy Levin; Daniel Levy*; Steven Lewis; Michael Mail (Staff); Clive Marks*; Joshua Rowe; Dr. Michael Sinclair*; Leslie Wagner*; Syma Weinberg (Staff); Lira Winston (Staff); Andrew Loftus*; Michael Rose*; Sir Harry Solomon*. (Not all were present at the first meeting.) * Later became Jewish Continuity Executive Board members.

[354] 'Jewish Continuity: A National Bureau for Jewish Education' (December 1992); 'Jewish Continuity: Creating A Learning Community' (December 1992); and again as: 'Jewish Continuity – Building the Jewish Future' (May and June 1993).

[355] At the Steering Committee meeting held on the 14th July 1993, they noted that "the recommendations made at the 4th July [Runnymede] seminar were essentially in tune with the earlier "Tasks and Targets" document [26th March 1993 mentioned above]." (Jewish Continuity Steering Committee, Minutes 14th July 1993).

August 1993, further iteration of the Jewish Continuity Working Paper
It promoted Task Forces around Leadership Recruitment and Training; Lead Communities; Personnel; Research and Planning; Jewish Activities in Non-Jewish Schools; Communal "Happening"; Liaison with Government. Clive Lawton's appointment as Chief Executive Officer was announced at the same meeting and from this time onwards he started to attend meetings.[356]

Jewish Continuity – Launch

September 1993, public launch of Jewish Continuity

27th September 1993, Steering Committee met as the Jewish Continuity Executive Board

7th November 1993 Jewish Continuity Steering Committee
Daniel Levy recommended that Jewish Continuity should continue to target individual top donors but "it should not launch a major fundraising campaign until its specific programmes were determined."

7th December 1993 Jewish Continuity document on Operations

17th December 1993, Jewish Continuity advertising campaign began[357]
A hard-hitting, headline grabbing campaign that aimed to capture the community's attention commenced with monthly full page *Jewish Chronicle* advertisements that starkly drew attention to the dangers of assimilation.

7th January 1994, Jewish Continuity Steering Committee
The Chair noted that the fundraising campaign would not start until Spring 1994.

12th January 1994, the Jewish Continuity-proposed educational Task Groups were identified
Leadership Development; Lead Communities; Professional Educators; Research and Planning; Programmes for Jewish Children in Mainstream (non-Jewish) Schools; Cross-community Events; Outreach.[358]

8th March 1994, Jewish Continuity Trustees
The Chairman noted pledges of £3.5m with just under £1m collected for the current year.

April 1994, First Jewish Continuity Awards
Awardees included cross-communal organisations but no awards were made to non-Orthodox bodies – none had applied, being unsure of the relationship and terms of engagement – out of the total allocations worth £250,000.

24th May 1994, Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting

[356] There had been 114 expressions of interest in the Chief Executive post. The role related to management involving staff, strategy, evaluation, policy, as well as public relations and marketing, liaison with lay and professional personnel within Jewish Continuity and those of its beneficiary organisations and finance and fundraising. By August 1993, Clive Lawton began appearing at planning meetings but was only spending a few days each month whilst completing responsibilities in his role as Deputy Director of Liverpool Education Authority, before commencing full-time as Chief Executive in January 1994. Michael Mail was appointed Chief Operating Officer and Syma Weinberg became Programmes Co-ordinator.
[357] Jewish Continuity had commissioned the Hype! Communications agency.
[358] Lawton summarised the work of the Sounding Board thus: "The Chief Rabbi's original consultancy group, the "sounding board" that met through 1993, identified several areas of activity, all of which were considered necessary to addressing the multi-layered and complex issues that contribute to moving Jews toward greater commitment. These included: developing professional educators, communal frameworks, lay leadership, research, work with children in non-Jewish schools, religious outreach, and cross community events." (Avar ve'Atid, December 1995, Issue 4, p 19.)

It was claimed that: "To date £3,642,140 has been raised in pledges and £792,973 has actually been received."

Jewish Continuity – Religious Issues

3rd February 1993, 'Jewish Continuity: Religious Principles – A discussion document'
Based upon the idea of inclusivism, it was an attempt to formulate a position that protected the Orthodox view but opened the possibility for engagement with other sections of the religious community on the basis of respect for "Judaism as a faith and way of life [*emunah* and *halakhah*] …" in a programming context. (Elsewhere, within Jewish Continuity, greater emphasis was given to Shabbat and Kashrut observance in terms of activities.) (The case was presented in more detail in Sacks's later book, 'One People?' (Sacks, 1993) on the major schisms facing the Jewish People; and also in his Jewish Chronicle article post-Masorti article (Jewish Tribune 12th January 1995), Jewish Chronicle 20th January 1995, p 24-25).

7th May 1993, *Jewish Chronicle* p 15 Book Review of Sacks (1993), 'One People?'
Rabbi Dr Sydney Brichto (a senior Liberal Judaism leader) wrote a sympathetic review of Sacks's book, 'One People?' (Sacks, 1993).

21st May 1993, Jewish Continuity briefing paper[359]
It noted: "Q Will Jewish Continuity expect Orthodox and Reform to work together? A No, Jewish Continuity will respect the differences and work in the context of what is acceptable to each community."

23rd February 1994, Jewish Continuity Executive
Agreed to set up a sub-committee to look into the cross-communal challenges that had become evident.[360]

May-June 1994
Establishment of the Jewish Community Allocations Board

1994-5 (n.d. – estimated), A Jewish Continuity document 'Jewish Continuity: Common Objections and Standard Answers'
Stated "Is Jewish Continuity biased against any section of the community?
The vast majority of our expenditure has funded projects where there is no denominational issue. We would not, of course, support a programme which would, for example, force people to break *kashrut* [laws of keeping Kosher] or *Shabbat* [keeping the Sabbath]. Nor would the Jewish Community Allocations Board.[361] We believe that with a sufficiently sensitive approach, and with understanding from the community, we will be able to meet the needs of all Jews whilst compromising nobody."[362]
(Jewish Continuity: 'Common Objections And Standard Answers' (undated).)

12th January 1995, Chief Rabbi published attack on Masorti Judaism. (Jewish Tribune, 12th January 1995)

[359] A Jewish Continuity (29th March 1993) internal briefing note on 'Religious principles' stated that more time was needed "to resolve the "religious principles" issue which is linked to the nature of Jewish Continuity's community-wide approach."
[360] The Sub-committee members were Michael Sinclair, Clive Lawton, Jonathan Kestenbaum, Daniel Levy, Andrew Loftus, Clive Marks and Leslie Wagner (Jewish Continuity Executive Minutes, 23rd February 1994).
[361] The Jewish Community Allocations Board (JCAB) was set up by Jewish Continuity (May-June 1994) as an attempt to allow Jewish Continuity funding to be offered to non-Orthodox organisations without compromising the Chief Rabbi – it is discussed in more detail shortly.
[362] The example given was that of RESQUJE. The courses were run by an independent, secular third party (the Institute of Education, London) and non-Orthodox teachers were studying there – placing it under the Institute's umbrella was considered a sufficient 'protective barrier' to safeguard the Chief Rabbi.

20th January 1995, Jewish Chronicle, letter reprinted with Sacks clarification and other articles and comments

Jewish Continuity – Organisation and Implementation

February 1994, Jewish Continuity launched The Research for Quality in Jewish Education Unit (RESQUJE), at the Institute of Education, University of London
It was an example of a central Jewish Continuity project to address shortcomings in the planning and development of Jewish education: "The Unit was to provide the opportunity to establish a framework within which the challenge to secure continuity through Jewish education could be systematically addressed. Thus the aim of the Unit was **to develop a professional community of educators who have the capacity to contribute to ensuring meaningful Jewish continuity in the UK."** (RESQUJE – Professional Growth for Quality Education in the Community (undated, probably 1995).

April 1994, Jewish Continuity Allocations – First Round
There was a reduced time frame even though the Task Groups were not fully engaged with partners – even at this early stage there appeared to be concerns with the Task Group process. As previously noted, the non-Orthodox groups did not apply.

11th May 1994, Jewish Continuity Executive
There was discussion and agreement for the establishment of the Jewish Community Allocations Board (JCAB).

23rd June 1994, Jewish Continuity Executive
It was announced that Leslie Wagner was stepping down from the Executive to chair the new Jewish Community Allocations Board – which was also to include non-Orthodox members.[363] Significantly, it was also pointed out that Dayan Ehrentreu,[364] representing the Beth Din (Religious Court), had approved the new structure.
The same meeting unanimously approved the Jewish Continuity-JIA fundraising arrangement agreeing £3m in 1995, £4m in 1996 and £5m in 1997 to be raised by a single joint campaign.

Succot 1994, JCAB First Allocations.

The Joint Israel Appeal (JIA) – Background

[363] The Jewish Community Allocations Board initial members were: Leslie Wagner (Chair, former Vice-President of the United Synagogue, and Vice-Chancellor of Leeds Metropolitan University), Laurence Begner (a solicitor and a founder of the independent Orthodox Ner Yisroel Synagogue), Judge Henry Lachs (from Liverpool and a Trustee of Liverpool's Orthodox King David Foundation for Jewish schools and a Vice-President of the Zionist Foundation Education Trust), Sir Peter Lazarus (a leading Liberal Jew – Chair of the Liberal Jewish Synagogue, who passed away in late 1995), Sir Peter Millett (deputy to Wagner and a Lord Chief Justice of Appeal and President of the Reform West London Synagogue, 1991-95), Rosalind Preston (a Vice-President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and had led the Chief Rabbi's survey into the role of women in the community). (Alex Sklan and Judith Tankel were later added.)
In the *Jewish Continuity Connects* Newsletter (February 1996, back page) it was reported: "Jewish Continuity's only involvement in it [the Jewish Community Allocations Board] now is to give the Board a block grant twice a year, to offer it professional advice on the field of 'Continuity's' interests, and to monitor the projects that it chooses to fund, not only to ensure that our money is being responsibly spent but also to learn from experiments in the field." It is also noted that: "Alex Sklan, currently co-chair of the Assembly of Masorti Synagogues [Conservative Judaism i.e. non-Orthodox] and in his professional life senior executive of Jewish Care [the largest Jewish community welfare organisation], has recently joined the Allocations Board." The Masorti movement being a non-Orthodox stream of Judaism now had a prominent member of the Allocations Board. Judith Tankel was also a member – a senior lay leader from the Glasgow community.
[364] Dayan (a senior religious title for a 'judge', indicating religious qualifications above a rabbi) Ehrenthreu was a powerful and influential figure.

Early 1990s developments
By the early Nineties, a number of major developments were impacting on Israel-Diaspora relations, including: leading Israeli politician, Yossi Beilin, had questioned whether Israel still needed the same degree of financial support from a Diaspora which might have its own higher Jewish priorities;[365] in the wake of the Gulf War (1990-1991), the United Nations rescinded its General Assembly 'Zionism equals Racism' resolution; in September 1993, the Israeli-Palestinian peace process was announced to the world and brought its own 'peace dividend' to Israel; there was a welcome mass exodus of Jews from the Former Soviet Union to Israel and a much smaller number of Ethiopian Jews. These were momentous events that had consequences for those working in fundraising for Israel.
The JIA was an organisation struggling to reinvent and reposition itself in the face of various developments and challenges.

9th March 1993, JIA Board
It was noted, reflecting the recession, that its [JIA] fundraising campaign was "not facing the easiest of economic climates"[366] – a euphemism for their lack of success.

13th May 1993, JIA Board
They noted the absence of new leaders and their assessment of the challenge of maintaining the centrality of Israel within the community.

14th December 1993, JIA Board
They discussed the re-organisation and repositioning of the JIA in the community.

9th February 1994, JIA Board
It was reported that a further flat campaign was anticipated.[367] It was also announced that dialogue with Jewish Continuity had taken place.

21st April 1994, JIA Board
They discussed the need for a comprehensive strategic review but could not agree a Policy Statement and new Mission. Nevertheless, Sir Trevor Chinn (JIA Chair) observed: "Despite this, he felt that this had been one of the most positive meetings he had attended and what had been achieved was that the paramount issue of the JIA's future role in the UK community was now being openly debated and addressed."

2nd June 1994, JIA Board
They unanimously agreed a new Policy Statement entitled 'A Bridge for Our People', noting: "This statement set out the three essential strands to the work of the JIA: the rescue of Jews from countries of oppression; partnership with Israel; partnership with British Jewry." This paved the way for the JIA to make public its long-standing support for various Israel-oriented Jewish education activities for young British Jews (including a new insistence that its beneficiaries publicly acknowledge JIA support) and, importantly for the soon to be publicly announced agreement with Jewish Continuity, to support a wider British Jewish agenda.[368]

---

[365] Speech in December 1993, reported in: Beilin, 2000, pp 50-51.
[366] At the JIA Board meeting (13th May 1993), it was recorded that the staff roll was reduced from eighty-seven and a half to sixty-five.
[367] At the same meeting, they also felt the need to publicly distance themselves from a Jewish Agency for Israel initiative to set up a youth centre in Golders Green with JIA support, as they did not want to be seen to be diverting funds away from Israel, with the consequential damage that it might do to their fundraising campaign for Israel.
[368] The scale of JIA's support for local British Jewish-Israel education was already considerable. For example, it was reported at the meeting of the 14th December 1993, that the planned allocations for 1994 included: JEDT £200,000; Zionist Federation Education Trust (for Jewish primary schools) £340,000; Joint Committee for Youth Affairs (JCYA) (youth movements, Israel Experience and Jewish Agency support services) £405,000. (A number of smaller allocations were agreed at the following meeting.) The 1995 budget saw an increase (spurred by the Jewish Continuity partnership) in the JCYA funding to £437,500 and a long term (Israel Gap Year)

The Jewish Continuity-JIA Agreement

9th February 1994, JIA Board
Sir Trevor Chinn (the JIA Chair) announced that a meeting had taken place that morning with Jewish Continuity and the outcome was a real possibility of establishing a close working partnership. It further noted: "JIA would fundraise for Continuity, thus saving them the expense of setting up a fundraising apparatus. Continuity would not undertake an [sic] major public fundraising, although it will do small scale fundraising, but only in liaison with the JIA and with our agreement; JIA will look to Continuity to run certain programmes relevant to the work of the JIA."

23rd February 1994, Jewish Continuity Executive Board
It recorded that discussions with the Joint Israel Appeal (JIA) had taken place – with particular reference to the work of Israel Experience.

24th May 1994, Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting
Sinclair (the Jewish Continuity Chair) "reported that a meeting was being set up between representatives of Continuity and JIA to discuss cooperation."

30th June 1994, 'Briefing Note by the Jewish Continuity Chief Executive' Clive Lawton (on the Jewish Continuity-JIA Agreement)
Lawton portrayed it as "franchising out" its fundraising to the JIA and that it would avoid "a bruising debate" over the relative merits of each organisation's work and an access into "Israel related activities". However, he also listed "Potential disadvantages" including JIA's style and image and that it might be seen as a "take-over or merger in which Jewish Continuity loses its momentum and image as fresh and breaking away from the old order." He was also concerned over whether the JIA fundraisers would be able to quickly enough internalise and promote the additional Jewish Continuity campaign.

8th July 1994, JIA-Jewish Continuity Press Release (embargoed until 15th July 1994)
It announced "a partnership in which the JIA will run the fund-raising campaign for Israel and Jewish Continuity."

5th October 1994, JIA-Jewish Continuity Memorandum

Jewish Continuity – Under Growing Pressure

4th September 1994, Jewish Continuity Board
It approved in principle a second draft of the Chief Executive's strategy paper, though asked him to rework it into a third draft (22nd September 1994).

5th October 1994, JIA Board
Sir Trevor Chinn was able to report that Jewish Continuity "were very sensitive to our concerns and were developing a strategy which would clarify their programmes and goals" – JIA were also pushing for a stronger Jewish Continuity strategy document.

21st November 1994, Jewish Continuity Board
Frustration was expressed that the Task Groups were spending too much time on grant applications and not enough on proactive work.

8th December 1994, JIA Board

Student Volunteer Schemes Bursary Fund of £100,000 – amongst others; and the 1996 grants included a JCYA increase to £617,500; UJS to £50,000, amongst others.

It was noted that JIA fundraising for Jewish Continuity had already begun and that strategic cooperation had also commenced.[369]
Chinn also declared that he was stepping down as Chair, though retaining a role as a JIA representative in communal affairs, and that Brian Kerner would take over for a two years term.[370]
It was also announced that the JIA had set up a new charity, the Joint Jewish Charitable Trust, to allow it to embrace Jewish Continuity's work.

16th December 1994, Michael Sinclair in the *Jewish Chronicle*
In an opinion piece, Michael Sinclair noted the rise of Jewish continuity as a priority throughout the Jewish world but claimed that British Jewry had gone further than others through its achievement of six objectives: "We have made the community aware of the problem. We have recruited new teams of lay leaders. We have raised funds. We have created a national organisation, Jewish Continuity, to implement a community-wide set of programmes.
"We have made a beginning through strategic projects we have initiated or stimulated and resourced. And we have forged a link with the JIA so that what might otherwise have been a bitter struggle between Israel and domestic needs has become, instead, a partnership." (Sinclair, Jewish Chronicle, 16th December 1994, p 24).

22nd December 1994, 'Jewish Continuity: Strategic Direction – 5 Year Goals and 1995 Programme
It finally appeared, against a backdrop of concern from the Office of the Chief Rabbi over the quality and rigour behind its thinking and presentation, pressure from the JIA and growing internal Jewish Continuity anxiety over strategic direction.

12th January 1995, *Jewish Tribune,* the Chief Rabbi on Masorti (Conservative) Jewish Leadership
A highly controversial article in the Strictly Orthodox newspaper, the Jewish Tribune, in which he launched a blistering attack on Masorti Judaism and its leadership. The Chief Rabbi had felt that various leaders within the Assembly of Masorti Synagogues were making inappropriate claims concerning recognition by his Office of Masorti marriage ceremonies. His article was interpreted by some to mean that the Chief Rabbi was effectively declaring that Jewish Continuity would be exclusively Orthodox. However, in the *Jewish Chronicle* the Chief Rabbi subsequently attempted to make clear that his article did not undermine Jewish Continuity's commitment to inclusivism (a view reasserted by Sinclair and the JIA leadership in the same edition (Jewish Chronicle, 20th January 1995, pp 24-28; Persoff, 2010).

23rd February 1995, Jewish Continuity Executive, Chair's Notes[371]
The Chair felt compelled to state: "The Chief Rabbi's remarks on Continuity contained in his article on the Masorti movement had been a source of controversy and had led to the misunderstanding that Continuity would only serve the Orthodox community. The Chairman's letter sent to Continuity activists and released to the press dispelled this notion."
The Chief Rabbi's attack on the Masorti movement was also to have repercussions for the Jewish Continuity relationship with the JIA who claimed that it had undermined their fundraising – a view contested by members of the Jewish Continuity senior leadership.

27th March 1995, Jewish Continuity Trustees
A sub-committee on 'pluralism' was established but did not appear to make much progress.

12th April 1995, JIA Board

[369] At the JIA Board meeting of the 9th February, 1995, the JIA confirmed that it would terminate its funding for the Zionist Federation Education Trust as this was now "an issue for Jewish Continuity."
[370] Kerner's term was later extended as he became the first Chair of UJIA.
[371] No Minutes for that meeting were found in the Jewish Continuity archives.

Michael Sinclair, Daniel Levy and Sir Harry Solomon joined the JIA Board representing Jewish Continuity.
Geoffrey Ognall (JIA Treasurer) and Alan Fox (Chief Executive) noted concern and difficulty in terms of cash flow and the organisation's ability to meet commitments.

Pesach 1995, Second JCAB Allocations

18th May 1995, Jewish Continuity Executive
Howard Stanton had replaced Clive Marks as Treasurer. Marks had become extremely dissatisfied with Jewish Continuity's development and resigned in protest over strategic planning, management and funding concerns.
Stanton imposed rigorous financial management thereafter.

Lawton internal briefing paper to Jewish Continuity Executive Board Members, 'Update on Targets' (n.d.)
The paper declared that Jewish Continuity was operating across the following categories: Educator and Education Service Development; Lay Leadership Development; Community Development; Israel Experience; Jewish Activities in Non-Jewish Schools (JAMS); Students and Young Adults; Outreach and Personal Development; Research for Planning; Development of Communal Dialogue.

5th July 1995, JIA Board
Discussion of the JIA's difficulties in raising the necessary funds for Jewish Continuity.
A new marketing strategy was agreed with a budget of £450,000 and it was noted: "The fundamental objectives were to clarify the JIA's mission statement, reposition the JIA within the community and address many of the negative perceptions about the JIA which had emerged from market research in the community."

Summer 1995, relations between Jewish Continuity and the JIA were becoming increasingly tense
Jewish Continuity leaders were demanding that the JIA honour its financial commitment as their financial situation worsened; and the JIA response that it would commit to further funding but that "restructuring" of Jewish Continuity was essential.

September 1995, '*Continuity Connects*' [first edition[372]] (the Jewish Continuity Newsletter)
The document identified the four major pillars of Jewish Continuity central activity: Personnel Development; Youth and Community Development; Outreach and Personal Development; Israel Experience Development (Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools was also noted).

September 1995, '*Continuity Connects*' Jewish Continuity Update
In terms of the Jewish Community Allocations Board grants to external bodies, there had been a change in roles: the Task Groups were to be replaced by an "independent panel of evaluators drawn from experts across the community." (p 2).

2nd October, 1995, Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting Minutes
It was reported that the JIA had expressed particular concerns regarding Jewish Continuity over "pluralism; the way Continuity interacts with other communal organisations; the desire by the JIA for a closer involvement in the decision making of the organisation."
The Jewish Continuity Trustees agreed to set up a review led by Professor Leslie Wagner[373] which began its work that month.

5th October 1995, Jewish Continuity Trustees
JIA leadership committed personal contributions to Jewish Continuity.

[372] 'Continuity Connects' replaced Lawton's 'Supporters' Updates' as the Jewish Continuity Newsletter.
[373] Wagner was supported by Perry Goodman, a respected, retired senior civil servant.

Succot 1995, JCAB Second Year Funding

22nd November 1995, Lawton's paper
Lawton wrote an internal paper which appeared to be a defensively framed response to the likely findings of the Wagner Review.

October 1995-March 1996, The Wagner Review conducted its work – see further below

16th November 1995, JIA Board
The Wagner Review was discussed and it was stated that: "The whole process is expected to be completed by the end of March 1996 with the issue of the final report making clear the aims and objectives of Continuity. The JIA will then be in a position to make a final, informed decision as to its future relationship with and commitment to Jewish Continuity and so end the uncertainty and confusion."

30th November 1995, Jewish Continuity Executive
The financial situation was becoming ever more acute: "Members expressed grave concerns regarding the implications of the current financial situation, highlighting the damage that could be caused to the credibility of the organisation and the loss of motivation of Task Group members. The particular issue of the standing of the Allocations Board if it did not make grants for the December round was also raised." (Jewish Continuity Executive Minutes, 30th November 1995).
JIA's financial commitment was discussed and it was also suggested that if the JIA was unhappy with the Review results then they may seek to end the relationship.

September 1995 and May 1996, 'Continuity Connects – Jewish Continuity News Updates'
By January, 1996, Jewish Continuity was operating across the following areas (Chair people in brackets): Arts, Media and Culture (Anna Josse); The Bursary Committee (Barbera Green); Community Development (Anthony Warrens); Formal Education (Sherry Begner); Informal Education (Frances Turner); Israel Experience Development (Edwin Shuker); JAMS (Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools) (Sir Harry Solomon); Leadership Development (Michael Goldstein); Adult Education and Outreach (Benjamin Perl[374]); Research for Planning (Gillian Gold); Students and Young Adults (Michael Rose/Natan Tiefenbrun).

January 1996/Pesach 1996 Second Year JCAB Allocations

<u>The Mandel Centre Critique</u>

1-2 October 1995, Mandel Institute Visit
The Mandel Institute leadership were deeply critical of Jewish Continuity.

<u>March 1996, The Wagner Review</u>
(Discussed more fully in Appendix 2.)

22nd January 1996, Jewish Continuity Trustees
Wagner presented an interim report.

13th February 1996, JIA Board
Sinclair strongly expressed his concerns and criticisms of the JIA fundraising for Jewish Continuity but the discussion was re-directed to the JIA-Jewish Continuity Liaison Committee – which had been suspended pending the Wagner Review into Jewish Continuity (October-March 1996).

March 1996, Wagner Report

[374] Benjamin Perl was a wealthy business person interested in investing in the growth of Orthodox Jewish schools.

The Review was formally announced on the 27th October 1995, signed off February 1996, and published March 1996.

17th April 1996, JIA Board
It was noted that "despite a good start" the fundraising campaign was "beginning to falter." They also discussed the outcome and follow-up to the Wagner Review (1996) and it was stated that: "If we were to continue our partnership with Continuity, we would not make the same mistake again of doing so without the support and agreement of our workers. We would only be able to sell the concept of the new Jewish Continuity when we had a clear picture of what that will be. Therefore, no long term commitment of future support could be given at this time."
However, the JIA did agree to commit to funding for Jewish Continuity through to 31st December 1996 – regardless of any developments.

The JIA-Jewish Continuity Merger

25th May 1996, Kerner appears to have decided to push for a merger.[375]
(A confidential letter was circulated setting out his proposal for a 'merger'.)

13th June 1996, Jewish Continuity Trustees
The merger proposal was discussed. Geoffrey Ognall reported that, at a meeting the previous evening, the JIA leaders and top professionals had unanimously supported the merger proposals.

13th June 1996, Jewish Continuity Executive and Trustees (joint meeting)
There was agreement to set up a Transition Committee which became an Implementation Group for the Wagner Review follow-up (also approved by the JIA on the 12th June 1996).

8th July 1996, Implementation Group (for the merger)
The members were Victor Blank, Sir Trevor Chinn, Alan Fox, Brian Kerner (was asked to be Chair), Jonathan Kestenbaum, Andrew Loftus, Lionel Shebson, Michael Sinclair, Sir Harry Solomon, Anthony Spitz, Howard Stanton.[376]
They noted that there were concerns that it might become a takeover rather than a merger; the importance of retaining the centrality of Israel; the need for the group to show leadership in taking it forward; the concern over the challenge of raising money for the Jewish Continuity agenda – it needed to be focused and marketable. They agreed that two issues needed to be addressed: "The strategic intent of the new organisation" (to be examined by Kestenbaum and Spitz) and "Operational/organisational issues" (to be examined by Fox and Stanton).

15th July 1996, Implementation Group
Agreed a proposed launch date for the new merged body of 1st January, 1997.

7th November 1996, Jewish Continuity Trustees
"It was suggested that, given the balance of leadership, the merger was clearly not a JIA takeover and that Continuity would be well represented. Furthermore, the merger represented a dramatic change for British Jewry and an achievement for the cause of Jewish education in that it was now being taken up by one of the two major charities in the community."
It was also noted that "Jonny Ariel would be in charge of the community/educational programmes."
The Trustees supported the proposed merger.[377]

[375] Kerner reported in interview that after a further exasperating attempt to secure Orthodox participation under the one roof of a reworked Jewish Continuity, he gave up, and on the 25th May 1996 decided to push for a merger – it was a defining moment. (At least one other interviewee claimed to have originated the merger concept.) In contrast, Wagner did not appear to have decided on the merger when he wrote his Review.
[376] Lawton was clearly out of the running for any future role.

10th November 1996, Jewish Continuity and JIA leaderships held simultaneous meetings
Each voted in favour of the merger and they then came together to confirm the decision.

December 1996 'Continuity Connects' (Jewish Continuity News Update)
By the December 1996 edition, as it was about to merge with JIA, Jewish Continuity listed its achievements as including RESQUJE, Jewish Community Allocations Board, Hebrew Reading Crash Course, Israel Trips, Limmud, Arts Resource Centre, JAMS, UJS, Research, Jerusalem 3000, Jewish Community Information, and much more.

The United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA)

30th May 1996, Kestenbaum was approached to head the new merged body [378]

October 1996, Kestenbaum formerly commenced as Chief Executive, UJIA
Kestenbaum brought over Jonny Ariel[379] to lead the Jewish education work – effectively replacing Lawton.

October 1996-June 1997, Kestenbaum-Ariel consultation and planning[380]
They entered into an extensive consultation and review process over a period of six to nine months which was a prelude to the launch of the new UJIA and its Jewish Renewal Department headed by Ariel.

19th, 20th and 27th February and 14th and 17th April 1997, Strategic Planning Group (SPG) made up of senior experienced professionals[381]
Ariel consulted with parallel professional and lay groupings (involving Leslie Wagner and others[382]). (This was in addition to many consultations and presentation meetings that took place across the community.)
It was recorded in the Notes of the professional SPG that: "Jonathan Kestenbaum stated that he had fought to resist the time pressure to come up with a strategy too quickly, but it was necessary to have a strategy to articulate by the 1998 campaign launch." i.e. autumn 1997.
It was noted that: "The four major areas of work are: planning, personnel, community, youth and students." Another area that was discussed was Community Building or Community Development – but this was not pursued as a distinct area of work. Youth and Students were to be presented as the flagship area within these headings (across the educational field) and run with a cross-communal approach and with Israel as a central feature.

Spring 1997, Ariel also established a Professional Advisory Group (mainly from partner organisations)
It played an important role in positively engaging partner organisational professionals.

---

[377] The Jewish Continuity Trustees meeting, 16th September, 1996, recorded that: "The Chairman was asked what safeguards would be in place for Continuity's programmes before the merger was agreed. Without safeguards, the organisation could shift its entire focus back to Israel within a few years."
In 2010, Michael Sinclair was sufficiently concerned of this danger that he wrote to the *Jewish Chronicle* to publicly warn the UJIA Chair, Mick Davis, that he was obliged to retain the Jewish Continuity education agenda in Britain (Jewish Chronicle, 25th June 2010, p 34).
[378] The Chief Rabbi himself became embroiled in a deep crisis around the recently deceased (18th August 1996) Rabbi Hugo Gryn and subsequent events (the Chief Rabbi's leaked letter to a Strictly Orthodox rabbinic authority concerning Gryn and a memorial attended by Sacks (January-February 1997). It had already been agreed that the Chief Rabbi would not play a leading role in the UJIA.
[379] Ariel was not Orthodox.
[380] Initial delays due to Kestenbaum sustaining a serious football injury resulting in weeks of hospitalisation.
[381] The professional group members were Jonny Ariel, Michael Mail, Simon Caplan, Roy Graham, Robert Rabinowitz, Jonathan Kestenbaum (who only attended briefly).
[382] Including Richard Bolchover, Sarah Bronzite; Barry Kosmin; Fred Worms. Tony Danker also played a role.

June 1997, 'JIA[383] Vision for Our Future' (UJIA Planning document)
It identified its work as "the rescue of Jews from countries of distress and the renewal of Jewish life within our community. The common link for these tasks will be Israel – a home for all Jews and an inspiration for the renewal of this community." (Agreed 9th June 1997, UJIA Board meeting.)

23rd June 1997, Professional Advisory Group
It was announced that Anthony Spitz would Chair the UJIA Jewish Renewal Directorate and the Vision and Mission Statements were shared and discussed.

1st July 1997, Strategic Planning Group (Lay) Note
It was stressed that the intervention areas needed to be decided first and then small lay teams should be appointed in each area to work on them (these groups being expert and focused) – and not the Jewish Continuity Task Groups which had been deemed to have lost their way.

July 1997, 'The New Organisation – Vision for Our Future' (July 1997) (PowerPoint)
It noted: "6 months work; Community-wide consultation; Getting the basics right; Creating a platform for action" and their Rescue and Renewal agenda, and the identification of strategic priorities as Educational Leadership, Young People and Israel Experience (these became the lead areas of UJIA Jewish Renewal, together with a smaller Department of Research and Development).

8th September 1997, UJIA Professional Advisory Group
It was announced that the UJIA Departments were intended to be Strategic Planning, Educational Leadership, Lay Leadership (did not emerge as a separate department though work was developed in this area), Israel Experience and Young People.
At that meeting, Ariel also set out the guiding principles for the new organisation as collaborative, consultative, national, community-wide, reflective, innovative, strategic and accountable. However, this was to be further refined over the following months.

26th September 1997, *The London Jewish News* p 2, 'Charity's new look'
Announced that week's launch of UJIA.

8th October 1997, the Renewal budget for the second six months of 1997
It was an interim budget managing the transition from Jewish Continuity to UJIA.

25th November 1997, UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive (first meeting)
Spitz set out the remit and purview of the Executive and reports were presented from the Strategic Planning Group, Educational Leadership and Young People and Israel Experience.

25th November 1997, Renewal Communications document for the first Renewal Executive meeting
It analysed the challenges in marketing Jewish Renewal and the lessons of Jewish Continuity in the areas of religious tensions, personnel and the approach to community. It also floated the new organisation's message as: "No contribution touches more lives."

11th February 1998, UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive
It was noted that Philip Skelker had been secured to lead the Educational Leadership Department though it was not yet publicised.[384]

[383] The name change to UJIA had yet to be confirmed.
[384] Skelker had been the Head Teacher at Carmel College – a private Orthodox Jewish Boarding School which had recently folded – and had subsequently been teaching at Eton College. His appointment at UJIA was then delayed for several months when his son was seriously injured in Israel. At the Renewal Executive meeting of the 23rd April, 1998, it was recorded that Skelker would start September 1998.

The 1998 budget heralded the Jewish Renewal structure and operation under the departmental headings of Young People, Israel Experience, Educational Leadership and Strategic Planning plus UJIA Regional budgets.[385]

27th July 1998, a UJIA document

It claimed achievements in establishing strong partnerships with a number of leading communal bodies[386] and in addressing the challenges of ""Jewish Renewal": Programming Youth and Students; Innovative Israel Experiences; Upgrade Central Agencies; Renewal Educators Recruitment Campaign." [387]

7th August 1998, agreement signed between the UJIA (Jonathan Kestenbaum) and the Jewish Agency for Israel (JAFI) (Dubi Bergman, Head of the UK Delegation, Jewish Agency/World Zionist Organisation)

A *modus operandi* was agreed. This agreement covered the Resource Unit (JPMP/Makor), the Israel Desk (Israel Experience) [388] and Shlichut (the delegation of Israeli education emissaries working with British Jewish youth groups). [389] It agreed that the staff would be employed as JAFI staff but (with the exception of the Shlichim) would be professionally accountable to Jonny Ariel, Director of UJIA Jewish Renewal. It stated: "All these functional responsibilities which were taken by Jonny Ariel will be under the responsibility of the Head of the Jewish Agency in Great Britain."[390] This was a pivotal agreement: the budgets ran through JAFI and, in effect, UJIA was directing the educational work. (In the case of dispute, Bergman could raise issues directly with Kestenbaum and take it further if required).[391]

15th September 1998, UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive

The Renewal structure and professional and lay personnel were all in place.

24th November 1998, UJIA Jewish Renewal Strategic Planning Group (Lay)

---

[385] The UJIA Regions were those main centres with UJIA fundraising infrastructures in place (Manchester, Leeds (Yorkshire), Glasgow (Scotland) and Liverpool (Merseyside)) and local committees were appointed to allocate their budgets according to the UJIA activity areas (as indicated by the departmental structure and strategic headings).

[386] It listed: The Centre for Jewish Education (Reform/Liberal), The Agency for Jewish Education (Orthodox), the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the Jews College London (Orthodox), Leo Baeck College (Reform/Liberal), The United Synagogue Community Development Department (Orthodox), Hillel (supporting Jewish student provision on campus).

[387] The UJIA also attempted to establish a 'Renewal Consultancy' service to support partner organisations through difficult change processes. This was attempted with both the Orthodox Jews College (which became the London School of Jewish Studies) and the Progressive Leo Baeck College. The former did not work out and the latter ran into financial difficulties – though change did, eventually, occur in both frameworks – together with their own associated educational partners.

[388] The Israel Experience Department continued to use the Jewish Agency's infrastructure for the provision of all programmes in Israel.

[389] The Informal Education Department (JPMP – later re-named Makor (1st February 1999) and marked Jonny Ariel's Renewal imprint on a previously Jewish Agency-directed project (it further evolved on the 1st April 2000, when Makor was formally merged with the Association for Jewish Youth (AJY) to become Makor-AJY – AJY was a century old Jewish youth work agency for Jewish youth provision; the merger marked the ascendency of the Israel and informal Jewish education-oriented JPMP/Makor and the decline in the Jewish club sector (as opposed to youth movements); the UJIA/Jewish Agency's Roy Graham directed the newly merged agency).

[390] An amount of $600,000 was earmarked as a JAFI contribution to the budget but the rest of the funds came from UJIA. Though JAFI managed all of the payments (also including most of the UJIA funding) for Israel Experience and Informal Jewish Education, UJIA Jewish Renewal decided how it was to be spent.

[391] One senior professional described it as the "abdication of educational responsibility" on the part of the Jewish Agency for Israel; in fact these developments were to mark the beginning of a worldwide shift in the Jewish Agency's mode of operation – and also reflected its growing financial difficulties.

It supported the Research and Development Department and identified its purpose as "to co-ordinate the work of the three central pillars namely Israel Experience, Young People and Educational Leadership."[392]

8th November 1998, 11th February 1999, 16th May 1999, 14th September 1999, 21st November 1999 UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive meetings
Further refined and implemented the UJIA Jewish Renewal strategy and operation which contributed to the eventual publication of the strategic plan at the end of 2000. However, fundraising remained challenging for the UJIA.

Autumn 1999, UJIA power point presentation to the *Jewish Chronicle* staff
It summarised what it termed 'Phase One'. Clearly, they were looking for positive news coverage. They set out their four goals for the Jewish Continuity-JIA merger into UJIA as "Create New Vision/Mission; Develop Strategy; Build/Combine Resources; Launch New Campaign." They claimed success in each area and summarised the "Renewal Achievements" as increasing young people participation in quality Jewish programmes, training leaders and more Jewish/Israel input reaching more young people (12,000 participants); increase in attendance on Israel Experience programmes in Schools, Youth Movements, Leadership Training, through bursaries and setting standards for programme delivery, and more work with 'people to people' meetings between Israelis and British Jews (2,100 participants); and the Educational Leadership work aiming for "Every Jewish Educator … [to be] inspired and inspiring" across the community through networks, bursaries, training and professional development (110 participants). They also presented the "Campaign Achievements" as "Mobilise British Jewry … to support young Jewish People" through an increased number of donations (they claimed that in December 1998 there were under 5,000 donations but had exceeded 24,000 by September 1999, 104 active groups, 1,000 volunteers and an overall increase in income). They summarised 1998 campaign income as £12,806,000 and expenditure at £13,825,000, including £4,024,000[393] for Jewish Renewal.
These claims were inevitably manipulated to present UJIA in the best possible light. However, it provided their own sense of their journey so far, and how they wanted it to be perceived – and is also illustrative of the progress that had undoubtedly been made.
They went on to set out the aims for Phase Two: "Sharpen Mission" through continuing to develop coherence across all areas of work, focusing on young people and the UJIA's commitment to them (in Britain and elsewhere); "Co-ordinate Approach" through working with communities around the world and using a specialist approach for different parts of the community; "Build Leadership" with the new team, leadership training and professional recruitment. Their 2000 Campaign strapline was introduced as: "Our Children, Our Future, Our Promise."

November 1999, 'UJIA Jewish Renewal – 2000 Programme'
It proposed a 1999 budget of £3,055,000 and a 2000 budget of £3,706,900 (revised to £3,305,000).

March 2000, Anthony Spitz had been succeeded by Michael Goldstein as Chair of UJIA Jewish Renewal

13th March 2000, 14th June 2000, 23rd July 2000, 12th September 2000, 12th November 2000, UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive meetings included planning for the new three years plan
New ideas to expand the Renewal platform (Lay Leadership Development, Community Development, Innovation Fund, Technology and Education) were all discussed and rejected.

[392] This lay group was led by Wagner, whose review of Jewish Continuity had commented that the December 1994 Jewish Continuity Strategic Plan had stated that it was concentrating "on four key areas: Personnel, Israel Experience, Community Development and Outreach with the 13-35 age group as a focus in each of the four areas." Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 21 (Wagner Review).
[393] Overall figures presented in this way need to be analysed in more depth – for example, does this figure include an apportioned UJIA overhead (running costs).

In the June meeting, Tony Danker asked about any changes in the Jewish world. (The situation in Israel was to seriously deteriorate in September 2000).
July 2000, the importance of measurable targets was noted, and also "the first three years were characterised by consolidation and implementing proper management but with limited innovation."[394]
Jon Boyd asked at the meeting: "How do we respond to the Anthony Wagerman [UJIA Communications Director] view: "Renewal is largely virtuous but dull"?"[395]

10th November 2000, Jewish Chronicle, Editorial
"Now, the good news
Amid violence in Israel, and flooding here at home, there were this week at least two bits of distinctly encouraging news within British Jewry. The first involved the United Jewish Israel Appeal – an organisation relaunched three years ago in a potentially uneasy marriage of the old JIA and a newer, but troubled, organisation called Jewish Continuity. The UJIA's annual review meeting – an exercise in public accountability which, itself, reflects a new trend in communal leadership – reported a sizeable rise in donations, as well as a range of successes in developing a dual agenda combining support for Israel projects with unprecedented backing for Jewish education, outreach and training within the British community."[396] *Jewish Chronicle*, 10th November 2000.

January, 2001, 'The Next Horizon' (2001) (the UJIA Jewish Renewal three years strategic plan)
It was a strong piece of work that was in the public domain. The document set out a clear strategic planning process with a brief note on the condition of the Jewish world followed by the challenges faced and what success might achieve.[397]

[394] In the early 2000s, subsequent attempts at innovation (professionally led) were rejected (at a lay level).
[395] Also recorded as "Worthy but dull" by others. (The phrase may have been originated by Tony Danker.)
[396] Even that week's *Jewish Chronicle* cartoon by the often more caustic Jeremy Gerlis was supportive of the UJIA.
[397] In fact, in the absence of an alternative plan, it was sufficiently robust to provide direction to the organisation for the following decade.

7.2 APPENDIX 2

A DOCUMENT-BASED TABLE OF KEY FEATURES OF RELEVANT INITIATIVES, REPORTS AND OTHER SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS (1971-2000)

Introduction

Appendix 2 summarises the salient elements of each of the major initiatives, reports and other developments relevant to this research. It is not possible to create a generic template within which to present each, as they are different in context, approach and structure; furthermore, they tend to use terminology in different ways without universal definitions for their operating principles and functions. However, this Appendix provides a unique summary, charting the most prominent features of each one (it does not cover an assessment of impact). It relies almost exclusively upon primary documentation, utilising significant extracts. This is not a comprehensive survey of the period and greater attention is paid to events occurring in the 1990s, as they are more central to this research.

The initiatives covered are:

- Chief Rabbi Jakobovits's 'Let my people know' (1971)
- The Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT) (1972-93)
- Chief Rabbi Sacks Inauguration Speech (1st September 1991)
- 'Securing our Future – an inquiry into Jewish Education in the United Kingdom' (JEDT 1992) (The Worms Report (JEDT, September 1992))
- JEDT Attempt at Follow-up to Worms Report, 1992
- Response from the Office of the Chief Rabbi (led by Jonathan Kestenbaum), 1992-3
- Jewish Continuity (1993-1998)
- The JIA-Jewish Continuity Agreement (1994)
- Jewish Continuity Strategic Plan: 'Jewish Continuity: Strategic Direction – 5 Year Goals and 1995 Programme' (22nd December 1994)
- The Mandel Critique (1-2 October 1995)
- The Wagner Review (March 1996)
- The United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA) (1997-2000)
- UJIA Jewish Renewal Strategic Plan: 'The Next Horizon' (2001)

Chief Rabbi Jakobovits's 'Let my people know' (1971)

Overview

Chief Rabbi Lord Jakobovits's 'Let my people know – Proposals for the Development of Jewish Education.'[398] initiative (Jakobovits, November 1971), led to the formation of the Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT) 1972-1993.[399] It was under the direction of the Chief Rabbi; focused primarily on school-building and to a lesser degree on other educational projects; raised funds from a limited number of targeted, wealthy individuals (and institutions) who were also involved in allocating the funds; it also provided a small amount of conditional funds for non-Orthodox educational projects. It had limited professional support providing expertise, and acted primarily as a grant-making body according to defined criteria. Jakobovits described it in terms of "the communal energies and revised priorities generated by the Jewish Educational Development Trust as the first corporate endeavour to raise Jewish education to the top of Anglo-Jewry's domestic agenda and budget." JEDT, 1981/82, p 2).

Problem Definition

"Wherein lies the glory of beautiful synagogues if tomorrow they will be empty monuments to our neglect? In this emergency of appalling defections among our youth, our expenditure in money and energy in Jewish education represents our defence budget in the communal economy, and it must be given the highest priority over every other Jewish effort." (Jakobovits, April 1967, Inauguration speech quoted in Bermant, 1990, p 192).

Aims

"Next to Israel, Jewish education must become our principal concern and the top priority in our communal budgeting. Thoroughly modernising our thinking and planning, congregations and individuals will have to accept the new facts of Jewish life already accepted elsewhere –whereby more money is spent on schools than shools [synagogues]. Shools preserve Jews; schools create them." (Jakobovits, 1971, p 4).

"There is a dearth of fully trained and qualified teachers of Hebrew and Jewish knowledge at all levels and, with anticipated growth and expansion of schools, this shortage will be even more marked. Unless decisive action is taken now, this may be a gravely restrictive factor, affecting all levels of educational development. Without an adequate supply of competent teachers new schools will fail to achieve their purpose." (Jakobovits, 1971, p 16). [400]

The Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT) (1970s-93)

Formation

Jakobovits's vision inspired the creation of the JEDT as the vehicle for implementing his ideas. Moshe Davis (Director of the Office of the Chief Rabbi under Jakobovits) brought together a number of wealthy Jewish individuals who were ready to support the JEDT with significant personal funding (Bermant, 1990, p 194-195; Worms, 1996, p 234).

Problem Definition[401]

"… Anglo-Jewry is still confronted with a grim prospect for the concluding decades of this century. The defection of our young people, a growing rate of intermarriage and the dropout rate of our uncommitted threaten an unprecedented crisis. Inadequate Jewish education clearly lies at the root of the problem and only a thorough and mature understanding of Judaism, through a greatly improved Jewish education, can provide a solution." (Jakobovits, 1971, p 15).

Aims

"Our aim is to place education higher on the community's agenda to ensure that our heritage is transmitted from generation to generation in a way that has continuing meaning and impact. By supporting Jewish education, the trust is involved in securing the community's future. By supporting

[398] As previously noted, there was already a communal campaign throughout the Jewish western world called 'Let My People Go', campaigning for the release of Soviet Jewry.

[399] The JEDT continued to function past this date but only to complete pre-existing projects.

[400] See FN 231.

However, there was more success in teacher training.

[401] In addition to that noted above under: 'Let my people know' (1971).

the JEDT you will play your part in this vital work."
"Jewish education is the most effective way of guaranteeing a healthy, thriving and vibrant Jewish community in this country." It argued that children needed access to Jewish knowledge "to understand and cherish their Jewishness, respect its values and have a commitment to the Jewish community and the State of Israel."
"Our purpose is to heighten interest and substantially increase support for Jewish education throughout the community. The funding emphasis is on improving and expanding facilities in four major areas – schools, teacher training, resources and innovative projects." (JEDT, n.d.)

Role

"The JEDT is uniquely placed to take a communal perspective on educational issues and we continue to be at the forefront of educational development, evaluating the current and future needs of the community as a whole. We will endeavour to bring about a more comprehensive and coherent approach to the community's educational requirements." (JEDT, n.d.)
(It made its biggest impact in school-building, and to a lesser extent in teacher training.)

Cross-communal Approach

It was a central Orthodox project. However, it did support a limited number of non-Orthodox projects[402] under clear constraints.[403] It saw its role as addressing the "needs of the community as whole."

Funding

JEDT's budget for 1992 was reported to be £1.4m and funding was agreed through to August 1993. However, there was a suggestion that, as a result of the recession, it only achieved half that figure.

Dissolution

In the JEDT Trustees Meeting 6th December 1993, it noted that the JEDT was wound down on the 31st August 1993.[404]

Chief Rabbi Sacks Inauguration Speech (1st September 1991)

Problem Definition

"We have suffered from complacency and religious underachievement. We have injured ourselves by divisions and petty rivalries. A section of our community is slowly drifting away. We are losing our most precious possessions – Jewish identity, the Jewish family, above all our commitment to the Torah which inspired generations to lead lives of holiness and moral beauty. Are we, who once heard the call of destiny, deaf to it now? Are we, who taught the world that religious faith is a journey from slavery to freedom, unable to cope with the challenges of freedom? God forbid. We have lost our prophetic vision. But we who live at this momentous time can recover it together." (Sacks, 1991, p 7).

Broad Aims

He called upon the rabbis to "bring close, enthuse and inspire", the educators to explore "how we can bring the school, the synagogue and the Jewish home closer so that they reinforce one another" and the lay leadership: "let us work together to plan, not for today or even tomorrow but for the next generation. Let us start now to recruit the leaders of ten and twenty years' time. Let us be less cautious, less insular, less afraid of experiment and open debate." (Sacks, 1991, pp 10-11). Sacks emphasised the ever more corrosive impact of modernity on late twentieth century British Jewish identity and presented a far broader definition of education that went beyond schools. (Elsewhere, Sacks stated: "Let us renew Jewish learning at every level, formal and informal, child and adult, in every context and every form. … The greatest single renewal of Anglo-Jewry will come about if we make learning the heritage of every Jew." (Sacks, 1991, p 9).

[402] For example, the Akiva School.
[403] Including requirements for Shabbat and Kashrut Observance (Sabbath and Kosher food).
[404] It was also noted: "The JEDT had succeeded in placing Jewish education at the centre of the communal agenda and, through its think Tank Report "Securing Our Future", it had paved the way for the creation of Jewish Continuity. He [the Chief Rabbi] expressed his gratitude to the Trustees and, in particular, to Michael Phillips for ensuring a smooth hand-over." The JEDT Trustees appeared to be happy with the arrangement for Jewish Continuity to succeed the JEDT.

Sacks's explanation of 'renewal' was as follows: "A Decade of Renewal: I choose the word carefully. Judaism recognises not *shinui* but *chiddush*, not change but revitalisation. And if we do not renew our institutions they will die the slow death of increasing irrelevance." (Sacks, 1991). He also noted some positive developments: "Our community has been immeasurably enriched in recent years by yeshivot, Chassidic groups, outreach movements, new ventures in adult and informal education." (Sacks, 1991) Sacks concluded: "And I no longer doubted what I had to do in Anglo-Jewry. I had to begin by calling on you to join me in creating *a Decade of Jewish Renewal*. Let us cease to be a community whose institutions and attitudes are growing old. Let us start this day and for the next ten years a process of working together to build a community where Jewish children can stand proud and free, knowing where they came from, where they are going to and before Whom they stand." Sacks, 1991.
His final rallying call was: "Let us work together to plan and create a Decade of Renewal of Jewish leadership, education and spirituality." (Sacks, 1991, p13).

'Securing our Future – an Inquiry into Jewish Education in the United Kingdom' (JEDT 1992) (The Worms Report (JEDT, September 1992))

Overview

The Worms Report (Jewish Educational Development Trust, 1992) was the result of a JEDT think tank that was never formally implemented. It sought to overcome what it described as the "fragmentation" within the Jewish education system by proposing the establishment of "a representative, umbrella body for Jewish education advised by professional educators and those engaged in communal planning and research" (JEDT, 1992, p xii) and understood by some to mean working across the community; and it had a focus on personnel development. However, it was overtaken by Chief Rabbi Sacks's Jewish Continuity.

Formation

The JEDT all male think Tank[405] chaired by Fred Worms plus the two senior JEDT professionals (Michael Mail and Syma Weinberg). It also included Rabbi Anthony (Tony) Bayfield, an identifiably senior figure within the Reform movement.

Role

It was set up to examine the situation for "the eighteen and under age group" (JEDT, 1992, p iii), and "to develop a strategy for Jewish educational renewal. The report does not seek to be narrowly prescriptive, but rather to identify priorities and to propose some principles for effective educational change." (JEDT, 1992, p viii).

Problem Definition

"The key to Anglo-Jewry's survival lies in education. Inter-marriage is rife. A large proportion of Jews have lost interest in their heritage. The number of one-parent families is increasing and there are more children with problematical halachic [Jewish law] provenance. The community is shrinking at the rate of 4,300 per annum. From a post-war 460,000, we are now less than 300,000 and if the rate of decline cannot be arrested, we shall be less than 250,000 in some twenty years time.

…

At any one time, 45% of our children aged between five and eighteen are deprived of formal Jewish education. 60% of our teenagers have opted out by not attending either Hebrew classes or Jewish schools after their Bar/Batmitzvah. By the time they are aged seventeen only 10% will have stayed the course." (JEDT, 1992, p iii).

Aims

It identified the challenge for Jewish education: "It is to raise standards, dramatically increase participation in Jewish learning, and ultimately to change the outlook of future generations of young Jews." (JEDT, 1992, p x).

Cross-communal Approach

The Report itself did not explicitly support a pluralist or cross-communal cooperation, though Worms himself appeared to indicate sympathy for a pluralist approach (Worms, 1996, pp 246-247) – his view

[405] "Members of the Think Tank Committee: Mr. Fred S. Worms *(Chairman)*, Rabbi Anthony Bayfield, Mr. Allan Fisher, Dr. Myer Goldman, Mr. Gabriel Goldstein, Mr. Henry Israel, Dr. Stephen Miller (Editor), Mr. Maurice De Vries. Professional Consultants: Mr. Michael Mail, Mrs. Syma Weinberg." (JEDT, 1992, p vii).

was contested.

Analysis

The Report identified 'five critical areas' that affected the 'quality and impact of Jewish education': the challenge of recruiting, training and retaining suitable teaching staff; a failure to utilise informal educators and to bring formal and informal education together; 'limited continuity of approach to the Jewish curriculum' and to assessment; lack of clarity on the role and deployment of lay leadership; 'the limited use of marketing techniques and concepts' to gain support for Jewish education, recruitment of personnel and promotion of educational programmes (JEDT, 1992, p ix).

Findings and Recommendations

"The absence of a strong central Jewish educational authority in the UK has produced a fissiparious [sic – fissiparous: literally meaning the production of new individuals by fission; splitting] system without the strength and financial clout to follow up recommendations."[406] (JEDT, 1992, p v).

It favoured five guiding principles: the need to apply cost-benefit analysis to prioritise the most effective programmes in the face of limited resources; a research based strategy; "the simple recognition that Jewish education cannot succeed as the sum of a set of independent parts"; there "is an urgent need for collaboration between people and across institutions to create progress at many different levels"; the need to develop "people not buildings", recommending that "the recruitment, training and development of educational personnel should be placed at the top of the communal agenda at least until the end of this decade"; an "integrated approach." As an example of the latter, the Report stated: "To have a real impact on performance, the policy should be to tackle a manageable set of related issues in a systematic way. Initially, the priority should be to address the interlocking problems of recruitment, training and curriculum development." (JEDT, 1992, pp x-xi).[407]

Key recommendation presented by Worms: "that a National Council for Jewish Education be created is, I believe, the almost inevitable solution to our structural deficiency." (JEDT, 1992, p vi and p 43).[408] Under 'Communal Infrastructure', Worms recommended: "The Community should establish a representative, umbrella body for Jewish education advised by professional educators and those engaged in communal planning and research. Its brief should be to encourage and facilitate educational collaboration and planning." (JEDT, 1992, p xii).

JEDT Attempts at Follow-up to the Worms Report (1992), 1992

Led by the JEDT two professionals,[409] they suggested a Conference that "will become the working group on organisational structure and will ultimately become the National Council for Jewish Education" (NCJE) and identified six priority areas (as future sub-committees) all to be under JEDT administration and monitoring: personnel; interaction between formal and informal [education]; lay leadership; marketing; organisational structure; curriculum development ('Securing Our Future – JEDT Think Tank Report: Report Follow-Up' JEDT, 5th October 1992a).

They then addressed the role of the NCJE: "1. to foster closer coordination and cooperation amongst the various educational bodies. 2. to facilitate greater rationalisation of services, where feasible. 3. to develop educational research and planning. 4. to provide a forum for discussion on common educational issues. 5. to act as a catalyst in the development of educational initiatives, particularly communal projects that could not be undertaken by individual organisations. 6. to represent and advocate on behalf of Jewish education within the Jewish and wider community. 7. to establish a

[406] He quoted as evidence several JEDT initiatives, including the JEDT report on teachers (JEDT, 1978). The Report concurred with the 1978 findings but noted that the situation had possibly since worsened with regard to teachers.

[407] The five elements were aligned with a number of specific matching projects (JEDT, 1992, p xii-xiv).

[408] The JEDT was already confidentially considering the creation of a 'Central Council' for Jewish Education (ahead of the release of the Worms Report, September 1992) at least as early as the spring 1992.

[409] Relying on two documents: 'Securing Our Future – JEDT Think Tank Report Follow-Up'– no authorship is stated but it is probably Mail and Weinberg, 5th October 1992a; 'Establishing the "National Council for Jewish Education [NCJE]"', (Mail and Weinberg) 5th October 1992b.

broadly based fundraising campaign on behalf of Jewish education. 8. to work in collaboration with the UK Advisory Council of the Joint Authority for Jewish Zionist Education[410] in strengthening educational links with Israel." ('Establishing the "National Council for Jewish Education [NCJE]'" JEDT 5th October 1992b).
It also stated that "Such a body would (a) not involve itself in service delivery, (b) seek to be inclusive rather than exclusive and (c) respect the different religious/ideological backgrounds of the various educational organisations."
It then discussed "Breadth of representation" and set out the challenge: "The scope of educational activity and the religious/ideological parameters need to be determined, recognising the sensitivities involved."; under "Fundraising" it discussed three possible funding sources namely, contributions from constituents of the newly formed NCJE, ""outside" sources for funding on a project by project basis" and finally "an on-going "United Educational Appeal" run under the Council's auspices."
The authors also became rather more equivocal on JEDT's relationship with the new body: "The NCJE could view itself as a JEDT-style development fund supporting new projects." (JEDT 5th October 1992b).

Response from the Office of the Chief Rabbi (led by Jonathan Kestenbaum), 1992-3

In his letter dated October, 1992 (though typed up 3rd November, 1992),[411] Kestenbaum (on behalf of the Office of the Chief Rabbi), responded and acknowledged the problem of 'fragmentation' in the Jewish education system and the proposal for 'a representative umbrella body', but claimed: "This proposal contains several flaws. A representative council will be unable to engage in genuine initiative, and the Chief Rabbinate will find itself bogged down in three areas: i) The institutional struggle over turf and territory. ii) Institutional expectation of financial gain. iii) constant ideological tension." (Office of the Chief Rabbi (Kestenbaum), October 1992 pp 1-2).
Kestenbaum argued that '"representative" alternatives' to address the fragmentation problem could be found elsewhere."
Kestenbaum was clearing the way for Sacks's own initiative. He did recognise that the JEDT think tank had "established a certain momentum"[412] (and also discussed the Kalms Report into the future of the United Synagogue (Orthodox umbrella body)[413]); that it "has given Jewish education "column inches" – how do we maintain the positive elements of that momentum without losing control of the process?"; and that "The National Council for Jewish Education is an attempt, amongst other things, to give coherence to educational fundraising." But, he asked: "What are the alternatives within a more flexible system?"[414] He argued that the Worms proposal would not effectively facilitate "educational innovation and best practice" and preferred to see a 'representative council' with an alternative locus.[415] He also expressed his reservations concerning the Bureau for Jewish Education as proposed

[410] A JAFI/WZO initiative.
[411] Office of the Chief Rabbi (Kestenbaum, J.) 'The Chief Rabbinate and Education – An Enabling Unit for Anglo-Jewish Education' October 1992 (typed up 3rd November 1992).
[412] ibid p 2
[413] ibid p 2.
He then went on to consider the Kalms Report, with particular reference to its section on Education within the United Synagogue, which, he noted, placed "responsibility for education at local level" and proposed "The establishment of a new Bureau for Jewish Education …" to "offer guidance, inspection and training to communities and schools on a supplier/purchaser basis"." (ibid p 2). Kestenbaum then commented with reference to both Worms and Kalms that it was unclear to him "what happens next" (ibid p 2). He then approvingly noted that "both focus relentlessly on what can best be done centrally and what must be done at local level." (ibid p 2) and that he saw within the Kalms Report's proposal for a Bureau for Jewish Education something close to his "own conception of an enabling unit since it focuses on servicing rather than controlling, consulting rather than imposing." (ibid p 2). However, he stated his concern about associating with the Kalms Report which in his view required "massive restructuring" in a "traumatic process" and the uncertainly brought by a new United Synagogue lay leadership over fallout from the Report (especially over some services that it advocated should be dropped). (ibid pp 2-3).
[414] ibid p 2
[415] ibid p 3.

by the Kalms Report, fearing involvement in "numerous political battles."[416] (A further complication for the JEDT was the financial difficulty involved in building Immanuel College.[417])

Kestenbaum introduced the concept of "An Enabling Unit for Jewish Education" (more in tune with the language of the Mandel Centre in Jerusalem led by Seymour Fox[418]), as a central body that partners others and enables them to better deliver their services. He noted the capacity of the Chief Rabbinate to facilitate Jewish education, "well placed to harness lay enthusiasm and shape community initiatives." He reaffirmed his opposition to a 'representative council', and then moved on to discuss "the role of the centre in Jewish education."[419]: an 'enabling unit' focused upon personnel; a focus on 'localities' in the bringing together of specialised educational settings (formal, supplementary, synagogue-based, family, etc.) supported by expertise, resources and funding; the recruitment of fresh lay leadership. (Office of the Chief Rabbi (Kestenbaum), October 1992, pp 4-5).

He summarised the key elements as: "Personnel, Community Education and Lay Leadership".[420] (Kestenbaum's model was in some ways rather closer to that of the later UJIA Jewish Renewal than Jewish Continuity.)

Regarding structure, he advocated thus: "The unit is to be small, and task-oriented. Once the tasks are identified, one must quantify objectives, and create individual lay led units for each task, thereby increasing opportunities for leadership and maximising ownership. I envisage a servicing agency with two or three professional experts. The expertise required is a function of each of the units [sic] tasks (personnel, community education, Lay Leadership)."[421] (However, he stressed that the task list was open to further discussion.) Here, Kestenbaum established the lay-led Task Group notion that was eventually adopted by Jewish Continuity.[422] He then presented four criteria for identifying 'enabling tasks': "1. Exclusively centre-orientated tasks. 2. Genuine community need. 3. Educational coherence. 4. The ability to translate tasks into quantifiable objectives." (Office of the Chief Rabbi (Kestenbaum), October 1992, p 5).

Kestenbaum's approach was plain and may be summarised as: understand the capacity, context and strengths; clearly define the role and tasks; create a 'fit for purpose' organisational framework to deliver the tasks which should be selected against a clear criteria.

He did make absolutely clear the following:

"I believe that the Chief Rabbi must be directly identified with this initiative. It is a key component for the Decade of Renewal and each one of the three components (Personnel, Community, Education [sic: should probably have read 'Community Education'] and Lay Leadership) will allow for a practical translation of the Chief Rabbi's philosophy." (Office of the Chief Rabbi (Kestenbaum), October 1992 p 5).

Elsewhere in the paper he also addressed timing and planning as well as fundraising for Jewish Education, where he focused the proposed 'enabling unit' on Special Educational Projects over Capital Funding for Large Scale Development or Shortfall on Operational Budgets which might be left to

---

Kestenbaum also wrote: "Indeed my proposal is that we allow the Joint Authority Advisory Council [referring to an Israel-based project of the Jewish Agency for Israel and World Zionist Organisation – and seen as a safer space with its Israel orientation] to become de facto the National Council for Jewish Education and so become the forum for cross institutional debate and discussion." ibid p 3.

[416] ibid p 3

[417] The JEDT was building Immanuel College (a private Jewish Secondary School in London) and was running into huge financial challenges – this may have added to the willingness of the Trustees to hand over their Jewish education 'mandate' to the Office of the Chief Rabbi prior to the launch of Jewish Continuity.)

[418] Indeed, the document went on: "I suggest asking the Mandel Research Centre for Jewish Education to consider taking this process on as part of their brief." (ibid p 7). (Both Kestenbaum and Ariel were Mandel Fellows.)

[419] ibid pp 3-4.

[420] ibid p 5.

[421] ibid p 5.

[422] In UJIA Jewish Renewal, Kestenbaum and Ariel reconstituted them as 'Policy Groups' in a more limited number of activity areas and focused on high level policy rather than detailed project analysis and assessment.

another mechanism. He also stated that the JEDT was to be "wound down". (Office of the Chief Rabbi (Kestenbaum), October 1992).[423]

Cross-communal Approach

At this point, there was no clear position on the management of cross-communal issues – partly, perhaps, because it was still in developement.

Problem Definition

A document dated 3rd February 1993,[424] and prepared by Kestenbaum (Office of the Chief Rabbi) for a consultation with the Mandel Centre, set out the early thinking. It noted: "Anglo Jewish education comes an exceptionally poor third after Israel and Welfare, in the search for community support and public confidence." (p 2). He also noted the need to overcome communal ambivalence[425] "to give Jewish education the communal, prominence, [sic] leadership and funds it deserves." (p 4). Kestenbaum then drew upon Sacks's views and noted the need to "Make Education the highest communal priority" and that "there are many 'educational ways toward continuity'" (p 4) and that powerful advocates will need to be recruited because "unless we educate our community to learn, understand, appreciate, love, practice and celebrate their Judaism, there will simply not be an Anglo Jewry to support Israel and fund welfare projects in generations to come." (p 4). He called for a 'holistic approach': "Thus an educational strategy must of necessity be a holistic strategy about family, informal education and the synagogue, or it will fail."

Jewish Continuity (1993-1998)

Overview

Sacks's initiative, Jewish Continuity (1993-1998), was an ambitious community education programme comprising a wide range of intervention areas; it had active lay involvement in both central projects and grant-making to partners. It ran into problems (including strategic planning, funding, cross-communal issues, leadership, governance, expectation management). In its three and half years of operational activity, it dispensed grant funding to partner agencies (for their own projects or those specified by Jewish Continuity) and it funded central projects of its own. It also set up the Jewish Community Allocations Board to allow it to fund organisations that could not be seen to be funded by the Chief Rabbi. In addition, it conducted research and offered advice. In late 1996, it agreed to merge with the Joint Israel Appeal (JIA) to form the UJIA.

Problem Definition and Critique

Chief Rabbi Sacks summarised the challenge as follows: "We face crisis, a crisis of continuity. It can be defined by a simple question and a far from simple answer. The question is: *Will we have Jewish grandchildren?* The answer is; Yes – *if*. This book and others I hope to write on the subject, are about the *if* of continuity." (Sacks, 1994, pp 2-3). He continued: "We are entering a new era in modern Jewish history. The past two hundred years have been dominated, for Jews, by two concerns: integration into the societies of Europe and America, and survival against the onslaughts of antisemitism and the Holocaust. The 1990s will be seen in retrospect as the beginning of a new phase, one in which the predominant concern became the continuity of Jewish identity against the background of assimilation and intermarriage in the diaspora and secularisation in the State of Israel." (Sacks, 1994, p 3). He summarised the threat of assimilation in stark terms: "Jews are not dying, but Judaism and Jewish identity are. There is no moral comparison between these two phenomena and none is intended. Nevertheless, in one respect the effect is the same. Jewish survival is once more in

[423] In this outline paper, Kestenbaum demonstrated an organisational and strategic rigour that was subsequently to be found lacking in Jewish Continuity as it began to take on an independent direction of its own – though later reappearing within the UJIA Jewish Renewal framework.

[424] 3rd February 1993, 'Presentation Paper Prepared for Mandel Institute Consultation' and included: 'Anglo Jewish Education – the Nature of the Problem' (21st January 1993), written by Kestenbaum (Office of the Chief Rabbi).

[425] He listed five sources for what he identified as ambivalence towards Jewish education (with particular reference to Jewish schools) in the community: it is not possible to preserve the Diaspora; alternatives to education as the "route to survival"; does education actually work; British public schools offer a better education; for many, social integration is desirable. (p 3).

doubt. The catastrophe is spiritual and cultural, not physical. It is passive, not active. It is motivated by no malign intentions. However, it has consequences no less significant for the course of Jewish history. A people once known for its loyalty to a unique destiny is vanishing into oblivion. A nation whose seemingly infinite capacity for survival excited the astonishment of historians is losing its will to survive." (Sacks, 1994, p 26)

Sacks stated: "Jews survived, quite simply, because they devoted their best energies to education, their money to schools, their admiration to scholars, their spare hours to study, and their first concern to the tuition of children. Their identity was constantly learned and relearned, enacted and reinforced, and passed on as a precious gift to the next generation. *The secret of Jewish continuity is that Jews cared about it. They created continuity by making the transmission of tradition their first duty and greatest joy.*" (Sacks, 1994, p 39). Further, he stated: "Our strategy for renewal is education.[426] Our traditional strength, our greatest gift, our highest value is education." (Sacks, 1994, p 47). He noted that Jews had let education slip (Sacks, 1994, p 48) and that "It has happened *because for decades we have supported every Jewish cause except one: the Jewish future of our own children.*" (Sacks, 1994, p 49). He noted that "We have failed to recruit and train rabbis, educators and youth leaders." (Sacks, 1994, p 49). Sacks examined the financial priorities of Jewish community giving, and quoted 1991 figures for Jewish charitable investment, finding that "*we allocated to education one-eighth of what we gave to welfare and less than one-twentieth of what we gave to Israel.*"[427] (Sacks, 1994, p 56). Thereafter, he set out the challenge: "Anglo-Jewry lacks an overall strategy for education, for continuity and for communal priorities as whole." (Sacks, 1994, p 58). He also argued that in "a new era in modern Jewish life …the crisis of continuity has arisen *now* because we are still using the priorities and strategies of an earlier age. … The result is that we find ourselves fighting yesterday's battles instead of today's." (Sacks, 1994, p 64). He noted that a Jewish identity built largely on survivalism was insufficient, as was dependence on Jewish life as an ethnic identity in an increasingly secular world. He concluded: "The era of continuity is about to begin with the realisation that the transmission of Jewish identity across the generations has become fragile and altogether at risk." Sacks, 1994, pp 72-73).[428]

Sacks also explained why he rejected 'segregation' (from wider non-Jewish society) as an approach and that 'integration' could and should happen without assimilation. On Israel and the Diaspora, he pointed out that "We live in the era of continuity. But our thinking is trapped in the era of survival." (Sacks, 1994, p 91); as he saw it: "But the immediate question is less whether Jews are at home in London or Jerusalem than whether they are *at home in their Jewishness*. That is likely to become the leading concern in Israel and the diaspora alike as both turn their attention to continuity." (Sacks, 1994, p 100).

Aims

The Chief Rabbi was determined to position Jewish education as the third arm of the community (Sacks, 1994, p 104) – alongside Israel and welfare provision – and Jewish Continuity was to be the vehicle for achieving it.

Chief Rabbi's Broad Proposals

Sacks then focused upon a programme of action which he entitled '*From Jewish Continuity to* Jewish Continuity' (Sacks, 1994, pp 101-111). He explained it as a complex problem and that he was focusing upon just one part, the community's collective response: "We need a new community-wide

[426] Education was broadly defined i.e. not limited to schools.

[427] Figures for 1991: £40 million for Israel; £13 million for welfare; £1.7 million for education (Charity Trends 1992 (Charity Aid Foundation, 1992), quoted in Sacks, 1994, p 55) . Board of Deputies of British Jews figures for 1990 showed a total of £47 million raised of which 53.1 per cent went to Israel, 35.2 per cent to welfare and 10.1 per cent to education (Sacks, 1994, p 56).

[428] He restated the problem thus: "Let us remind ourselves why the crisis has occurred. For several generations we have neglected Jewish education. The result is that we know little about Judaism, and our children know even less. They have heard about Israel, but that is a place where they do not live. They have heard about the Holocaust, but that happened sometime else, somewhere else, to people they did not know. They may have experienced antisemitism, but that is not a reason to want their children to be Jewish and thus carry the risk of being exposed to it. They know that Jews like Jewish food, Jewish humour and Jewish friends, but so, too, do many non-Jews. Why then should our children choose not to marry out?" (Sacks, 1994, p 101).

organisation. The reason is simple. There are many religious and educational bodies in Anglo-Jewry and many youth groups and outreach programmes. Each is valuable and each has a vital role to play. But there is nothing that puts them together into a coherent strategy. The result is fragmentation and creative chaos – creative, but chaos none the less.

"A single body is needed to promote, plan and resource all those many activities in our community which create Jewish continuity. Its task will be to intensify Jewish life in such a way as to create future generations of Jews who are proud, knowledgeable and committed as Jews. To do so it will have to aim at nothing less than a complete transformation of Anglo-Jewish attitudes, so that continuity moves from last to first place on our communal agenda. The new organisation will have to become the third arm of Anglo-Jewry, alongside Israel and welfare. The clearest test of its success or failure will be whether in five years' time education is still languishing at the bottom of our list of communal charities or whether it has made its claim to at least equal status with the other two causes. If we succeed, Anglo-Jewry will have a future. If we fail, its future is altogether in doubt." (Sacks, 1994, p 104).

He explained: "A coherent strategy for continuity would look at what happens to children outside the classroom as well as within, and at what happens when one life-phase ends and another begins. It would examine the Jewish home, the peer-group, the synagogue and other institutional expressions of Jewish life and strive to forge links between them. It would look at critical moments of transition. It would be based on careful research, monitoring and evaluation. It would discover what works and what does not; which Jewish experiences are positive and which negative; where the community loses Jews and where it can hope to attract them." (Sacks, 1994, p 109).

He concluded: "It will be a community-wide organisation encompassing all activities which promote Jewish continuity across the generations. It will seek to secure the future of Anglo-Jewry by creating a vibrant community of proud, knowledgeable and committed Jews. It is built upon the principles that every Jew is precious, that Jewish life has a distinctive spiritual and ethical content, and that Jewish identity can only be sustained in the long run by Jewish learning, experiencing and doing.

"Through the structures it creates, the tasks it undertakes and the funds it raises, Jewish Continuity will promote the importance of continuity until it becomes the first item on the Anglo-Jewish agenda. It will develop a strategy for continuity, informed by research, monitoring and evaluation. It will create an informed and energetic lay leadership dedicated to the task. It will seek to increase funding for continuity-creating projects, including Jewish day-schools, Jewish enrichment in non-Jewish schools, youth groups, adult, informal and family education, student societies, university chaplaincy, outreach activities, residential retreats and Israel experiences. It will allocate funds in such a way as to ensure a rational distribution of resources, minimising waste and duplication and encouraging excellence, creativity, coverage, integration and reinforcement. It will focus on the 'people' dimension of continuity the recruitment and training of teachers, youth leaders, adult educators and outreach workers. It will create a central and nationally available pool of resources and specialised expertise. By these means it will strive to raise levels of knowledge of and participation in Jewish life." (Sacks, 1994, pp 109-110).

Jewish Continuity sought to enthusiastically embrace all Jews but only wished to do so on Orthodox terms (i.e. acceptable to the Office of the Chief Rabbi). The Chief Rabbi took a broad view of what constituted education – including youth activities and Israel trips and, therefore, not limited to schools. (He also noted that: "Not all education creates continuity, and not everything that creates continuity is education." (Sacks, 1994, p 106). He affirmed that "Jewish education is about Jewish continuity." (Sacks, 1994, p 107).

The book also contained an Appendix that Sacks claimed covered other decisions about "organisational style and objectives." (Sacks, 1994, p 109). In the Appendix he stated: "The key decisions which we have taken are these: Jewish Continuity should be a *lean* and *enabling* organisation. It will empower the people and organisations in the field. It will not engage directly in education and outreach. It will resource those who are. It will give them the help they need to do their work better.

"Jewish Continuity will *implement strategy by 'steering not rowing'*. It will shape policy by the decisions it takes to fund this project rather than that one. It will make its funding conditional on objectives, whether these concern quality control, or networking, or success in reaching target populations. Where it identifies a gap in communal provision, it will contract it out to organisations

with the most appropriate record of achievement. It will encourage educators, rabbis, youth workers, student leaders and outreach practitioners to engage in problem solving, lateral thinking, integration and innovation. It will work through, not over the heads of, local organisations.

"Jewish Continuity will be a national, community-wide, overarching body involving schools, synagogues, youth groups, student societies, university chaplaincy, informal, family and adult education. It will attempt to enlist Israel and welfare organisations as well. It will be broadly based, so that every Jewish community in Britain will have its own Jewish Continuity committee, its local leaders and its own development plan.

"Jewish Continuity will be a task-oriented organisation. Its aim is not to achieve a consensus on what constitutes Jewish identity, literacy or commitment. No such consensus is currently available. The Jewish community is fragmented. It contains a host of institutions whose visions conflict. Were we to aim for agreement on matters which have divided Jews for the past two centuries, we would invite a decade of sterile debate. Instead, Jewish Continuity will recognise the diversity of ways in which Jews arrive at Jewish commitment. It will encourage those activities which make a positive difference to Jewish lives, and to the Judaic strength of the next generation. It will set a priority on creativity, excellence and innovation rather than on a common-denominator approach to Jewish life." (Sacks, 1994, pp 118-119).

He then moved on to address a series of objectives. Vision: "Jewish Continuity rests on a vision which it must communicate: that to be a Jew is to be an heir to one of the greatest traditions of faith, morality, community and individual living the world has ever known." (Sacks, 1994, p 119). Leadership; Resources; A Communal Strategy; An integrated strategy; A research-based strategy; Promoting people; Making connections; A bias towards outreach and innovation; A learning community (Sacks, 1994, pp 119-123). Sacks's aspiration was to provide a "disciplined structure" (Sacks, 1994, p 123). Sacks clearly presented ambitious aspirations with useful operating principles. In sum, Sacks offered a vision of a future transformed by the impact of a comprehensive, all-embracing educational endeavour.

Role

The first Jewish Continuity advertisement/leaflet headlined: 'Today we'll lose another ten Jews' over a picture of young adult Jews walking over a precipice. The leaflet declared: "Jewish Continuity will be an enabling body. We will not own schools or programmes but aim to resource them. We will provide a communal vision and strategy that encompasses and goes beyond the many excellent programmes already in existence. We will commission research and monitor programmes to ensure effectiveness and accountability. We will have a bias towards outreach and innovation. We will operate on the basis that in most cases it isn't new, exciting buildings that we need but new, exciting people and ideas." (Jewish Continuity leaflet, 1993).[429]

Authority of the Chief Rabbi

"Alterations to Memorandum and Articles of Association [of Jewish Continuity]

10. No alterations or additions to the Memorandum or Articles of Association of the Trust shall be made without the prior written consent of the Chief Rabbi and the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales.

The Chief Rabbi

11. All matters concerning the construction and interpretation of the objects of the Trust shall be determined by the Chief Rabbi." (Jewish Continuity Memorandum and Articles of Association (16th July 1993)).

Mission

The Memorandum and Articles of Association of Jewish Continuity were also created and included the following Objects: "The Trust is established for the purpose of ensuring the continuity of the

[429] Lawton later summarised: "With a dynamic high profile and an impressive advertising campaign, Jewish Continuity captured the imagination of the organized Jewish community. Until then, each organization in the community had raised funds for itself. Now a small handful of generous philanthropists provided a base fund for Jewish Continuity of nearly one million pounds sterling per year for the first four years. In British Jewish community terms, this immediately established Jewish Continuity as a "larger" charity and signalled that it would become larger still, in view of the fact that it had not yet started to approach the general community for funds." (Lawton, December 1995, pp 19-20).

Jewish Community in the United Kingdom. Its objects are to promote such charitable purposes and to assist such Charitable Institutions as the Trustees shall in their absolute discretion think fit. In particular (but without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing) the Trust shall have as its objects the furtherance of education, learning and research for the public benefit of all aspects of Judaism and of the Jewish tradition amongst all age groups within the Jewish community in the United Kingdom and, at the discretion of the Board, elsewhere in the world."

Jewish Continuity Planning

A working strategy paper went through a number of consultations and further iterations.[430]

A Jewish Continuity document (26th March 1993) entitled 'Jewish Continuity – Targets and Tasks', noted that "… the areas outlined below have been identified because they underpin the system as a whole and are the foundations for a vibrant educated community." It also pointed out: "There are issues that will pervade the activities of Jewish Continuity relating to a number of tasks, and these include: a) the importance of an holistic approach to education for all ages involving both the formal and informal arenas; b) the need for "outreach to the unaffiliated"; c) the centrality of Israel to Jewish life." It identified the following five years task headings and targets: Lay Leadership (500 activists); National Fundraising Campaign (£5 million per year from 10,000 donors); Educator Recruitment and Training (majority of Jewish Studies teachers to have a validation Certificate); five schools to offer intensive in-service training for their teachers (25 special merit teachers to develop their expertise and 15 bursaries per year for training in Jewish education); Lead Communities (5 will be established); Education for Jewish Pupils in Non-Jewish Schools (new coordinating body); every pupil will have opportunity to access some form of Jewish education; training for educators (15 educators deployed); Research and Planning (participation rates; educational outcomes; attitudes; deployment of educators; the economics of education); Communal Events (1 annual nationwide educational event and each lead community will organise 1 annual communal event); Marketing (promoting the image and activities of the organisation); Liaison with Government (panel of experts to co-ordinate community's relations with government on education).

An August 1993 paper promoted Task Forces around Leadership Recruitment and Training; Lead Communities; Personnel; Research and Planning; Jewish Activities in Non-Jewish Schools; Communal "Happening"; Liaison with Government.

(Clive Lawton's appointment as Chief Executive Officer was announced at the same time and from then onwards he started to attend meetings.)

By 12th January 1994, the educational Task Groups were identified as: "Leadership Development; Lead Communities; Professional Educators; Research and Planning; Programmes for Jewish Children in Mainstream (non-Jewish) Schools; Cross-community Events; Outreach."[431]

Lawton wrote a single page note, 'What is 'Jewish Continuity?' (29th June 1994). It appeared to have been in response to the soon to be announced JIA-Jewish Continuity agreement. He clearly felt the need to restate Jewish Continuity's role and remit in an effort to secure both its independence and the parameters of its proposed influence over a broad swathe of Jewish education.[432] He noted that: "Its mission is to intervene in the Jewish community by whatever means it deems most effective to engage the maximum number of Jews in experiences, contexts, programmes and activities which will increase their Jewish involvement, awareness and commitment and thus enhance the prospects of the continuity of Jewish life."

[430] 'Jewish Continuity: A National Bureau for Jewish Education' (December 1992); 'Jewish Continuity: Creating A Learning Community' (December 1992); and further as: 'Jewish Continuity – Building the Jewish Future' (May and June 1993).

[431] Restating Lawton's view on the Sounding Board: "The Chief Rabbi's original consultancy group, the "sounding board" that met through 1993, identified several areas of activity, all of which were considered necessary to addressing the multi-layered and complex issues that contribute to moving Jews toward greater commitment. These included: developing professional educators, communal frameworks, lay leadership, research, work with children in non-Jewish schools, religious outreach, and cross community events." (*Avar ve'Atid*, December 1995, Issue 4, p 19.

[432] Lawton himself was keen to stress how it went beyond 'Jewish education' to something bigger – perhaps defined around 'Jewish growth' or 'Jewish development' i.e. the broader definition of Jewish education as defined earlier in this research.

He then set out the proposed operational areas for Jewish Continuity: "Raising awareness of the issues facing the community …; Training of personnel, particularly educators (both formal and informal) but also other Jewish communal personnel and lay leadership …; Community development, interaction and networking …; Individual development through … outreach … family education …the Israel experience … major cultural events … support for the development of artistic and cultural expressions within the context of Jewish Continuity's concerns; Programme intensification through curriculum development, intervention in contexts where Jews gather, … improved adult education curricula and personnel training, incorporating Israel as a key feature of intense Jewish programming in every context; Research and information gathering.[433] (Jewish Continuity, 29th June 1994).

Cross-communal Approach

Another document was entitled 'Jewish Continuity: Religious Principles – A discussion document' (dated 3rd February, 1993). The document is in line with Sacks's argument presented in his book 'One People?' (Sacks, 1993) – his major work on the schisms facing world Jewry – and reaffirmed in his Jewish Chronicle article (20th January 1995) – following his attack on Masorti in the Jewish Tribune (12th January 1995). It was based upon the idea of inclusivism (as distinct from exclusivism (restricted to the Orthodox) and pluralism (no normative position and equal validation of all forms of Judaism)).

"Judaism as a faith and way of life [*emunah* and *halakhah*] …Inclusivism is based on faith and a way of life … Jewish Continuity, in faithfulness to inclusivism, will support programmes in any organisation or institution so long as those programmes are consistent with the Judaism of *emunah* and *halakhah*. This would include programmes relating to Jewish history, culture, Ivrit and Israel".

Under the heading of 'Practical implications', it stated: "1. Jewish Continuity, in faithfulness to inclusivism, will support programmes in any organisation or institution so long as those programmes are consistent with the Judaism of *emunah* ["faith"] and *halakhah* ["a way of life"]. This would include programmes relating to Jewish history, culture, Ivrit and Israel.[434] Repeated as: "Its programmes, where they have religious content, will be consistent with Torah and mitzvot, for these have always formed the overarching canopy of Jewish unity and continuity." (Jewish Chronicle, 20th January, 1995, p 25).

2. The members of the *Council* of Jewish Continuity must share a commitment to inclusivism, which means that they must subscribe at least nominally to the Judaism of emunah and halakhah. Nonetheless, since Jewish Continuity will offer services and support across the community, there must be a *consultative body* which informs and makes recommendations to the council, and which would include representatives from all sectors of the community."

3. The *professional staff* of Jewish Continuity must be acceptable to all, and offer their services to all. (Jewish Continuity, 3rd February 1993, p 2).

A Jewish Continuity document that was undated (but probably 1994-5) and entitled: 'Jewish Continuity: Common Objections and Standard Answers' stated under 'Religion' that it followed the Chief Rabbi's principle of 'inclusivism': "Is Jewish Continuity biased against any section of the community? The vast majority of our expenditure has funded projects where there is no denominational issue. We would not, of course, support a programme which would, for example, force people to break *kashrut* [laws of keeping Kosher] or *Shabbat* [keeping the Sabbath]. Nor would the Jewish Community Allocations Board.[435] We believe that with a sufficiently sensitive approach, and with understanding from the community, we will be able to meet the needs of all Jews whilst compromising nobody. For example, our major personnel initiative, training teachers and developing

[433] The document also set out its aspiration for achieving greater rigour in this area of communal work: "In all our activities, Jewish Continuity plans to address one of the fundamental weaknesses in community spending hitherto, outside the welfare field. We intend that moneys should be spent in such a way that the value for money is tested, the outcomes are monitored, the programmes are evaluated and there is effective follow up. Furthermore, while we wish to be, and will insist on being, experimental, we also intend to be rigorous in the testing of ideas before making major commitments."

[434] Elsewhere, the emphasis is on Shabbat and Kashrut observance at activities.

[435] The Jewish Community Allocations Board (JCAB) was set up by Jewish Continuity as an attempt to allow Jewish Continuity funding to be offered to non-Orthodox organisations without compromising the Chief Rabbi; it is discussed in more detail shortly.

schools' curriculum at the Institute of Education (RESQUJE), is open to Jewish Studies teachers from all movements."[436] (Jewish Continuity: Common Objections And Standard Answers (undated)).
"We should be prepared to work with anybody who will work with us, provided they respect in their relationship with us commonly held standards of Shabbat and kashrut [dietary laws] observance. We can be clear that working with an organisation does not represent an endorsement of its aims but a desire to help it bring its achievements into line with Jewish Continuity's aims." (Lawton's Jewish Continuity Report offering his own assessment (22nd November 1995, p. 1).

Funding

At a Jewish Continuity Executive meeting (7th January 1994), the Chair noted that the fundraising campaign would not start until Spring 1994.
At the Jewish Continuity Trustees meeting of the 24th May, 1994, it was claimed that: "To date £3,642,140 has been raised in pledges and £792,973 has actually been received."
At the JIA Board (5th July 1995), it was announced that the JIA was struggling to raise the necessary funds for Jewish Continuity.
"The Chairman reported that he [Brian Kerner] and Sir Trevor Chinn had met with Michael Sinclair, Sir Harry Solomon and Charles Corman [from Jewish Continuity[437]] and had advised them that due to adverse publicity [referring primarily to the Chief Rabbi's Letter on the Masorti movement (January 1995)], we would not be able to meet the level of support originally committed for the current year. We would make every effort to create a proper partnership and raise as much money as possible."
The Jewish Continuity response at the same meeting was: "Dr Sinclair agreed that every effort must be made to get the partnership to work in the manner intended, but he pointed out that Continuity had not agreed to release the JIA from its 3 year guarantee."

Grant Giving

The Jewish Continuity operating model was presented in a document dated 7th December 1993, in which it set out its allocations process for external applicants, indicating that the applications would be assessed by the Task Directorate to see if the proposals met Jewish Continuity criteria; if so, they would then be referred to the relevant Task Group who would engage with and evaluate the external projects alongside the internally generated projects (i.e. Jewish Continuity's own work: "proactive, reflecting its own educational/continuity agenda" and run either by an external organisation or by Jewish Continuity itself). The whole process and recommendations would then be reviewed by the Jewish Continuity Board.

Jewish Community Allocations Board

Established May 1994 to allocate funds across the community – including to non-Orthodox.
At the Jewish Continuity Executive 11th May 1994, a paper was tabled "proposing the creation of an Allocations Board" as a result of "anxieties on both the "left" and "right" wings of the community regarding Jewish Continuity's approach." It was to consider Projects from across the community and was an attempt to create a separation between the Chief Rabbi and the provision of funds to non-Orthodox organisations. The proposal was for the Task Groups to review the applications and then forward them together with recommendations to the Allocations Board – without interference from the Jewish Continuity Executive.
It was also announced that the Task Groups were to begin considering "proactive" projects.
At the Jewish Continuity Executive 23rd June 1994, the Jewish Community Allocations Board was launched.

[436] The courses were run by an independent, secular third party (the Institute of Education) and though non-Orthodox teachers were studying there, placing it under the Institute's umbrella was considered a sufficient 'protective barrier' to safeguard the Chief Rabbi.

[437] According to the Minutes of the second Jewish Continuity AGM held on the 19th June, 1995, the Jewish Continuity Trustees were: Dr Michael Sinclair (Chair), Mr Victor Blank, Sir Trevor Chinn, Mr Stanley Cohen, Mr Charles Corman, Sir Martin Gilbert, Mr Michael Goldmeier, Mr Andrew Loftus, Mr Geoffrey Ognall, Mr Michael Phillips, Mr Stephen Rubin, Mrs Ruth Deech, Dr Nasser D Khalili, Mr Michael Levy, Mr Clive Marks, Dame Shirley Porter, Sir Harry Solomon, Mr Cyril Stein, The Right Honourable Lord Woolf, The Right Honourable Lord Young. (The Wagner Review (1996) added to the list: Dr Ruth Deech, Ruth Deutsch, Robert Dorfman, Dr Nasser D Khalili, Andrew Loftus, Michael Philips, Stephen Rubin (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p 56).

(At the Jewish Continuity Trustees meeting (12th September 1994), it was announced that £436,000 was available to the Allocations Board and that two out of four Progressive bids had been successful.)

Jewish Continuity Strategic Plan (22nd December 1994)

See below.

The JIA*-Jewish Continuity Agreement, 1994[438]

Press Release, 8th July 1994, embargoed to 15th July 1994

Agreement was reached in July 1994. Sinclair (Jewish Continuity) and Chinn (JIA) declared: "The issues of Israel and Jewish Continuity are inextricably entwined: the Diaspora needs a strong Israel, and Israel needs a vibrant Diaspora. This move confirms that link, removes the duplication of separate fund-raising efforts and further enhances both organisations." They announced "a two-line campaign, allowing donors to apportion their contribution. This will free Jewish Continuity to concentrate on its vital role of education and outreach whilst it will benefit from the unparalleled fund-raising skills of the Joint Israel Appeal." Finally, it stated that: "This joint campaign will ensure that Jewish Continuity has the funds to implement its planned programmes, with a guarantee against specific donations of £3 million in 1995, £4 million in 1996 and £5 million in 1997 whilst, at the same time, the JIA will continue with its life-saving activities in Israel."

The JIA-Jewish Continuity Memorandum (5th October, 1994)

Specified that the campaign was to be renamed as the 'JIA Campaign for Israel and Jewish Continuity'. Crucially, it stated: "JIA commitment to include funds already raised by Jewish Continuity, agreed to meet budgetary requirements up to £3m in 1995, £4m in 1996 and £5m in 1997." Jewish Continuity was to continue to fundraise as part of the agreement but in coordination with the JIA, and also their respective leaderships were to be represented on each other's Boards. In addition, it included the following important pledge: "Jewish Continuity is committed to working across the whole community." There was also agreement for a coordination committee, marketing schedule, training and that "Jewish Continuity will advise and/or participate in programmes that JIA supports, where agreed."

*JIA: the Joint Israel Appeal (JIA) was the leading fundraising body for Israel. It brought together leading communal philanthropists (as well as a community-wide appeal) and carried considerable weight within the community leadership. It worked in close partnership with the Jewish Agency for Israel (JAFI) to rescue Jews in distress and to support a number of welfare and other projects in Israel. In addition, it worked on Jewish and Israel education in both Israel and Britain. It invested significant funds in domestic Jewish education and worked with the Jewish Agency and its partners, amongst others. Many of its leading figures were also philanthropic supporters of Jewish education who understood there to be direct linkage between Jewish education and support for Israel. (In contrast, there were others who argued that the JIA should focus all of its fundraising on Israel.) However, despite the JIA's considerable investment in education, it relied largely on the pedagogic expertise of others, including the Jewish Agency for Israel.

By the early 1990s, the JIA's dominance and indeed confidence were waning as a result of the evolution of the Israel-Diaspora relationship due to: the growing strength of the Israeli economy; the after effects of the Gulf War (1990-91); the peace process that was announced in September 1993; the welcome large scale exodus of the early Nineties of Jews from the Former Soviet Union to Israel and a much smaller number of Ethiopian Jews. Furthermore, the recession of the late 1980s and early 1990s had undermined the JIA's fundraising capacity and they were also weak in the recruitment of new, younger leadership and donors. Therefore, by the early 1990s, the JIA was struggling to reinvent itself in the face of a changing Jewish world. As Jewish Continuity emerged, the JIA became

[438] The '*JIA Reporter'* (September 1994), the JIA's in-house newsletter, announced that "The partnership was launched at the residence of the Israel Ambassador His Excellency Mr Moshe Raviv, and attended by communal leaders and key workers and supporters of both organisations." It was relegated to p 2 of the Newsletter presumably because of the terrorist car bomb attack on Balfour House (JIA offices) that had taken place 27th July 1994.

increasingly concerned with protecting its own prominent position within the community. By early 1994, they were considering their own strategic overhaul and had opened a dialogue with Jewish Continuity.

Jewish Continuity Strategic Plan: 'Jewish Continuity: Strategic Direction – 5 Year Goals and 1995 Programme' (22nd December 1994) and Developments through to Wagner Review (October 1995-March 1996).

It was described as a working document as opposed to a better presented public document. Its key components comprised the following: "Mission – The mission of Jewish Continuity is to secure the future of British Jewry by creating a vibrant community of proud, knowledgeable and committed Jews." It identified the 'Key Areas of intervention' as: "Targeting Key Personnel" (formal and informal professional educators and lay leadership); "Building Community" (focusing on key institutions but focusing on youth as an early voluntary engagement); "Providing Gateways to Jewish Life" (using life cycle moments and, "given the right circumstances", cultural events); "Developing the 'Israel Experience'" ("recognises the centrality of Israel in Jewish life" and as "one of the most potent ways of enhancing Jewish identification amongst young people."

It then went on to identify "Our Target Group" focusing on "The 13-35 age group: Teenagers; Students; Young Adults and Families with young children." Women were also noted as an addition to this list.

The document then proceeded to discuss "The Role of Our Organisation: **To work in collaboration** with existing organisations and communal frameworks; **To develop relationships** between existing organisations and between new initiatives; **To provide a consultancy and advice** service to those considering pursuing work in the field of Jewish continuity; **To provide resources and advice** to the Jewish Community Allocations Board to enable it to support programmes it judges will enhance the prospects of Jewish Continuity; **To establish initiatives** in fields that other pre-existing organisations cannot or have not pursued (perhaps because of issues of scale, scope, resources or risk) that might enhance the prospects of Jewish continuity; **To involve the maximum number of lay people possible** in working for and espousing the cause of Jewish continuity." (Jewish Continuity Strategic Plan (22nd December 1994)).

Amongst other good practice commitments, it strove "to be inclusive in respect of all Jews," and to be research-driven, committed to consultation and links "with existing communal agencies and leading experts in the field." The Paper then went on to the "1995 Programme" and listed its "Targets And 5 Year Goals" under the following headings: 1.Educator and Education Service Development; 2. Lay Leadership Development; 3. Community Development; 4. 'Israel Experience' Development; 5. Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools (JAMS); 6. Student and Young Adult Provision; 7. Outreach and Personal Development; 8. Research for Planning; 9. Development of Communal Dialogue (Jewish Continuity Strategic Plan (22nd December 1994)).

Each category included 1994 Achievements and 1995 Targets and 5 Year Goals – it was an extremely ambitious programme.

Jewish Continuity Operations

The September 1995 edition of Continuity Connects [first edition[439]], the Jewish Continuity Newsletter, showed the organisation at the height of its activity, clearly setting out its operations.[440]

[439] 'Continuity Connects' replaced Lawton's Supporters' Updates as the Jewish Continuity Newsletter.

[440] The Newsletter also drew attention to positive feedback to Lawton from the highly respected American community development professional, Bernie Reisman: "On his last visit, Professor Bernie Reisman of Brandies University summed up his thoughts on the Community Development programme in a letter to me in July. "My current reaction is the same as when I first read about it: 'WOW!'" He then congratulates us on devising a scheme which he believes to be "well designed" and "appropriately tuned to the needs of British Jewry today". No mean endorsement from probably the leading expert in communal service professionalization in the world.

…

Back to Bernie Reisman's letter: "The goals of Continuity are imaginative, important and bold. You have to take action and demonstrate through the activation of your programs that good things begin to happen with the Jewish community. I say this to warn about being too cautious or conservative. All the materials I have read and the meetings I have had with the professional staff give me much confidence in the plans and strategies of

The document identified the four major pillars: Personnel Development; Youth and Community Development; Outreach and Personal Development; Israel Experience Development (Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools was also noted).
By January, 1996, Jewish Continuity was operating across the following areas (Chair people in brackets): Arts, Media and Culture (Anna Josse); The Bursary Committee (Barbera Green); Community Development (Anthony Warrens); Formal Education (Sherry Begner); Informal Education (Frances Turner); Israel Experience Development (Edwin Shuker); JAMS (Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools) (Sir Harry Solomon); Leadership Development (Michael Goldstein); Adult Education and Outreach (Benjamin Perl); Research for Planning (Gillian Gold); Students and Young Adults (Michael Rose/Natan Tiefenbrun). (Restated in Continuity Connects – Jewish Continuity News Updates, September 1995 and May 1996)).

Funding

The Wagner Review (1996) noted that "Overall, Jewish Continuity is estimated to have spent some £2 million in 1995" with approximately 50 per cent spent on core programmes, 31 per cent on the Allocations Board and 17.5 per cent on central organisational costs; it also noted that this was £1 million short of the JIA funding commitment and noted the disruption it had caused (Wagner Review, 1996, p 7). It also included the distribution of Allocations Board expenditure during 1994-5 as 48 per cent to non-denominational, 12 per cent to cross-community through Orthodox bodies, 28 per cent to Orthodox, 10 per cent to Progressives and 2 per cent to Masorti (Wagner Review, 1996, p 9).
Jewish Continuity planned to increase its own spending to 80 per cent of income by 1997 (according to a *Jewish Chronicle* report).

The Mandel Critique (1-2 October 1995) [441]

The Mandel Institute was critical of Jewish Continuity's approach. Fox stated that "everything Continuity wanted to do was worth doing but it was important to prioritise. There could not be funding available to do all the list properly and therefore choices had to be made. There would be insufficient personnel available to undertake any one of the tasks on Continuity's list." Further comments noted that though Jewish Continuity "had elicited a great communal excitement … there was a lack of understanding of what it was" and that "Professor Fox felt that it was impossible to move too quickly." There was tension between Sinclair's "disruptive technology" and Fox's "love and affection" in dealing with the community. "The suggestion was also made that Continuity had gone from the global vision on to action and had thereby missed the articulation of its mission statement." Annette Hochstein, from Mandel, assessed Planning and Implementation "with the following points":
"The identity of an organisation determines its strategy and how its choices are made; These choices had to be made; It was not possible to do everything; Being at a crossroads permits redirection.
She posed three strategic questions
1. What is Continuity? Is it a) a development agency? b) an enabling organisation or catalyst? c) a foundation?
2. Given what Continuity is, what should its priorities be?
3. Given what it is and the methods of choosing, how does it mobilise itself and the community to ensure it receives funding, and has the people and institutions that can do its work?

Continuity. My encouragement is to move forward." ('*Continuity Connects'* (Jewish Continuity Newsletter), September 1995, p 3).

[441] The Mandel Institute had prior involvement with Jewish Continuity: "Professor Seymour Fox, Alan Hoffman and Annette Hochstein of the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem lent their immense expertise in educational planning, and helped us to formulate the right questions." (Sacks, 1994, Acknowledgements).
A Mandel promotional leaflet, 'Mandel Institute – Facing the Critical Challenge' (n.d.) stated: "The challenge is to create an environment in which Jews will choose to be Jewish. To do this all the forces of the community will have to be rallied in a combined assault on the problem. In the vanguard will be education and community leadership – education as the critical instrument and community leadership the mobilising force to address the most serious issue facing the Jewish people today.
Forging a response to this challenge is the mission of the Mandel Institute in Jerusalem."

She felt that the first point had been blurred which may have been useful initially but now needed clarification.
The questions which must be answered if Continuity is a foundation are: what are the most important things which need doing? by what criteria will it select areas and then specific programmes? does it invest in a major way in a small number of areas or in a multitude of Programmes?
She pointed out that responsibility to existing frameworks meant it was important to declare clearly what will be supported.
If Continuity is a co-ordinating body and a catalyst for others, it had to ask how to bring everyone into the vision and motivate them to rise to the challenge.
If Continuity is a deliverer of services there were implications as to what it could do in the other areas. She felt it was hard to be both an implementer and as strategic thinker." (Jewish Continuity, 1 and 2 October 1995).

The Wagner Review (1996)

Remit

Wagner noted that he had been "invited by the Trustees of Jewish Continuity in consultation with the JIA to chair a review" for which the terms of reference were: "To review the functions, structure, governance, religious complexion and funding of Jewish Continuity; and to recommend a range of options for its restructuring and operations to enable it to continue to improve its services to the community." (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, p ix (Wagner Review)).

Cross-communal Approach

There was a cross-communal Advisory Board to the review process.[442]

Jewish Continuity Achievements

"Jewish Continuity has many achievements to its credit. After little more than two years' existence it is a recognised part of British Jewry. It has raised more than £3 million. It has established new arrangements where previously there were gaps particularly through RESQUJE, the quality education unit at the University of London Institute of Education, JAMS, and the Youth Development Unit.[443] It has developed support for Israel experience programmes for young people and introduced a successful Hebrew Reading Crash Course for adults. Through the Allocations Board it has supported the work of more than 70 organisations including the Union of Jewish Students, Chaplaincy, Sinclair House, B'nai Brith, Board of Deputies, the United Synagogue, Aish Hatorah, Lubavitch, Reform Synagogues, Masorti, the Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, Leo Baeck College, Project Seed, various schools across the community and community developments in the provinces. And at the same time it has attracted a cadre of new and younger people into communal leadership and service." (Wagner Review, 1996, p 46).[444]

Findings

Wagner presented an interim report to the Jewish Continuity Trustees (22nd January, 1996) outlining the key issues as: the organisation's role, whether it should be strategic, catalytic, co-operative or competitive; the perceptions of the religious complexion, cross community or Orthodox – and the role of the Chief Rabbi; funding, whether by the JIA, or self-funding and the need for clarity of funding between the Allocations Board and Jewish Continuity's own core programmes; the strategy and need to prioritise; governance, the lack of communal experience of some of those involved, the decision- making process and roles of the Trustees, Executive Board, Honorary Officers, Chairman,

[442] The Advisory Board included Seymour Saideman (President, United Synagogue (Orthodox) and David Walsh (Chairperson), Reform Synagogues of Great Britain), as well as Ruth Deutsch, Clive Marks, (both Jewish Continuity Trustees), Eldred Tabachnik QC (President, Board of Deputies of British Jews), Mrs Judith Tankel (Past President, Glasgow Jewish Representative Council. Dr Michael Sinclair (Jewish Continuity) and Sir Trevor Chinn (UJIA) were both ex-officio members.

[443] RESQUJE was rapidly wound down by UJIA. The Youth Development Unit was never agreed by the field and did not become operational – there was a review of the field by Miller S.V. (1998).

[444] All that eventually remained with UJIA was the Hebrew Reading Crash Course (HRCC), Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools (JAMS) and Pikuach.

Chief Executive.
"Professor Wagner commented that Continuity had not been undertaking a strategic planning role and this ought to be addressed. …
"The option of Continuity fundraising for itself was a possibility but there was as yet no evidence it could produce the required level of funding on an annual basis…." (Jewish Continuity Trustees Meeting, Minutes 22nd January 1996).
Wagner's final Report (Jewish Continuity, March 1996, pp i-iii) included the following:
Function and Role: Jewish Continuity needs to be more focused with greater clarity of the limits of its role; it should be more strategic and with more of a co-ordinating role; it may remain challenging but needs to operate in a more consultative manner and with greater decision-making transparency and accountability; the provinces should receive a fairer distribution of funds; Jewish Continuity should only deliver services in exceptional circumstance; the Allocations Board should be incorporated into the organisation and an innovations fund should be established.
Finance: Jewish Continuity could do its own fundraising but would probably be less successful than if they partnered the JIA in this task; there is also the danger of being seen to compete for funds with other communal educational organisations; partnering the JIA avoids duplicating fundraising efforts yet still receiving substantial funds; however, there would be constraints, most significantly that the JIA would insist that funds were distributed across the community; the JIA would also be taking risks in terms of broadening its remit to spiritual and cultural survival as well as physical survival, with major implications for the successful retention of support from its key stakeholders; "The best chance of success is to re-establish the partnership as a symbiotic relationship through a re-constituted, re-vamped and re-launched Jewish Continuity rather than as some marginal re-adjustment to current arrangements."
Religious Complexion: Jewish Continuity would never have come into existence without the Chief Rabbi's efforts; however, there is "confusion between his role as spiritual head of the Orthodox United Hebrew Congregations and the representative and symbolic role which he and his predecessors have carried out both inside and outside the community. His continuing prominent association with Jewish Continuity creates significant difficulties because, whilst he has no involvement with its strategic or operational activities, he is held responsible by Orthodox religious leaders for its decisions, particularly those involving allocations to non-Orthodox organisations." Jewish Continuity has become a "proxy battleground" for religious tensions; "The Chief Rabbi should be less directly involved in the second phase of Jewish Continuity"; "Any new role – as mentor, consultant or more symbolic – as in other communal organisations, must be accepted by all parties as non-controversial." "Most Orthodox religious leaders will not participate in decision-making forums which directly fund non-Orthodox religious organisations. It may be possible for Jewish Continuity to operate across the religious spectrum with the participation and support of the mainstream Orthodox communities – if there are changes to the language used and the structures within which it operates." Language is important and 'pluralism' should not be used as it implies legitimation and approval; "terms such as "co-existence" and "peaceful co-existence"" would be more appropriate; "In this report, the term "cross-community" is used to refer to a Jewish Continuity which deals with all groups." "A structure is required which accommodates religious sensibilities. The key issue here is not who gets the money but the process by which it is given. Finally, however, there needs to be a will to succeed. Wise people can make the worst structures work and foolish people can wreck the most sublime of structures. Diplomatic behaviour must accompany diplomatic language to enable Jewish Continuity to operate across the religious spectrum."
Governance: the current decision-making structure is "over-elaborate and confusing and leads to too much power being vested in the Chairman"; some have also suggested it is "arbitrary rather than systematic"; it has also attracted new leadership; however, there is widespread "dissatisfaction with its decision-making and communications processes." "Its decision-making structures must offer greater transparency and accountability" through a revised framework with a small Trustees group responsible for "financial probity and oversight" and Governors "for strategy, policy, programmes and budgets"; "If it is to be an organisation working across the community the Board of Governors should have three separate committees dealing respectively with individual allocations to organisations within the Orthodox and Masorti and Progressive communities with the third committee dealing with cross-community organisations and projects."

Three Options for the Way Forward: 1. An outreach organisation which would be more limited than Jewish Continuity and could either be a narrower, Orthodox outreach organisation (encouraging people to become more observant) operating independently and run by the Orthodox communities, or a wider view of outreach also embracing non-religious organisations and acting cross-communally – it noted that if the wider version were to be chosen it might well become a development agency[445] which was, in fact, option two; 2. A development agency which would be closer to the existing Jewish Continuity model but with the Allocations Board integrated within it and operating in a more focused manner and work more like a foundation – only operating services itself in emergency situations or pilot projects – this would mean it becoming an Orthodox body and a parallel non-Orthodox body would also probably emerge leading to duplication; 3. "A strategic planning and development agency – this would extend its function to fill a gap which the JEDT Report (Worms) identified. It could only operate as a cross-community body with fundamental change in its organisation and style of working. It would still carry out a developmental role including incorporating the work of the Allocations Board but possibly within narrower limits than at present. Research, publications and strategic debate would be more prominent that [sic] at present."

The United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA), 1997-2000

Overview

A merger between the JIA and Jewish Continuity resulted in the establishment of the United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA) (1997 to date) – UJIA Jewish Renewal[446] superseded Jewish Continuity and operated within narrower and tighter parameters: it worked cross-communally; focused primarily on youth in the areas of Informal Jewish Education (including a Lifelong Learning Unit), Israel Experience (educational travel to Israel), Educational Leadership (school teachers and educators) and Research and Development;[447] and was funded as part of a community-wide appeal on behalf of Israel and Jewish education.

Problem Definition

Essentially the same as Jewish Continuity.

Vision, Mission and Values

"Our vision is that future generations of Jews will be secure, proud and knowledgeable members of the Jewish people, committed to our unique heritage and the eternity of Israel." "Our Mission is to *secure the future of the Jewish People.* We pursue this mission by mobilising the UK Jewish Community's support for: the *Rescue* of Jews in need throughout the world, and their absorption into Israel; the *Renewal* of Jewish life in Britain, and of our partnership with Israel."[448] It continued: "Our Values: Every Jew has a responsibility for every other Jew; Every Jew has a contribution to make, and the means for making that contribution; Every Jew has a duty to secure the Jewish future." (JIA Planning document: 'Visions for Our Future' (June 1997).

Planning

By the spring of 1997, Ariel had also established a Professional Advisory Group[449] consisting primarily of the leaderships of three capacities which he sought as partners: The Agency for Jewish

[445] Mandel and Wagner each appear to use the term 'development agency' differently.

[446] UJIA eventually became the name for the new merged entity, with Jewish Renewal being the title for the area of work within it that replaced Jewish Continuity, while the rest of the work came under 'Rescue' and was involved in supporting projects in Israel and Jews in distress around the world.

[447] This research examined the UJIA Jewish Renewal operation during 1997-2000; other work areas were added later.

[448] A UJIA document providing notes from an Executive Retreat (6th May 1999) was later to address the notion of working in similar fields across both 'rescue' and 'renewal' with a focus on youth groups and summer camps, Israel Experience, Educator Training, Aliya (emigration to Israel) and Absorption, etc.

[449] It ensured cross-communal work and co-operation under a UJIA umbrella. The Group was taken to Israel on a high level professional development seminar (22-27th February 1998) – run by the Mandel Centre. The Group continued to meet: for example, on the 28th September, 1998, the subject was the development of Advanced Studies in Education (to MA level) and both the Orthodox and non-Orthodox shared their experiences and expertise.

Education (AJE) (Orthodox and primarily formal education, early years and supplementary); The Centre for Jewish Education (CJE) (Reform and Liberal, primarily formal education, early years and supplementary); Jewish Programme and Materials Project (JPMP[450]) (primarily informal education and youth leadership, cross-communal and under the then direction of the Jewish Agency for Israel[451] (JAFI)).

UJIA's role was to be "the catalyst for systemic renewal" and be a "critical friend to these three capacities." ('The Role of UJIA in Jewish Renewal' Note, n. d.)

Jonny Ariel had also developed a number of other aspects to the planning process. He identified what he called an 'acupuncture approach' – as opposed to surgery – by which he meant that UJIA Jewish Renewal, given its relatively limited resources, would be most effective by targeting a limited number of carefully chosen pressure points for maximum impact. He also established a five points check list for each intervention: "Is it true [if this was done would it have the effect claimed?]: Is it doable [was UJIA able to actually do it?]? Is it measurable? Is it sayable [sic] [was UJIA able to articulate it in its communications?]? Is it sellable? [was UJIA able to raise the funds to support it?]."[452] Ariel attempted to create a language for Jewish Renewal. He was responsible for pushing phrases some of which were original and some not: "turning up the Jewish heat"; "deliver low hanging fruits", "secure early wins", "under promise and over deliver", "it's about people, stupid" (referring to the need to find the best educators rather than invest further in buildings or seeking other strategies – as previously noted, based on Clinton's 1992 election slogan: "Its about the economy, stupid."). He also promoted ideas such as "sacred neutrality" (for bringing the different sections of the religious community together); "taking a helicopter view" (in planning for the community's educational future); relying on "planning and expertise" and deploying "financial resource". He also encouraged the notion of 'critical friendship' in dealing with partners. He also advocated "intellectual rigour", "ideological inspiration" and "leadership development". His approach also relied upon asking the appropriate, penetrating questions and pushing colleagues for tight and robust answers. For example, he asked of UJIA Jewish Renewal questions such as: What will success look like? What are the change mechanisms? What role should the UJIA play? All of this demanding analytical endeavour was brought together in 'The Next Horizon' (2001) – the UJIA Jewish Renewal strategic plan.

(The senior Jewish Renewal staff team (15th June 2000), discussed 'visionary frameworks' and considered the following question: what Jewish renewal frameworks are accessible to the individual Jew and what have the greatest renewal impact? To which the majority view was the home, school and synagogue. However, in answer to which frameworks are most realistically influenced by UJIA, the answers were Israel Experience, Youth Groups and Teacher Development.)

Operations

"JIA-Renewal should be organised as a Strategic Planning and Development Unit. Its work will reflect four fundamental commitments: Our work will be community-wide in scope with the potential to touch all Jews. Our work will rigorously focus on the educational system's strategic priorities. Our work will be carried out in collaboration with key communal agencies. Our work will prioritise that which can only be done by a central agency.

"There are four priority areas for our investment in Jewish Renewal: 1. Leadership; 2. Building Community; 3. Young People; 4. Israel Experience." ('JIA Vision for Our Future' (UJIA (June 1997)).[453] Each capacity would be expected to provide "a) Intellectual capacity; b) Ideological

[450] JPMP: the Jewish Programme and Materials Project owned by the Youth and Hechalutz Department of the Jewish Agency for Israel since its formation in the late 1970s (with some earlier and lesser involvement from the Association for Jewish Youth (AJY)) – there was an international network of JPMP-type resource centres around the Diaspora and centred in Jerusalem.

[451] In a UJIA Jewish Renewal Communications document to the first Renewal Executive, it was reported that the Jewish Agency played a critical role in delivering the Israel Experience in particular (as well as the youth movements), that they were facing cutbacks and that JIA and Jewish Continuity had increased their funding – and, importantly, that they (the Jewish Agency) were "unhappy with the UJIA's attempts to assert their control over the budgets."

[452] A sixth question was later added: 'Is it exitable?' – could the funding be ended.

[453] The JIA (by this time it had merged with Jewish Continuity but not yet renamed UJIA) Board of Directors Meeting, 9th June 1997: Brian Kerner (Chair), Victor Blank, Michael Bradfield, Sir Trevor Chinn, David S. Cohen, Gerard Cohen, Joy Cohen, Stanley Cohen, Allan Fisher, Michael Goldstein, Jonathan Kestenbaum

inspiration; c) Professional development." (UJIA Jewish Renewal, Strategic Planning Group (Lay), 1st July 1997).
A Draft UJIA Programme Book (27th September 1997), added the following Guiding Principles:
"Accountability – we will ensure that funds raised will be utilised in the most effective way to achieve the UJIA's stated mission. Monitoring – we will ensure that all programmes supported are regularly monitored and their performance assessed. Reporting – we will provide regular updates on how our programmes are progressing."
Under a UJIA-Jewish Agency agreement (7th August 1998), UJIA formally took over direction of the Israel Experience and Young People Departments. (The Allocations Committee for deciding funding to the youth movements (and students) was joint, and the Shlichim (Israeli educator emissaries) remained under JAFI direction).

Cross-communal Approach

The Next Horizon document (UJIA, 2001) did not dwell on the subject and adopted safer language that all would be able to accept, and also deployed Jewish Peoplehood concepts. Nonetheless, it was fully committed to a cross-communal approach.

Funding

A 1998 Jewish Renewal budget of £3m[454] was prepared but also included a minimum contingency budget of £2 million. The budget consisted of grants to external organisations aligned with UJIA's strategic aspirations (together with several allocations felt to be politically necessary) and internal allocations to work that UJIA was itself pursuing – either in terms of projects or central capacity. There was no Allocations Board or grant application procedure which was considered to be potentially too divisive. (UJIA Jewish Renewal Executive, 11th February 1998).
It was reported at the February 1999 Jewish Renewal Executive: "The Executive discussed the issue of how the profile of Jewish Renewal can be improved within the fundraising campaign. The difficulties involved were discussed and it was questioned whether it was simply an issue of training or whether there was a larger problem for example Renewal being harder to convey and less emotive than Rescue." The UJIA Jewish Renewal 1999 budget request had been reined back by 18 per cent over concerns around income projection.[455] (This happened again for the 2000 budget.)
In a document entitled 'UJIA Jewish Renewal – 2000 Programme' (November 1999), it proposed a 1999 budget of £3,055,000 and a 2000 budget of £3,706,900 (revised to £3,305,000). (The actual 1998 expenditure was reported as £2.2 million.) The 1999 budget indicated that the UJIA Renewal structure was now clearly in place, retaining the departmental budget areas established in the 1998 budget. The budgets for 1999 and 2000 were underspent. Furthermore, the projected 2001 budget was later to be revised significantly downwards as the income did not meet projections.[456]

UJIA Jewish Renewal Strategic Plan: 'The Next Horizon' (2001)

The UJIA Jewish Renewal three years strategic plan finally appeared in January, 2001. It was in the public domain.[457] The document re-stated the Vision and Mission.
It identified what it termed 'the ten commitments' as part of its visionary aspiration:
"Visionary thinking

(CEO), Eldred Kraines (Company Secretary and Finance), Daniel Levy, Andrew Loftus, Robert Manning, Geoffrey Ognall, Ronnie Preston, Dr Michael Sinclair, Sir Harry Solomon, Anthony Spitz, Howard Stanton, David Walsh, Michael Ziff. Apologies: Gary Phillips, Joshua Rowe, Stephen Rubin, Lionel Shebson, Jo Wagerman. Ex Officio: Jonny Ariel, Jayson Moser, Ruth Moser, Lee Scott, Suzie Simmons. By Invitation: Michael Mail (Jewish Renewal Operations), Anthony Wagerman (JIA Marketing). Uri David was later added.

[454] A July 1997 document, under the Communications strapline of 'Securing the Future of the Jewish people', had set the overall UJIA fund raising targets at: 1998: £12,510,000; 1999: £14,400,000; 2000: £16,570,000 – all excluding Legacies. These were ambitious targets intended to cover the work in Israel and the UK.

[455] The actual 1998 spend had in fact been £2.2million so £3 million for 1999 still marked a significant increase.

[456] On the 29th November 2000, the senior UJIA Jewish Renewal staff were briefed on the financial situation and the fact that the income target for the 2001 Jewish Renewal budget had to be revised downwards; part of the problem was that after the ear-marked donations for Israel had been taken into account, the donations ear-marked for Jewish Renewal and the unrestricted income was not as much as had been anticipated. Furthermore, the financial operating procedures ruled out carrying over underspends or dipping into reserves.

[457] In the absence of an alternative plan, it was sufficiently robust to provide direction to the organisation for the following decade.

1. We strive to fulfil our individual and collective Jewish dreams

"Al haTorah": A community of learning

2. We commit to lifelong Jewish learning
3. We learn and spend significant time in Israel
4. We absorb Jewish and non-Jewish wisdom

"V'al ha'avodah": A community of meaning

5. We create Jewish homes
6. We live by the Jewish calendar
7. We participate in Jewish ritual life

"V'al gemillut chassadim": A community of caring

8. We apply Jewish values to all areas of life
9. We volunteer to help others and to repair the world
10. We donate *tzedakah* to enable communal renewal." (UJIA (2001)

It set out what it called 'Our Theory of Change': nurturing visionary frameworks; mobilising effective leadership; cultivating upbeat culture.

Under 'Our Unique Role' it identified: 'Helicopter View'; 'Educational Expertise'; Critical Friend'; Financial Support'; and 'New Horizons' (i.e. a commitment to experimentation and piloting new areas).

The document set out a strong commitment to meaningful partnerships with other relevant communal organisations and also defined its lay-professional framework for Governance.

Under 'Our Programme', there was a summary of the role of each department, how they work together and funding arrangements; this was followed by further information and, importantly, detailed programming goals. Educational Leadership – "Our goal is that every Jewish educational leader will be trained and qualified, inspired and inspiring" with its key elements of recruit, train and retain; Israel Experience – "Our goal is that every young person will travel to Israel for the educational journey of a lifetime" with its key elements of quality, quantity and variety; Informal Education: "Our goal is that every Jew participates in rich and meaningful Jewish experiences" with its key elements to enlarge, enliven and enlighten; Research and Development – "Our goal is that every Jewish educational organisation will understand and focus on the community's most pressing educational priorities and plan accordingly" with its key elements of collate, consult and create.

The UJIA Jewish Renewal role was summarised as: "The UJIA has to play a particular and focused role. We need to hold an overview of Jewish education and developments throughout the community and share this perspective with others. We need to bring educational expertise into the community to strengthen, motivate and support our teachers and leaders. And we need to offer financial grants, subsidies and bursaries to enable Jewish life to thrive." (p 33).

26th March 2001, Renewal Executive

A positive report from the Chair of Jewish Renewal included the following reference: "Seymour Fox [Director of the Mandel Centre] valued our 3 year plan."

7.3 APPENDIX 3:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – [Date], [Name of Interviewee]

[add individualised prompts and probes …]

1. **Thank you** for agreeing to this interview.
2. The interview is conducted on the basis of being **'Confidential'** – in so far as I will not quote you directly on any sensitive matters – but **if I would like to use attributable quotations on any sensitive matters I will request your permission**.
3. The interview is for **my postgraduate academic research** and **not part of my professional work**.
4. I would like your **permission to record the interview** – this is only for the purpose of my later analysis and the tapes will **not be in the public domain.**
5. Please feel free to **turn the recorder off** at any point where you would prefer not to be recorded.
6. I will also be **taking notes**.
7. The interview should last approximately an hour – ***[confirm time available]***.

As I explained in my letter/telephone call/email, I would like to interview you about **the organisations Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal**. My research covers the period **1991-2000 relating to Jewish Continuity and the first four years of UJIA Jewish Renewal (1996-2000)**.

[Ensure the Interviewee is 'tuned-in' to the correct time period and events.]

(I know that you have insights and expertise on specific events and areas of activity but I also realise that you **may not be able to comment on every question –** and that is fine.)

(***If relevant***: I am **not dealing with the Israel side of the UJIA's operation**.)

I have a **set of questions** to work through, but towards the end of the interview I will ask you to please raise any **other relevant issues or ideas** that you feel have not been adequately addressed.

1. I WOULD LIKE TO START WITH YOUR PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT:

Please **briefly** describe **your own communal involvement** in this area**.**
[***Particularly***: Office of the Chief Rabbi, Jakobovits, JEDT, Worms Report, Sacks, Jewish Continuity, UJIA Jewish Renewal, other relevant organisations?]

How did **you become involved** in Jewish Continuity? UJIA Jewish Renewal?
[***Follow-up on their involvement*** *– may have been covered already.*]

2. I WOULD NOW LIKE TO FOCUS ON JEWISH CONTINUITY:

a) In your view, what were the **origins of the organisation Jewish Continuity**?
[What were the developments leading to its creation? influences?]
[Jakobovits, JEDT, Worms Report, Developments in North America (the concept 'Jewish continuity'), Chief Rabbi Sacks (his writings), the concept of Jewish Continuity, the JIA]

b) What were the **issues and challenges** that it was addressing?

c) How did **Jewish Continuity work/operate**?
What did you understand to be **Jewish Continuity's approach, mode of operation and strategy?**
*[**Examples:** Priority areas of work; Goals; Approach to communal partners; cross-communalism; fundraising, (Israel)]*

c) **Leadership**:

What was your view of the **role played by the leadership** of the organisation – **lay and professional**?
*[Explore roles of **Michael Sinclair** and **Clive Lawton** and others.]*

[What was your view of the **role of the Chief Rabbi – Sacks**?]
*[Address **Cross-communalism/Inclusivism** at the most appropriate point.]*

3. ***If relevant to Interviewee:***
d) what was **your assessment of the <u>JIA</u>** at this time and its **response to Jewish Continuity**?
[Check for responses on: Fundraising, leadership, relevance/resonance of message]

4. I WOULD APPRECIATE HEARING YOUR OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF JEWISH CONTINUITY?
*[Explore **strengths and weaknesses/successes and failures** …was there anything that could have been **done differently?**]*

In your opinion, why was the original Jewish Continuity model/structure unable to continue?

*[**Note Wagner Report** on **function, fundraising, religious complexion, governance**]*
*[**<u>ALSO:</u> Expectation management; leadership; role of JIA; fundraising; cross-communalism; planning and strategy**]*

[With hindsight, what might have been **done differently**?]

5. THE JEWISH CONTINUITY-JIA MERGER: WHAT WAS YOUR VIEW OF THIS DEVELOPMENT?

6. I WOULD NOW LIKE TO FOCUS ON UJIA JEWISH RENEWAL:

a) In your view, what were the **origins of the organisation UJIA Jewish Renewal**?

[What were the developments leading to its creation? influences?]
[Jakobovits, JEDT, Worms Report, Developments in North America (the concept 'Jewish continuity'), Chief Rabbi Sacks (his writings), the concept and organisation Jewish Continuity, the JIA]

b) During those formative years of 1996-2000, what did you understand to be the **issues and challenges** that UJIA Jewish Renewal was addressing?
*[Make it clear that we are **now discussing UJIA Jewish Renewal** and not Jewish Continuity – and only focussing on **the first four years**.]*

c) How did **UJIA Jewish Renewal work/operate**?
What did you understand to be **UJIA Jewish Renewal's approach, mode of operation and strategy?**
*[**Examples**: Priority areas of work; Goals; Approach to communal partners; cross-communalism; fundraising; Israel]*

d) **Leadership**:

What was your view of the **role played by the leadership** of the organisation – **lay and professional**?
*[Explore roles of **Brian Kerner** and **Jonathan Kestenbaum** and **Jonny Ariel** and others.]*

7. I WOULD APPRECIATE HEARING YOUR OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF UJIA JEWISH RENEWAL?

*[Explore **strengths and weaknesses/successes and failures** …was there anything that could have been **done differently?**]*

8. WHAT ARE THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN JEWISH CONTINUITY AND UJIA JEWISH RENEWAL?
[Take 'similarities' and 'differences' separately]
*[Areas of engagement and priority, ideological priorities, mode of operation, strategy, relations with partners, cross-communalism, **leadership - lay and professional**, fundraising etc]*
[What **lessons did UJIA Jewish Renewal learn from Jewish Continuity** and what did it fail to learn?]

[What type of organisations were: JEDT? Jewish Continuity? UJIA Jewish Renewal?
- Funding Foundation? Service Provider? Strategic Enabler? Central Agency? *[Explain terms as required]*

9. ARE THERE ANY OTHER INSIGHTS OR OBSERVATIONS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD CONCERNING ANY OF THE AREAS THAT WE HAVE DISCUSSED?
[Prompts: issues that we have not covered? thoughts you had about the organisations? particular aspects that troubled you or inspired you at the time? Overall assessment of strategic and operational issues?]

[Time permitting:] **10. WHAT WAS THE LASTING IMPACT OF JEWISH CONTINUITY AND UJIA JEWISH RENEWAL?**

[Also attached to interview schedule in case it was needed by interviewer for reference but only used twice]

Jewish Continuity

To secure the future of Anglo-Jewry by creating a vibrant community of proud, knowledgeable and committed Jews.

Jewish Continuity Task Groups

Initiative areas:
Personnel Development; Youth and Community Development; Outreach and Personal Development; Israel Experience Development; Jewish Activities in Mainstream Schools

Task Groups:
Arts, Media and Culture; Community Development; Formal Education; Informal Education; Israel Experience; JAMS; Leadership Development; Outreach; Research for Planning; Students and Young Adults; Bursaries Committee.

UJIA Renewal

Our Vision

Our vision is that future generations of Jews will be safe, proud and knowledgeable members of the Jewish people, committed to our unique heritage and to the eternity of Israel.

Our Mission

Our Mission is to secure the future of the Jewish People.

We pursue this mission by mobilising the UK community's support for:

- the Rescue of Jews in need throughout the world, and their absorption into Israel.
- the Renewal of Jewish life in Britain, and of our partnership with Israel.

UJIA … ensuring Jewish life lives on

UJIA Mission:
Investing in young people and education in Israel and the UK.

7.4 APPENDIX 4:

DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS

Four Components:

1. Interview Schedule Questions: Areas of Investigation
2. Data Categories
3. Data Concepts
4. Central Themes (the Basis of the Research Findings)

Interview Schedule Questions: Areas of Investigation

The interview schedule (built significantly on the documentary analysis, literature review and subsequent piloting) focused upon the following key areas – some through direct questions and others were the basis for prompts and probes.

1. Background to the period 1991-2000 (relating to Jewish Continuity and the first four years of UJIA Jewish Renewal):
Office of the Chief Rabbi (OCR);
Former Chief Rabbi Jakobovits;
The Jewish Education Development Trust (JEDT);
The Worms Report;
Chief Rabbi Sacks;
How interviewees became involved with Jewish Continuity and JIA and, later, UJIA.

2. Jewish Continuity:
Jewish Continuity: origins – Jakobovits, JEDT, Worms Report, Developments in North America (the concept 'Jewish continuity'), Chief Rabbi Sacks (including his writings), the concept of Jewish Continuity, the JIA;
Jewish Continuity: issues and challenges;
Jewish Continuity: approach, mode of operation and strategy – priority areas of work, goals, approach to communal partners, cross-communalism, fundraising, Israel;
Jewish Continuity Leadership: the role played by the leadership – lay and professional (Michael Sinclair and Clive Lawton and others);
The role of Chief Rabbi Sacks;
Cross-communalism;
Inclusivism.

3. JIA:
Assessment;
Response to Jewish Continuity?;
JIA: fundraising, leadership, relevance/resonance of campaign message.

4. Jewish Continuity – overall assessment:
Strengths and weaknesses/successes and failures;
Was there anything that could have been done differently;
Discontinuation of the model.

5.a. Wagner Report:
Function and role, fundraising, religious complexion, governance;
Expectation management, leadership, role of JIA, fundraising, cross-communalism, planning and strategy.

5.b. The Jewish Continuity-JIA Merger:
Why did it happen;
How did it happen.

6. UJIA Jewish Renewal:
Origins of the organisation UJIA Jewish Renewal;
Developments leading to its creation, influences behind it – Jakobovits, JEDT, Worms Report, Developments in North America (the concept 'Jewish continuity'), Chief Rabbi Sacks (including his writings), the concept and organisation Jewish Continuity, the JIA;
Issues and challenges;
Approach, mode of operation and strategy – priority areas of work, goals, approach to communal partners, cross-communalism, fundraising, Israel;
UJIA Jewish Renewal Leadership: role played by the leadership – lay and professional;
Brian Kerner, Jonathan Kestenbaum, Jonny Ariel and others.

7.UJIA Jewish Renewal – overall assessment:
Strengths and weaknesses/successes and failures;
Was there anything that could have been done differently.

8.a. Jewish Continuity and UJIA Jewish Renewal – similarities and differences:
Areas of engagement and priority, ideological priorities, mode of operation, strategy, relations with partners, cross-communalism, leadership – lay and professional, fundraising, other;
Lessons for UJIA Jewish Renewal from Jewish Continuity and what did it fail to learn.

8.b. Organisational models/types:
JEDT, Jewish Continuity, UJIA Jewish Renewal;
Funding Foundation, Service Provider, Strategic, Central Agency/'Enabler'.

9. Any insights or observations that you would like to add?

10. Lasting Impact.

<u>Data Categories</u>

The interview notes were then analysed and each unit of data was coded according to the following categories that emerged from the interviews:

1. Jewish Educational Development Trust (JEDT)/Worms Report
2. Chief Rabbi Sacks and Former Chief Rabbi Jakobovits
3. Chief Rabbi Sacks

4. Jewish Continuity Origins (including JEDT/Worms Report to Jewish Continuity)
5. Michael Sinclair: Jewish Continuity Lay Chair
6. Jewish Continuity: Other Lay Leaders

7. Clive Lawton: Jewish Continuity Chief Executive
8. Jewish Continuity: Cross-Communalism
9. Jewish Continuity: Strategy
10. Jewish Continuity and the Jewish Community Allocations Board (JCAB)/Funding
11. Jewish Continuity-Joint Israel Appeal (JIA) Relations/Fundraising

12. Joint Israel Appeal (JIA)

13. Mandel Critique of Jewish Continuity
14. Wagner Report

15. Jewish Continuity-JIA Merger (to form the United Jewish Israel Appeal (UJIA))

16. Jonathan Kestenbaum: Chief Executive of the Office of the Chief Rabbi (OCR) (Sacks) and Chief Executive of UJIA
17. Jonny Ariel: Executive Director for UJIA Jewish Renewal
18. UJIA Jewish Renewal Lay and Professional Leadership

19. Jewish Continuity and UJIA: Role of Lay and Professional Leadership
20. Jewish Continuity and UJIA: Relationship with Partner Organisations
21. Jewish Continuity and UJIA: Comparisons

22. Other Educational Initiatives

23. UJIA Jewish Renewal: the Problem Definition
24. UJIA Jewish Renewal: Strategy

25. Miscellaneous

<u>Data Concepts</u>

Thereafter, each category was analysed in order to identify key concepts within each:

1. JEDT:
    a. Former Chief Rabbi Jakobovits – promotion of school building
    b. Jakobovits's role in JEDT
    c. Approach to Cross-communalism
    d. Pre-occupation with building Immanuel College (early 1990s)
    e. Worms Report/Fred Worms: implications for Strategic Planning
    f. Transition from JEDT to Jewish Continuity

2. Chief Rabbi Sacks and Former Chief Rabbi Jakobovits:
    a. Transition
    b. Backgrounds and Profiles of Each and the Implications for their Respective Chief Rabbinates (including their approaches to Jewish Education)
    c. The Contrast between Sacks and Jakobovits
    d. Approaches to cross-communalism
3. Chief Rabbi Sacks:
    a. Cross-communalism
    b. Sacks – Personality

c. Office of the Chief Rabbi - Approach
d. Jewish Continuity Vision

4. Jewish Continuity - Origins:
   a. Vision/Idea
   b. Purpose
   c. Structure/Governance
   d. American Precedents
   e. Launch
   f. Key Developments

5. Michael Sinclair:
   a. Personality/Background
   b. Views/Ideological Perspective
   c. Cross-communalism
   d. Approach
   e. Fundraising
   f. Relationship with Chief Rabbi Sacks
   g. Relationship with Clive Lawton
   h. Assessment of his Role

6. Jewish Continuity Lay Leaders:
   a. Chairs of Task Groups
   b. Influential Players e.g. Clive Marks, Leslie Wagner

7. Clive Lawton:
   a. Personality/Background
   b. Views and Ideological Perspective
   c. Jewish Continuity – Approach to the Role of Chief Executive
   d. Cross-communalism
   e. Relationship with Chief Rabbi Sacks and Jonathan Kestenbaum (OCR)
   f. Relationship with Michael Sinclair
   g. Relationship with Lay Leaders
   h. Assessment of His Role

8. Jewish Continuity:
   a. Establishment/Set Up
   b. Rationale/Goals
   c. Context
   d. Strategy e.g. Community Development
   e. Structure e.g. Task Groups, RESQUJE
   f. Governance
   g. Public Relations/Presentation
   h. Role of Lay Leaders
   i. Finances and Fundraising
   j. Delivery/Operation
   k. Relationships with Partners
   l. Impact
   m. Critiques

9. Jewish Continuity – Cross-communalism:
    a. Sacks and Jakobovits
    b. JEDT as a Precedent
    c. Chief Rabbi Sacks's Influence
    d. Inclusivism and Pluralism
    e. Place of Jewish Continuity in the Wider Community
    f. Role of Jewish Continuity Trustees
    g. Role of the Progressives
    h. Role of Orthodoxy
    i. The Jewish Community Allocations Board
    j. Chief Rabbi Sacks's letter on Conservative (Masorti) Jews (12th January 1995)
    k. The Rabbi Hugo Gryn Affair
    l. Implications for the Relationship between Jewish Continuity and the JIA

10. Jewish Continuity and the Jewish Community Allocations Board (JCAB)/Funding:
    a. Funding Strategy
    b. Role of JCAB
    c. Impact of Funding Approach

11. JIA:
    a. JIA – an Assessment of its Standing and Place in the Community
    b. JIA and Jewish Education
    c. JIA and Jewish Continuity

12. Jewish Continuity and JIA – Fundraising:
    a. Assessment of Jewish Continuity Fundraising
    b. Assessment of JIA Fundraising
    c. Jewish Continuity-JIA Relations - General
    d. Jewish Continuity-JIA Relations Concerning Funding

13. Mandel Centre Critique:
    a. Relationships with Key Lay Leaders
    b. Critique of Jewish Continuity's Approach

14. Wagner Report:
    a. Reasons for Establishment of the Review
    b. Mode of Operation of the Review
    c. Areas of Focus – Function and Role; Finance; Religious Complexion; Governance
    d. Proposed Three Options for the Future – Outreach (Orthodox-only); Development Agency (cross-communal, more focussed foundation (grant-giving body) with restricted service delivery); Strategic Planning and Development Agency (cross-communal, with a more limited foundation role and a focus upon strategic planning and co-ordination)

15. Jewish Continuity-JIA Merger:
    a. Reasons for the Merger
    b. Process and Mechanism for the Merger
    c. Consequences and Outcomes
    d. Reactions to the Merger

16. Other Educational Initiatives

17. UJIA Jewish Renewal – Cross-communalism:
    a. Approach
    b. Lessons from Jewish Continuity

18. UJIA Jewish Renewal – Fundraising

19. UJIA Lay and Professional Leadership

20. Jewish Continuity-UJIA Comparisons:
    a. Rationale/Goals
    b. Vision/Idea
    c. Structure/Governance
    d. Strategy
    e. Delivery/Operation
    f. Leadership
    g. Funding
    h. Public Relations/Presentation
    i. Transition
    j. UJIA Jewish Renewal Advantages
    k. Criticisms

21. Jonny Ariel:
    a. Personality/Background
    b. Jewish Continuity
    c. UJIA Role

22. Jonathan Kestenbaum:
    a. Personality/Background
    b. Relationship with Chief Rabbi
    c. Relationship with Jewish Continuity

23. UJIA Jewish Renewal:
    a. Vision/Idea
    b. Rationale/Goals
    c. Context
    d. Establishment/Set Up
    e. Purpose
    f. Strategy
    g. Planning
    h. Structure e.g. Jewish Renewal Departments
    i. Governance
    j. Finance and Fundraising
    k. Delivery/Operation
    l. Professional Leadership
    m. Lay Leadership
    n. Relationships with Partners
    o. Impact
    p. Criticisms

Central Themes (the Framework for the Research Findings)

The documentary evidence provided the basis for the interview schedule and the additional triangulation and clarification.

The Central Themes that initially emerged were:

1. (Context of British Jewry)
2. Vision and Strategic Direction
3. Implementation/Mode of Operation
4. Funding
5. Leadership
6. Cross-communalism
7. Public Relations/Communications

However, these were further refined to comprise the Findings section of the research:

1. Vision and Planning
2. Organisation and Implementation
3. Leadership Roles and Personalities
4. Challenges:
    a. Cross-communalism
    b. Relations with Partner Organisations
    c. Funding
    d. Communications and Expectations

7.5 APPENDIX 5

A List of Key Individuals from Which the Interviewees were Chosen (some of whom have been deliberately disguised) – this is not intended to be an exhaustive list

	NAME	MAIN COMMUNITY ROLE/S IN THE 1990s (IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS RESEARCH)	CATEGORY FOR SAMPLE PURPOSES	INTERVIEW DATE OF THOSE WHO ARE QUOTED IN THE REPORT
1	PROFESSOR GEOFFREY ALDERMAN	Academic/Journalist	Academic/ Expert Informant	
2	JONNY ARIEL	First Executive Director, UJIA Jewish Renewal	UJIA Professional	February 2004/ December 2006
3	RICHARD BOLCHOVER	Jewish Chronicle Trustee, JPR Trustee	Lay Leader/ Expert Informant	
4	RABBI DR TONY BAYFIELD	Chief Executive, Reform Movement	Partner Professional	November 2007
5	DUBI BERGMAN	Former Director, Jewish Agency for Israel, Europe	Partner Professional	July 2010
6	SIR VICTOR BLANK	Jewish Continuity Board and UJIA Board	JC/UJIA Lay Leader	
7	JON BOYD	Reform Movement, Youth and Student Director/ UJIA Renewal, Research & Dev. Dept.	UJIA Professional	September 2007
8	MICHAEL BRADFIELD	Jewish Continuity and UJIA Board	JC/UJIA Lay Leader	
9	SIMON CAPLAN	Former Chief Executive, JEDT (UJIA Jewish Renewal Strategic Planning Group) Freelance Jewish Educator	Educationalist/ Expert Informant	April 2008
10	SIR TREVOR CHINN, CVO	JIA Chair/Jewish Continuity Board	JIA/UJIA Lay Leader	July 2010
11	DAVID COHEN	Second Chair, UJIA	JIA/UJIA Lay Leader	
12	SHIMON COHEN	Director, Office of Chief Rabbi (under Jakobovits)	Expert Informant	
13	PROFESSOR STEVE M. COHEN	Academic (American) (One of the leading academics on Western Jewry)	Academic/ Expert Informant	
14	CHARLES CORMAN	Jewish Continuity Trustee	JC Lay Leader	
15	TONY DANKER	UJIA Renewal Exec (Research and Development)	UJIA Lay leader	March 2008
16	DAYAN CHANOCH EHRENTREU	Head, Bet Din	Rabbinic Leader/ Expert Informant	
17	STEPHEN ELIAS	Chair, UJIA Renewal, Manchester	UJIA Lay Leader	
18	ALASTAIR FALK	Former Head Teacher, Jewish Secondary School	Educationalist/ Expert Informant	
19	JUDGE ISRAEL	Former President of the Board of	Historian/	

	FINESTEIN	**Deputies of British Jews Historian of British Jewry (Recently Deceased)**	**Expert Informant/Lay Leader**	
20	**ERIC FINESTONE**	**Director, Association for Jewish Youth (Association for Jewish Youth (AJY)**	**Partner Professional**	
21	**ALAN FISHER**	**JC/UJIA Board**	**JC/UJIA Lay Leader**	
22	**ALAN FOX**	**JIA, Chief Executive**	**JIA Professional**	
23	**PROFESSOR SEYMOUR FOX**	**President, Mandel Centre (Recently Deceased)**	**Education Professional/ Expert Informant**	
24	**DR. HARRY FREEDMAN**	**Chief Executive, Assembly of Masorti Synagogues**	**Partner Professional**	**April 2008**
25	**SYDNEY FROSH**	**President, United Synagogue**	**Partner Lay Leader**	
26	**ANDREW GILBERT**	**Has headed the Movement for Reform Judaism, Limmud, UJIA Renewal Executive Member (Israel Experience, Chair)**	**Partner/UJIA Lay Leader/Expert Informant**	**November 2007**
27	**DAVID GOLDBERG**	**Director, UJIA Israel Experience Department**	**UJIA Professional**	**February 2007**
28	**GABY GOLDSTEIN**	**Worms Report Group, JEDT/ Former Ministry of Education Inspector**	**Education Consultant/ Expert Informant**	
29	**MICHAEL GOLDSTEIN**	**Jewish Continuity and UJIA Board/ 2nd UJIA Jewish Renewal Chair**	**JC/UJIA Lay Leader**	**April 2008**
30	**SIMON GOULDEN**	**Head, Agency for Jewish Education, US (Orthodox)**	**Partner Professional**	**May 2008**
31	**SHLOMI GRAVITZ**	**JAFI Department Director – Israel**	**Partner Professional**	
32	**PROFESSOR DAVID HILLEL-RUBIN**	**Former Director of Jews' College (Orthodox)**	**Partner Professional**	
33	**ALAN HOFFMAN**	**Director, Education Department, JAFI**	**Partner Professional/ Expert Informant**	**December 2006**
34	**DR KEITH KAHN-HARRIS**	**Freelance Researcher, Jewish Continuity/UJIA Jewish Renewal**	**Academic/ Expert Informant**	
35	**AVRAHAM INFELD**	**Director, Melitz**	**Educational Leader/ Expert Informant**	
36	**HASIA ISRAEL**	**Education Director, Youth and Hechalutz Dept Jewish Agency for Israel, UK**	**Partner Professional**	
37	**SIR STANLEY KALMS**	**JEDT/United Synagogue/Office of the Chief Rabbi**	**Partner Lay Leader**	
38	**BRIAN KERNER**	**First Chair, UJIA (and JIA Chair and Jewish Continuity Board)**	**JIA/JC/UJIA Lay Leader**	**December 2009**
39	**LORD JONATHAN KESTENBAUM**	**Director, Office of the Chief Rabbi/First Chief Executive of UJIA**	**Office of the Chief Rabbi /UJIA Professional**	**April/June 2008**
40	**RABBI DR ALAN KIMCHE**	**Outreach Worker, Jewish Continuity**	**JC Professional**	

41	**PROFESSOR BARRY KOSMIN**	**Director, Jewish Policy Research (JPR)**	**Academic/ Expert Informant**	
42	**ELDRED KRAINES**	**JIA and UJIA Company Secretary and Finance Director**	**JIA/UJIA Professional**	
43	**CLIVE LAWTON**	**Chief Executive, Jewish Continuity**	**JC Professional**	**December 2005**
44	**GEOFFREY LEADER**	**Deputy Director, Agency for Jewish Education (United Synagogue, Orthodox)**	**Partner Professional**	
45	**ANTHONY LERMAN**	**Director, Jewish Policy Research (JPR)**	**Expert Informant**	
46	**DAVID LERNER**	**JFS School/UJIA Professional**	**Expert Informant**	**December 2005**
47	**REVERAND ELKAN LEVY**	**President, United Synagogue (1996-9)**	**Partner Lay Leader**	**August 2007**
48	**LORD MICHAEL LEVY**	**Chair, Jewish Care/JIA Board**	**JIA/UJIA Lay Leader**	
49	**PETER LEVY**	**JEDT/Reform Movement**	**Partner Lay Leader**	
50	**LEONIE LEWIS**	**Director, Community Development Group (US)**	**Partner Professional**	**December 2006**
51	**ANDREW LOFTUS**	**JIA and UJIA Board**	**Jewish Continuity Lay Leader**	
52	**MICHAEL MAIL**	**JEDT, Jewish Continuity and UJIA Professional**	**JC/UJIA Professional**	**February 2006**
53	**PROFESSOR ZEEV MANKOVITZ**	**Academic, The Hebrew University**	**Academic/ Expert Informant**	
54	**RICHARD MANNING**	**Chair, UJIA Renewal, Leeds**	**JIA/UJIA Lay Leader**	
55	**CLIVE MARKS**	**Trustee, Lord Ashdown Charitable Settlement, Jewish Continuity**	**JC Lay Leader**	**September 2008**
56	**SIMON MAURER**	**Director, UJIA Campaigns (Fundraising)**	**UJIA Professional**	
57	**RABBI DR CHARLES MIDDLEBROUGH**	**Chief Executive, Liberal Judaism**	**Partner Professional**	
58	**DR HELENA MILLER**	**Deputy Director, Centre for Jewish Education (Progressive/non-Orthodox)**	**Partner Professional**	**April 2008**
59	**PROFESSOR STEPHEN MILLER**	**Consultant to JEDT Worms Report/Jewish Policy Research (JPR)/Academic, City University**	**Academic/ Expert Informant**	
60	**STEVE V. MILLER**	**Freelance Jewish Community Researcher/Educator**	**Expert Informant**	
61	**GEOFFREY OGNALL**	**JIA/JC/UJIA Board**	**JIA/UJIA Lay Leader**	**April 2008**
62	**SHALOM ORZACH**	**Second Executive Director, UJIA Renewal (succeeded Ariel)**	**UJIA Professional**	
63	**YEPHET OZERI**	**Director, Youth & Hechalutz Dept (JAFI) – London**	**Partner Professional**	
64	**MICHAEL PHILLIPS**	**JEDT, Chair**	**JEDT/UJIA Lay Leader**	
65	**FELIX POSEN**	**Community Philanthropist**	**Independent Lay Leader/ Expert Informant**	
66	**PROFESSOR DEREK PUGH**	**Academic, Open University**	**Expert Informant**	

67	**DR ROB RABINOVITZ**	**Jewish Continuity & UJIA Professional (& UJIA Strategic Planning Group)**	**JC/UJIA Professional**	
68	**JEROME REBACK**	**UJIA Renewal Executive (Informal Jewish Education, Chair)**	**UJIA Lay Leader**	
69	**DAME RUTH ROBBINS**	**Head Teacher, Jewish Free School (JFS) (Secondary)**	**Partner Professional**	
70	**SIMON ROCKER**	**Reporter, Jewish Chronicle**	**Journalist/ Expert Informant**	
71	**LAURIE ROSENBERG**	**Formerly Board of Deputies of British Jews**	**Partner Professional**	
72	**JOSHUA ROWE**	**Honorary President, UJIA Manchester/ Chair Governors, Jewish Secondary School, King David, Manchester**	**Lay leader/ Expert Informant**	
73	**CHIEF RABBI LORD JONATHAN SACKS**	**Chief Rabbi**		
74	**RABBI NAPHTALI SCHIFF**	**Aish, Director**	**Expert Informant**	
75	**MARLENA SCHMOOL**	**Board of Deputies of British Jews**	**Expert Informant/ Partner Professional**	
76	**LEE SCOTT MP**	**First Director, UJIA Campaigns (Fundraising)**	**UJIA Professional**	
77	**LIONEL SHEBSON**	**JIA, UJIA Board**	**UJIA Lay Leader**	
78	**PETER SHELDON**	**President, United Synagogue**	**Partner Lay Leader**	
79	**RABBI DR MICHAEL SHIRE**	**Director, Leo Baeck College (Progressive/Non-Orthodox)**	**Partner Professional**	**April 2008**
80	**BARRY SHRAGE**	**Chair Executive, Boston (USA), Combined Jewish Philanthropies**	**Jewish Community Development Specialist/ Expert Informant**	
81	**DR MICHAEL SINCLAIR**	**Chair, Jewish Continuity and UJIA Board**	**JC Lay Leader**	**December 2008**
82	**PHILIP SKELKER**	**First Director, UJIA Renewal Educational Leadership**	**UJIA Professional**	
83	**SIR HARRY SOLOMON**	**Jewish Continuity and UJIA Board**	**JC/UJIA Lay Leader**	**August 2008**
84	**ANTHONY SPITZ**	**First Chair, UJIA Renewal**	**JIA/UJIA Lay Leader**	
85	**HOWARD STANTON**	**Treasurer, Jewish Continuity & First Treasurer, UJIA**	**JC/UJIA Lay Leader**	**October 2009**
86	**ELDRED TABACHNIK QC**	**President, Board of Deputies of British Jews**	**Expert Informant**	
87	**NATAN TEIFENBRUN**	**Jewish Continuity/Limmud Activist**	**JC Lay Leader**	
88	**NED TEMKO**	**Editor, Jewish Chronicle**	**Journalist/ Expert Informant**	
89	**FRANCES TURNER**	**UJIA Renewal Executive (Informal Jewish Education)**	**UJIA Lay Leader**	
90	**ANTHONY WAGERMAN**	**First Director, UJIA Communications**	**UJIA Professional**	

91	**PROFESSOR LESLIE WAGNER**	**Jewish Continuity/Wagner Report, Author/ Jewish Community Allocations Board (JCAB), Chair**	**Academic/JC Lay Leader/Expert Informant**	**April 2008**
92	**DAVID WALSH**	**President, Reform Synagogues of Great Britain**	**Partner Lay Leader**	
93	**PROFESSOR ANTHONY WARRENS**	**Jewish Continuity/UJIA Board, 3rd UJIA Jewish Renewal Chair**	**JC/UJIA Lay Leader**	**November 2007**
94	**MICHAEL WEGIER**	**Third Executive Director, UJIA Renewal**	**UJIA Professional/ Expert Informant**	
95	**SYMA WINEBERG**	**JEDT Professional/Jewish Continuity Professional/Later Director, Office of the Chief Rabbi (OCR)**	**JC Professional**	**January 2006**
96	**LADY WINSTON (LIRA)**	**Jewish Continuity Professional/UJIA Professional**	**JC Professional**	**October 2007**
97	**RABBI JONATHAN WITTENBERG**	**Assembly of Masorti Synagogues, New North London**	**Partner Professional**	
98	**DR JONATHAN WOOCHER**	**Jewish Community Professional, North America**	**Educationalist/ Expert Informant**	
99	**FRED WORMS**	**JEDT, Worms Report**	**Lay Leader/Expert informant**	
100	**RABBI SAUL ZNEIMER**	**Chief Executive, United Synagogue, Orthodox**	**Partner Professional**	**October 2007**