Journal of Modern Jewish Studies

FORCES OF TOMORROW

Jim Gledhill[a]

[a] Address: School of Art History, University of St Andrews, 79
North Street, St Andrews, Fife KY16 9AL. [email:]
Published online: 23 Feb 2015.

Click for updates

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Jim Gledhill

FORCES OF TOMORROW
Youth culture and identity in the British Hashomer Hatzair movement

This article examines the social experience of belonging to the British section of the international Socialist Zionist youth movement, Hashomer Hatzair. The study is based on interviews conducted with 10 former activists across four generations and focuses primarily on the movement in London. It will be argued that Hashomer Hatzair represented a unique alternative youth culture based on a model developed by the movement's founders in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. This model synthesized Robert Baden-Powell's Scouting, the Jugendkultur of the German youth movements, Socialist Zionism and Marxism. Imported to Britain by young German and Austrian refugees from Nazism, this youth culture was reproduced initially in the English countryside, and after the war plugged into the pre-existing politics of Jewish radicalism in London and the general Zionist fervour that anticipated the establishment of Israel. Hashomer Hatzair emphasized autonomy from adult society. By creating autonomous youth spaces, the movement opened a portal for young Jews to shape their own identities. Through a process of politicization and education, the movement's adherents would identify life on Israeli kibbutzim as an ideal future in adulthood. In tandem with the projection of heroic Jewish role models, this process encouraged Hashomer Hatzair's followers to define their Jewishness in secular and existential terms, in opposition both to contemporary consumerist and urbanized capitalism, and to the traditional communal associations of the past.

Introduction

If militancy is unpopular in some parts of the world today, our Movement is not unaccustomed to swimming against the stream; if today we are in the minority, this only drives us on to greater efforts. For we are part of that section of humanity which represents the strugglers, the dreamers, the revolutionaries of today, the victors of tomorrow. (Dan Leon in Hashomer Hatzair 1952, 60)[1]

Forged under Habsburg imperial rule, the Socialist Zionist youth movement Hashomer Hatzair (The Young Guard, henceforth Hashomer) was born in Galicia in 1913. Vienna subsequently acted as a crucible for the intellectual development of its exiled leadership during World War I. Deriving its early form and ideology from the German Wandervögel and Blau-Weiss movements, Hashomer combined the physical discipline and woodcraft of Robert Baden-Powell's Scouting with an autonomous Jewish youth culture. The

Wandervögel ideologue, Gustav Wyneken, conceived a *Jugendkultur* opposing capitalism, philistinism and urbanism that would prove an enduring influence on Hashomer, refracted through the Zionist philosophy of Martin Buber and Aaron David Gordon. Buber believed that the *galut* (exile) had cleft the Jewish being and Jews could only achieve unity again through existential self-realization and the bond of a new organic *Gemeinshaft* (community). For Gordon, Jews had become alienated from nature and had to reconnect with the soil through pioneering settlement and agricultural labour. These ideas coalesced as the key components of Hashomer ideology: *hagshamah atzmit* (self-realization) and *halutziut* (pioneering ethos). Hashomer pioneers first went to Palestine in 1920 during the Third Aliyah. The Hashomer belief system also incorporated the Socialist Zionism of Ber Borokhov, ideologue of the Russian Poalei Zion (Workers of Zion) and Marxism. This political current came to the fore decisively during World War II when the movement aligned itself to the Soviet Union; an outlook it defined as "the orientation toward the forces of tomorrow" (Friedman 1955, 34–48; Lacquer 1962; Margalit 1969, 25–46; Benin 1990, 27; Near 1992, 113–119; Shimoni 1995, 223–226; Rechter 1996, 25–45; Halpern and Reinharz 1998, 220; Lacquer 2003, 297–308).

The British section of Hashomer was founded by German and Austrian refugees from Nazism who arrived in London after the November Pogrom of 1938 under the auspices of Hechalutz (The Pioneer), an international umbrella organization of *halutzic* youth movements. Hechalutz brought around 1,000 young people to England, supported by the Zionist Federation and the Council for German Jewry. Training centres were established in various parts of the country for the young refugees to learn agricultural skills in preparation for emigration to Palestine (Hechalutz 1942, 4; Bentwich 1956, 94–95; Silberklang 1993, 333–371). *Hakhsharah*[2] was designed to prepare pioneers for their future lives on a kibbutz. The first conference of the British Hashomer organization was held in Liverpool in 1939. After World War II, it established branches in London, Liverpool, Leeds and Manchester, with a *hakhsharah* at Bedford and then later near Bishops Stortford. In common with orthodox communist parties, Hashomer operated on the Leninist principle of democratic centralism. The movement was directed by the *hanhagah rashit* (executive committee) and the *mazkirut* (secretariat) consisting of elected officers, including the *mazkir* (general secretary) and *gizbar* (treasurer). Hashomer Hatzair of Great Britain and Ireland was established as a political party in October 1947 to be the British section of its Israeli parent formed the previous year (*On Guard,* October–November 1947, 2–5; Hashomer Hatzair 1952, 20–23). Two-thirds of the Israeli party were members of the Kibbutz Artzi federation founded in 1927. This subsequently became the largest component of the Mifleget Hapòalim Hame'uhedet (MAPAM, United Workers' Party) when it was created in 1948.[3] From the beginning, Kibbutz Artzi sent over *shlihim* (emissaries) to maintain organizational and ideological oversight. These older, experienced political cadres would also sit on the *hanhagah rashit*.[4] This form of "guided democracy" was common among the pioneering youth movements that settled the kibbutzim (Peres 1963, 95).

Stephan Wendehorst has produced an accomplished study of Hashomer within the context of British Zionism, using the movement's official archives in Israel (see Wendehorst 1999; Wendehorst 2012, 142–152). His work does not, however, consider the human face of the movement. The present article is therefore principally concerned with Hashomer as a radical youth culture, and the psycho-social experience of its adherents. This work arose from the intersection of two research strands undertaken by the

author at the Museum of London: uniformed youth movements and left-wing politics in London's Jewish community. Through the museum, I was able to conduct interviews with a sample of 10 former activists across four generations. Of the sample interviewed, seven originated in the East End or north London, one in suburban north-west London, and two joined the movement in other places: one in Manchester, and another, a member of the founding immigrant generation, in Vienna. The seven subjects from inner London areas grew up in working-class households. All English interviewees were educated in Grammar Schools and four attended Hackney Downs School. The Austrian interviewee attended a Gymnasium and so shared an equivalent educational background with the English. The scope of the article will be primarily the experience of belonging to Hashomer in London, its organizational fulcrum in the period between the late 1940s and early 1960s, after which the movement entered its twilight. The organization's formative years, *hakhsharah* and activity in other parts of the country will also be examined, but the article will not discuss interviewees' subsequent experiences in Israel.

The use of oral history sources in relation to the history of youth movements has associated methodological issues. Individuals typically construct their own narratives as "life stories" in order to interpret or validate past experiences and to achieve a coherent sense of self. The recollections of a group bound by common social experiences represent a complex relational dynamic between individual and collective memory (Abrams 2010, 40–45 and 95–103). Individuals may retrospectively superimpose macro-historical or political narratives onto past social experiences as part of a collective process of remembering or to legitimize past behaviours. This may obscure more complex individual motives for action, often informed by psychological and emotional factors. The experience of anti-Semitism, for example, was influential in the case of some individuals, but this was not universal. The interviews taken as a body of evidence reveal that, despite the common social background and personal relationships between many of the subjects, there is some significant degree of experiential variation depending on age, geography, education, working and familial circumstances.

Blue, white and red: radical politics and London's Jewish community

In the period of study, London's Jewish community underwent significant demographic change that, along with the creation of Israel, influenced its political orientation. Luftwaffe bombing, slum clearance and the expansion of council housing during post-war reconstruction accelerated the inter-war trend of outward migration from traditional Jewish enclaves in the East End. Jews moved north to Hackney, Dalston, Stoke Newington and Stamford Hill, and to the suburbs of Hampstead, Golders Green, Edgware, Finchley, Hendon, Wembley and Willesden. Others moved to the Essex hinterland of Ilford, Woodford, Harold Hill, Hainault and Loughton. The vector of upward social mobility produced a decline in the Jewish working-class in the East End cabinet-making and garment trades. Many Jews continued to work in the East End, but no longer lived there, weakening the force of communal cohesion (Lipman 1954, 168–171; Brotz 1955, 140–141; Krausz 1964, 32–33, Krausz 1969, 87–92; Endelman 2002, 229–230).

Despite the upward social trajectory of sections of the community, there continued to exist a visible Jewish working-class in north London in the post-war period. Of the

seven interviewees who grew up in north London, four had parents who worked in the clothing trade. In the case of both Maurice Collins and Norman Rose, their fathers worked as pressers and their mothers as sewing machinists. Diana Lazarus's father was also a presser. David Merron's father, a Byelorussian immigrant, continued to commute to a tailor's workshop in Whitechapel after his family moved to Stoke Newington during the war. The fathers of Helena Davis and Michael Saffer both worked as taxi drivers.[5]

In political terms, the Jewish community remained generally left of centre, expressing a clear electoral preference for the Labour Party. The appeal of Socialism for young Jews in north London was rooted in the radical political culture nurtured among East End Jewish immigrants from the late nineteenth century (Feldman 1994, 6 and 383–385; see also Fishman 1975). This culture, based on a collective challenge to political, cultural and religious authority, was a powerful motive force in both improving the social conditions of the Jewish community and resisting Fascism, and therefore resonated beyond the crowded tenements of Stepney. In this respect, the politics of Hashomer were not simply a foreign implant; they plugged directly into a pre-existing discourse of Jewish working-class radicalism fostered over successive generations. This found expression through various immigrant labour organizations, such as the Workers' Circle Friendly Society and Poalei Zion, and was a significant factor in Jewish support for the Communist Party.

In Hackney, in the late 1940s and 1950s, the Young Communist League (YCL) and the Labour Party League of Youth were the main foci of political allegiance for young Jews active in the cause of Socialism. For many, joining the communist movement represented the most potent expression of anti-Fascism, but also an escape from the ghetto world of hereditary work and religious conformity. Communist politics also appealed to youngsters who rejected the Americanized consumerism and fashion trends of the 1950s and looked for broader cultural horizons (Samuel 2006, 67 and 185). Zionism shared with Communism the attraction of a transnational political movement with a future-orientated project of building a new society. Although both organizations shared a pro-Soviet Marxist worldview, Hashomer and the YCL were local rivals during this period with the former resolutely rejecting the politics of the latter as assimilationist. Despite early Soviet and Czech support for Israel (see Kramer 1974), the YCL opposed Zionism on ideological grounds. David Merron describes how in debates between activists, Hashomer countered the charge of being "petit-bourgeois nationalists" by labelling Jewish communists as "*luftmenschen*"[6] (David Merron interview 2012).

Competition with local communists notwithstanding, Hashomer's loyalty to the Soviet Union was central to its post-war ideological outlook, and a major source of legitimacy in the eyes of Jewish youth who, although attracted to Zionism, admired the Red Army's heroism in defeating Nazi Germany. Disillusionment grew in Hashomer, however, after its own activist Mordechai Oren was indicted alongside Rudolf Slansky and other Jewish communists during the 1952 show trials in Czechoslovakia. This controversy was followed by Nikita Khrushchev's revelatory speech exposing the crimes of the Stalin era at the twentieth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956. This epochal turn of events prompted the movement's estrangement from Moscow. Given the pro-Israeli stance of many influential Labour Party politicians, the younger generation orientated toward the Labour left during the late 1950s.[7] The Labour MP, Sydney Silverman, a veteran of Poalei Zion, acted as a patron and frequent keynote speaker at

Hashomer's secular seder nights in north London. The inclination toward Labour, and the British political sphere in general, appears more pronounced among the younger generation. The cause of nuclear disarmament was actively taken up at this time. Diana Lazarus recalls members participating en masse in the first march from London to Aldermaston organized by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in 1958 (Diana Lazarus interview 2012). Taking part in peace marches and labour movement events, such as May Day parades, although consistent with Hashomer's Marxist internationalism, ran contrary to its core Zionist logic of Israeli-centred activism.

Hashomer also had to contend with larger Zionist youth organizations, as well as maintaining an uneasy affiliated relationship with the Zionist Federation, and the Jewish Agency upon which it relied for financial support. Zionist youth movements had since the 1930s mounted a challenge to the traditional East End-based organizations sponsored by the pre-war Jewish Establishment. These included the assimilationist Jewish Lads' Brigade (JLB), which was modelled on the Boys' Brigade and promoted a brand of "muscular Judaism" (Kadish 1995, 119). Hashomer's principal competitors among the Zionist youth movements all represented currents within Labour Zionism: Habonim (The Builders), Brith Chalutzim Datiim (BACHAD, Union of Religious Pioneers) and Bnei Akiva (Sons of Akiva).[8] Hashomer participated alongside fellow Zionist youth groups in collections for the Jewish National Fund in middle-class suburban areas, and also took part in communal forms of entertainment, such as sports days and *hagigot* (celebrations) on Jewish festivals.

By the 1960s, Hashomer found itself in a contradictory and ultimately untenable position; it was both adrift from the Soviet Union and politically at odds with mainstream Zionism. During the 1960s, and markedly after Israel's victory in the Six Day War in 1967, the political centre of gravity among Jewish youth shifted rightwards (Kelemen 2013, 78). Previously, Zionism had acted as a radical and largely secular modernizing current in Jewish life and was therefore compatible with left-wing politics. A protean ideology, it had offered emancipation from the old world of ghetto oppression, poverty and backwardness, a world often associated with the synagogue (Cohen 1982, 12). It had been possible to maintain common cause between Zionist youth organizations with divergent politics because the main priority was *aliyah* within a hegemonic ideological framework of Labour Zionism. Once Zionism had captured the high ground of the Anglo-Jewish Establishment, its new socially conservative leaders increasingly promoted suburban middle-class philanthropy and lobbying for Israel over *hakhsharah*. The Zionist Federation's construction of a network of kindergartens and elementary day schools to preserve diasporic communal cohesion (Aridan 2004, 229–233) was profoundly at odds with the Hashomer ideology of autonomous education and pioneering. The rate of *aliyah* continued to rise from the mid-1960s (Waterman and Kosmin 1986, 16–17), but increasingly, emigration from Britain was not *halutzic* as the political power of Israeli kibbutz idealism waned.

The biological revolt: autonomous youth culture and alternative living

From its inception, a central tenet of Hashomer ideology was autonomy from the adult world. The movement promoted a distinctively Jewish youth culture that was at once

ascetic and aesthetic. Prior to joining Hashomer, a number of those interviewed had experienced older forms of Jewish associational culture sponsored by the pre-war Jewish elites, such as the JLB and youth clubs affiliated to the Association of Jewish Youth (AJY). Like their non-Jewish counterparts, these clubs offered table tennis and other games, and had emerged in the context of secularization as a means of providing both a degree of communal cohesion and an antidote to delinquency (Brotz 1955, 183).

An early article in Hashomer's magazine, *On Guard*, praises England for giving birth to the Scout movement and the idea of a "free youth culture." The author Yaakov Morris, an influential figure among the first generation of activists, identifies the common thread in youth movements as "the biological revolt of youth against adult society." Adult society represented the corrupting influence of "cynicism and superficiality" manifest in "lipstick and jitterbug." In his opinion, even the Labour Party League of Youth and the YCL had succumbed to this corrupting influence by subordinating their members' lifestyle choices to political expediency (*On Guard*, July–August 1946, 13–15). Joining Hashomer meant accepting a strict moral code. Like the single-sex Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, *shomrim* were supposed to follow a set of 10 laws for good conduct. The tenth law forbade smoking and drinking alcohol, and required the *shomer* to maintain "sexual purity" (Biale 1992, 300). In reality, the rules governing drinking and smoking were largely observed, but personal romantic relationships were common, which led to both physical relations and later, marriage, in a number of cases.

Hashomer members were expected to shun bourgeois culture in the form of popular music and fashion. The modest uniform consisted of a simple blue unisex shirt and coloured neckerchief corresponding to the stage the member had reached in the movement. Female members wore a skirt or trousers, and socks rather than stockings. They did not use make-up or nail varnish and wore their hair naturally. Diana Lazarus initially went to an AJY youth club in Clapton. For her, the popular music, make-up and fashion in evidence at the club were unappealing and she found the Hashomer uniform removed "social embarrassment" (Diana Lazarus interview 2012). The ungendered simplicity of the uniform was consistent with the movement's co-educational egalitarianism and set it apart from traditional uniformed youth movements in which gender difference was emphasized through dress. In common with other organizations, however, wearing uniform had an appeal for teenagers who felt unwanted peer pressure to follow fashion trends in an increasingly consumer-orientated society. Whilst emphasizing self-restraint, Hashomer was socially libertarian and culturally avant-garde in many respects, which no doubt enhanced its appeal for Jewish teenagers inclined towards an alternative lifestyle. Hashomer rejected both Establishment-endorsed youth culture and what it regarded as decadent urban subcultures, like the burgeoning "Teddy Boy" scene. Eschewing the rock-n'-roll and mass-produced pop music of the 1950s, and in common with the YCL, Hashomer sanctioned the left-wing folk revival of Ewan MacColl. An appreciation of European cinema, including Italian Neo-Realism and the French New Wave, was cultivated on group outings to the West End.

Hashomer was also characterized by a mode of alternative living that was radically advanced for its era. The movement had two *batim* (houses, singular *bayit*) in London: at Nightingale Road in Hackney and Broadhurst Gardens in Hampstead. The houses were used as meeting places, offices and living spaces for activists, typically, the *mazkirut* and *bogrim*.[9] Household resources, including food and even clothing, were shared and where

members had jobs outside the movement, their wages were ploughed back into the commune. Couples would find intimacy difficult in the collective environment, and would often have to conduct their relationships behind the scenes or away from the house. Young males and females living together in this way drew moral censure from socially conservative religious elements within the local Jewish community. David Merron recalls their condemnation of the *bayit* as a "brothel." In reality, the *bayit* could act as a space for the secular redefinition of traditional elements of Jewish communal life. In David's time, members would sometimes meet at Nightingale Road on Friday evenings for Oneg Shabbat (David Merron interview 2012).

The model adopted in London's *batim* was based on the paradigm of the central and eastern European movement. Members would meet at the *bayit* regularly each week where they would be split into age groups. For the older groups, the *madrikhim* (youth leaders) would initiate discussion on a given political, scientific, historical or literary subject. They would usually organize games for the youngest members known as *kovshim* (conquerors).[10] These games were often drawn from Scouting and originally devised by Robert Baden-Powell. As a leader, Maurice Collins played "Kim's Game" from Baden-Powell's *Scouting for Boys* with his group. The Scout movement's "learning by doing" approach was a cornerstone of Hashomer's educational system wherein members learnt the basics of woodcraft, such as tracking and tying knots (Baden-Powell 2005, 48; *On Guard*, May–June 1946, 3; Maurice Collins interview 2012).

By developing a free youth culture within a framework of socialist politics and Scouting, the movement grounded its avant-garde tendencies within a robust organizational structure that could appeal to young people of different ages. Marxist political education, typically the reading of *The Communist Manifesto* and other classic texts, was combined with a cultural immersion that was central to the experience of being a *shomer*. The movement fostered a critical approach to art, literature and music that, for its more intellectually curious members, provided a radical alternative education to the one they were receiving at school. In political terms, Hashomer saw its educational role as autonomous and to some extent adversarial in relation to school and family. The movement idealized the kibbutz as a "new family" whilst portraying the traditional familial structure and school as capitalist ideological apparatuses for imposing "class rule by strict authoritarian education" (Hashomer Hatzair 1952, 80–81).

Creating autonomous youth spaces away from school, family and the corrupting influence of competing teenage milieux meshed with the movement's Zionist mission by directing youngsters towards a specific way of life as adults. Baruch Kimmerling has argued that territorial space is imbued with values for individuals, groups and societies via a process of "symbolic orientation," wherein meanings are attributed to places through culture (Kimmerling 1983, 214–215). The organic connection with Israel was reinforced through cultural forms: Hebrew songs and folk dancing, the most common being the circular Hora. Folk dancing in traditional dress also took place at *hagigot*, secular celebrations held to coincide with religious festivals, such as Pesach. *Hagigot* would also be organized jointly with peer Zionist youth movements to celebrate Israel's Independence Day.[11] For Hashomer activists, the cultural awakening they experienced coalesced with their politicization, to reify Israeli kibbutzim as the autonomous spaces in which their future lives would be realized. Culture was the matrix through which initiates could define their Jewishness in secular terms, replacing

traditional communal associations with new and transformative Israeli frames of reference.

Back to nature: camping and open-air ritualism

As in Scouting, rambling and camping were regularized in Hashomer's annual programme. Day rambles were organized around London's green belt, in areas such as Epping Forest. *Mahanot* (camps) were held three times a year, during Whitsun, summer and winter, and typically took place at locations around Wales, Derbyshire and the Cotswolds. As David Matless has written, pre-war youth movements drew on the "popular culture of the open air" and self-organized youngsters challenged the authorities with "political walking" on private land (Matless 1998, 74). In the post-war period, young people's outdoor activities were less confrontational because they took place within a new regulated landscape codified by the state in the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act. Hashomer had to negotiate rules and regulations and its rural expeditions relied on a range of organizations for logistical support, including British Rail and the London County Council. For winter camps, the organization was able to use land on former military bases, often featuring Nissen huts and concrete toilet blocks. British Rail wagons were hired to transport equipment, such as army-surplus bell tents.

Camps transported much of the *bayit* programme to the outdoors with greater emphasis on Scouting. Hiking and tracking were accompanied by ceremonial ritual; the *mifkad* (assembly) was modelled on the patriotic flag ceremonies of Baden-Powell's movement. Members would stand in a horseshoe formation for a ceremony led by the *mazkir* in which a communal salute was given. In Scouting, participants would traditionally salute the union flag; *shomrim* saluted Hashomer's own blue and white flag bearing the Magen David and the fleur-de-lis, the international symbol of Scouting. Helena Davis recollects a more dramatic flag ceremony at Stoke Park, a country house near Northampton, where torchbearers stood on the roof (Helena Davis interview 2012). The *mifkad* also occasioned the ceremonial presentation of badges, another ritual derived from Scouting. The *semel* (badge) conferred status on recipients and signified graduation to the higher age group. The *semel boger* represented the final stage and was awarded to those committed to self-realization. As in Scouting, the *mifkad* contained both the collective repetition of affirmations expressing loyalty to the movement and singing. Military-style commands were given in Hebrew: *amod dom* ("stand to attention") and *amod no'ah* ("stand at ease").

In addition to tent inspections and morning exercises, "wide games," another invention of Baden-Powell, were played. A typical game involved dividing into teams with each side attempting to capture the other's flag. In an echo of the 1948–1949 Arab-Israeli War, Ivor Stilitz recounts that on one occasion, the teams were divided into "Jews" and "Arabs."[12] Although ideologically committed to bi-nationalism and opposed to militarism, the Hashomer ethos combined pioneering zeal with the imperative of Israeli self-defence. Maurice Collins recalls learning about General Orde Wingate, the British Army officer who embraced Zionism and trained the Haganah in Palestine before World War II (Maurice Collins interview 2012). Most of those interviewed did not regard Hashomer ritual as overtly military, although Diana Reich

remembers feeling uneasy about the "militaristic overtones" of the *mifkad*.[13] Diana Lazarus also felt that she was being prepared for military service in Israel (Diana Lazarus interview 2012).

As a social group in Britain, Jews have remained largely urbanized since the late nineteenth century (Waterman and Kosmin 1986, 20). For those participating in Hashomer's camps, the world of the outdoors offered adventure and escape from urban confinement, a reconnection with nature denied to previous generations ghettoized in the inner city. Rambling and camping tapped the "popular culture of the air" and offered alternative spaces for exploration and discovery, often representing initiation into the movement. Open-air activity allowed youngsters to evolve a sense of independence and self-reliance. For the deeply committed, the camp also represented the kibbutz ideal in embryo.

Sowing the seeds: *hakhsharah* as praxis

The *batim* and *mahanot* both acted as preparatory antechambers for collective life on the kibbutz. However, the ultimate test of a member's readiness for *aliyah* was the experience of *hakhsharah*, which was designed to put the theories of Borokhov and Gordon into practice. In the process, *garinim* (seeds) would be formed for specific kibbutzim in Israel. The English *hakhsharah* model was developed by Hechalutz in 1935. Labour Zionism was hegemonic in Hechalutz as the umbrella organization of pioneering youth movements working in concert with the trade union body, Histadrut (General Federation of Jewish Labour) in Palestine. The David Eder Farm at Harrietsham near Maidstone was established with the support of the Zionist Federation and the majority of its trainees were members of Habonim.

After the arrival of refugees from Germany and Austria, training centres were established in various parts of England; groups from the different continental Zionist youth movements were kept together. Hashomer members were based at two centres: a group of about 25 at Hopton House in Hodnet, Shropshire and another of around 35 at Wiggie House in Redhill, Surrey. At these training centres, they worked the farms assisted by the War Agricultural Committees of each county (Hechalutz 1942, 10). This was a mutually beneficial arrangement, in that it provided both agricultural training for pioneers, and also vital labour for the war effort. Meir Weiss, a refugee from Vienna, experienced both training centres. The refugees first encountered English-born *shomrim* at Wiggie House. This generation of activists went on to build the national organization in London and other cities after the war. Meir transferred from Wiggie House to Stalybridge, where he worked as a coal miner in the mining commune, Kibbutz Hakorim, supported by the Ministry of Fuel and Power. His group established Hashomer's first autonomous *hakhsharah* at Bedford in 1946 and became the founders of Kibbutz Yasur near Haifa in 1949.[14]

The Bedford farm was subsequently replaced by a new *hakhsharah* at Hatfield Heath, near Bishops Stortford. Non-Jewish professional farm managers were employed to undertake the day-to-day running of the farm, which was funded by the Jewish Agency, and to provide basic agricultural training for future pioneers. A *shaliah* would be resident on the farm to maintain ideological oversight. The farm was run on communal lines with shared cooking, eating, sleeping and showering arrangements.

Typical responsibilities included milking cows, feeding chickens and cutting kale. In addition to the residential group, at weekends, *shomrim* would often travel to the farm from London to socialize or to help during harvests.

In practice, this collectivity could generate tensions when idealistic expectations had to be sacrificed for the daily exigencies of farming. Gabby Dover was sent to the farm from Manchester after completing his A levels. There he was immediately given indoor laundry duties by one of the female leaders, rather than the land work Hashomer ideology had prepared him for.[15] Michael Saffer, who moved to the farm in 1959 from his parents' council flat in Clapton, acclimatized quickly to both agricultural work and the communal lifestyle:

> You look out of the window and there's acres and acres of green fields and it's yours, you know, this is your home … I'd lived on the second floor of a council block overlooking the gas works and the River Lea. (Michael Saffer interview 2013)

For the predominantly urban working-class trainees, this rural lifestyle represented profound experiential change, particularly as the majority would probably have lived in their parental homes prior to marriage, with associated social restrictions. *Hakhsharah* represented a qualitative development of the social freedoms enjoyed at the *bayit* and camp, and formed an integral part of identity formation within the youth community.

Life and fate: identity formation and the "New Jew"

In his study of Hashomer's origins, Elkana Margalit describes the movement as "an intimate emotional association of companions" in which individual identity was sacrosanct in communal life. He also attributes a strongly esoteric character to Hashomer as a "spiritual and moral vanguard" imparting to its followers "an inner truth" (Margalit 1969, 40–44). These characteristics were also paramount in the British variant and can be identified clearly in the memories of its activists. In a similar fashion to other youth movements, Hashomer appealed to young people by offering them a common identity symbolized by the wearing of uniform. It attracted a specific segment of young urban Jews by opening a portal to explore themselves through learning and introspection. The forging of a separate identity through cultural autonomy is evidenced by members' adoption of Hebraic versions of their English names. Changing names symbolized independence not only from British society but also from assimilationist currents within the Jewish community that frequently encouraged the Anglicization of names.

Diana Reich's parents were both refugees from Fascism who settled in suburban Neasden. Her mother came to London on a Kindertransport from Vienna; her Bukovinian father came from Trieste where he had studied. Her mother's Viennese middle-class background was highly assimilated, but her father's was Orthodox. Although they anglicized their surname from Ruckenstein to Royce, neither of her parents felt "remotely English" and she herself had no inclination to assimilate even though there was nothing overtly religious or traditional in her upbringing. She relates how Hashomer granted "an all-encompassing sense of belonging" for Jews who felt marginalized in British society:

> We were very conscious of the fact that we were Jewish, that we were in a way strangers, and to a certain extent that made life very difficult because we didn't have the rituals or traditions of our background to fortify us. (Diana Reich interview 2013)

For some, the movement redefined a pre-existing Jewish identity; for others, it connected them to an absent Jewishness. David Merron speaks of Goodman's Fields, where he spent his childhood, as an "East End *shtetl*," a parochial Yiddish-speaking environment. Jews of his generation typically regarded Yiddish as a foreign language used by their immigrant forebears. After moving to Stoke Newington and starting at Hackney Downs in 1942, David initially felt distanced from his Jewish identity, despite the high proportion of Jewish students at the school. Finding the JLB unappealing, he, along with many of his peers, joined the patriotic Army Cadet Force, and enjoyed camping and shooting on the rifle range at school. David cites exposure to left-wing literature, local anti-Semitism and the British government's harsh treatment of Holocaust survivors seeking refuge in Palestine, as major influences in drawing him to Socialist Zionism. As a *shomer,* he evolved an explanatory belief system and a totalizing identity that were empowering. From David's account, a decisive factor in forging an enduring commitment that would see him become *mazkir* and a pioneer of Kibbutz Zikim on the Gaza border was the emancipatory future symbolized by the Israeli *shlihim*:

> People took a couple of years out from the kibbutz, came to England … you suddenly saw these sabras, these upright, beautiful men and women born in the sunshine of the kibbutz and you thought, God, if that's what the new Jewish generation's going to be then we're going to emulate that. (David Merron interview 2012)

Evoking the socialist axiom of the New Man, Gabby Dover, who succeeded David as *mazkir*, describes in similar terms the way in which Hashomer instilled a sense of being "New Jews." On "independence days," the *bogrim* would leave the *tzofim* alone to run the camp in order to prepare them for future leadership (Gabby Dover interview 2012). In a radical departure from other uniformed youth groups where adult leadership was the norm, in Hashomer, even the *madrikhim* would only be in their late teens. As a *madrikha* at 16, Helena Davis disguised her own age in order to maintain her status as a leader with members who were of the same age (Helena Davis interview 2012).

With the Zionist vision of the "New Jew" came a revitalizing physicality embodied in the Israeli pioneer and soldier. Jewish rebirth in Israel represented a break with the old world of exile in which persecution had been inevitable.[16] The "Jewish fighting model" sought to dispel negative images of Jewish victimhood during the Holocaust. This combative Jewishness not only counteracted feelings of helplessness, but also validated Zionism over the assimilationist strategies of the old Anglo-Jewish order (Bolchover 1993, 121–122 and 132–133). In Hashomer, this meant the veneration in its educational programme of heroic Jewish fighters, such as the legendary pioneer-soldier Joseph Trumpeldor, who was killed defending the Jewish settlement at Tel Hai from Arab attack in 1920. The movement was also able to take pride in the military heroism of its own alumni. The personification of the Jewish resistance ideal was Mordechai Anielewicz, leader of the Zydowska Organizacja Bojowa (Jewish Combat Organization)

during the 1943 Warsaw Ghetto Uprising against the Nazi authorities. The poet Abba Kovner was admired both as a fighter and as a cultural figure. Kovner was the leader of the Fareinikteh Partizaner Organizatzieh (United Partisan Organization) in the Vilna Ghetto and later a partisan and officer in the Givati Brigade of the Israel Defence Forces. Strong female role models in the form of Chaika Grossman, organizer of the Bialystok Ghetto underground and Ruzka Korczak, Kovner's comrade in the FPO, were also promoted from Hashomer's ranks.[17]

The need for physical and emotional armour was pressing among young Jews for whom the spectre of persecution loomed large. The founders of the British organization were themselves refugees from Nazism and members across the generations lost relatives in the Holocaust. In 1946, a group of young survivors from the Theresienstadt concentration camp was flown over from Czechoslovakia by the British government to join the *hakhsharah* at Bedford (Meir Weiss interview 2012; *On Guard*, July–August 1946, 2). For the subsequent generation, anti-Semitism remained a fact of life in areas of north London and the East End. Maurice Collins experienced bullying at Parmiter's School in Bethnal Green, a largely non-Jewish area with a strong tradition of support for far-right politics (Maurice Collins interview 2012. See also Husbands 1982, 18–19). It should be emphasized, however, that this trend was not universal among younger members. Neither Diana Lazarus nor Diana Reich experienced anti-Semitism at school. In the case of the former, the John Howard School contained a significant Jewish student population, but Diana identifies a progressive ethos that removed the overtly Christian content of school assemblies to encourage cohesion (Diana Lazarus interview 2012). This stands in marked contrast to Helena Davis's experience of segregation, in which she remembers on one occasion a teacher asking "Jewish" and "English" girls to line up separately for their respective assemblies (Helena Davis interview 2012).

The emotive power of the "New Jew" furnished young people with courage to confront anti-Semitism, but also provided a positive mirror in which to shape their own identities and master their fates. Identities were formed by the overlaying of larger historical narratives and collective experiences derived from elsewhere in the diaspora, in some cases through familial channels. This explains why Diana Reich felt unwilling to assimilate, despite the absence of an anti-Semitic experiential trigger. In another sense, the spur to social independence and aspiration encoded in both individual and collective experiences, such as "independence days," informed the process of self-realization.

Building bridges: intergenerational conflict and self-realization

Youth movements act as a collective social framework for navigating the path to adulthood by imparting beliefs and incubating the process of identity formation in the young. The experience of belonging is structured through rites of passage that form distinct stages on the road to maturity. These stages are usually marked symbolically through dress and the awarding of badges. Shmuel Eisenstadt argued that young people require "bridges" to make the transition from family life into wider adult society. He identified uniformed youth movements, such as the Boy Scouts and the Boys' Brigade, as "youth-orientated agencies" that were established outside the formal

educational system as adult responses to the "problem" of youth. These organizations were designed to instil civic virtue and social consciousness, to broaden cultural horizons, and also to allocate specific roles to the young in adult life within the established social order. Political parties and religious organizations also represent such agencies creating common values and purposes for the young upon reaching adulthood. Eisenstadt made a distinction between such agencies and the "spontaneous youth life," embodied in the German youth movements, that emerged in the context of industrialization and the decline of traditional familial structures in modern universalistic societies (Eisenstadt 1956, 166–171).

Hashomer differed from mainstream British youth movements in its promotion of autonomous youth culture and agency, a radical inheritance from the "spontaneous youth life" of its formative years. In Diana Reich's words:

> We detached ourselves from our parents at a terrifyingly early age … we took responsibility for ourselves … and we did have very equal intellectual and romantic relationships. (Diana Reich interview 2013)

Freedom of association and movement, doubtless, held a particular appeal for young Jewish women in this period when only 11% were working, as opposed to 34% of the overall female population (Krausz 1964, 29). For both sexes, geographical mobility represented liberation from the constraints of the family home and school. Although Hackney Downs and other Grammar Schools offered European travel opportunities, as did peer youth organizations, Hashomer afforded its young membership the freedom to travel independently. Members often hitchhiked to camps or to the farm. Gabby Dover hitchhiked to France via Belgium for an international camp in the company of a Belgian Hashomer contingent (Gabby Dover interview 2012).[18]

This degree of personal freedom disrupted societal norms, provoking intergenerational tensions and parental intervention. Most Hashomer recruits came into contact with the organization through school friends and peers rather than parental initiative. A major bone of contention with both parents, and ultimately many *shomrim*, was its restrictive policy on higher education. In the mid-1950s, Jewish students accounted for around 2.8% of the university population at a time when Jews represented around 1% of the overall population in Britain (Krausz 1964, 29). The rationale for the policy originated in the ideas of Ber Borokhov who wrote that "it is as if the inexorable whip of history was driving Jews further and further away from the soil and nature, and higher and higher into the insubstantial ether of social stratification" (Borokhov quoted in Hashomer Hatzair 1952, 42–43. See also Mintz 1997). Capitalist development was displacing Jewish labour from proletarian occupations and the priority for the Jewish people was therefore to create a new generation of workers in their own homeland. Under this logic, higher education would produce upward social mobility and was therefore forbidden, although in practice somewhat inconsistently.

Where the movement sanctioned higher education, this was in order to further its organizational objectives. Gabby Dover was allowed to study Hebrew and Aramaic at the School of Oriental and African Studies, thereby avoiding National Service to continue working as a cadre (Gabby Dover interview 2012). Norman Rose was ordered to abandon his architecture degree at University College London, as it was preparing him for a "bourgeois profession," and instead to study construction at a polytechnic in Brixton, training

more useful for kibbutz (Norman Rose interview 2012). Diana Reich was authorized to study social anthropology at Manchester University whilst running the *bayit* in Cheetham Hill. Diana's experience suggests that Hashomer's influence and longevity could both have been extended nationally had it not opposed higher education. She describes the Manchester organization in this period as being less politicized and functioning more as a secular Zionist youth club. Uncharacteristically, it enjoyed good relations with the local JLB, then under the leadership of Stanley Rowe, a non-Jewish professional youth worker.[19] According to Diana, there was also some crossover in the predominantly working-class membership of the two organizations. She performed youth work in the deprived area of Moss Side in a scheme supported by the university. In doing so, she was able to utilize the skills and youth leadership training acquired in the movement (Diana Reich interview 2013). Had Hashomer reconfigured its *halutzic* ethos to encompass a broader definition of activist youth work within the British context, it may have adapted to survive long-term. Through its proscriptive educational policy, the movement placed fetters on the intellectual development of many of its most able cadres, and frustrated the curiosity and ambition nurtured by its own cultural programme.

The friction between the movement's leadership, members and parents over education formed part of a complex relational dynamic between youth and adult authority. Ivor Stilitz joined Hashomer in 1954 and was a salaried activist during the late 1950s. He was instructed to leave Hackney Downs at the age of 15 prior to sitting his O levels, but his parents took legal action to ensure that he remained at school until 16 so he could complete his examinations (Ivor Stilitz interview 2012).[20] David Merron suggests that, in many cases, Jewish parental motives for sending their children to Grammar School were socially aspirational (David Merron interview 2012). Whereas this is no doubt true to a large extent, it does not apply to all those who joined Hashomer. Helena Davis attended Hackney Downs's sister Grammar School, Dalston County, but experienced parental hostility to her educational ambitions owing to her gender and the family's limited financial resources. Joining Hashomer was liberating because it gave Helena access to wider intellectual discourse and a "bridge" to explore alternative social roles to those prescribed by her parents. After completing her A levels, she went to the *hakhsharah* at Hatfield Heath and also worked at a local horticultural nursery as a prelude to studying agriculture at Wye College, Kent. To her subsequent regret, however, the movement's leadership dissuaded her from doing so.

The relationship between movement activists and the *shlihim* as adult authority figures was characterized by a dynamic of respect and rebellion. In Helena's case, her relationship with the *shaliah* became oppositional and she left Hashomer, along with her boyfriend, Barrie, when the leadership threatened him with expulsion for refusing to abandon his degree at Imperial College to work for the movement in Ireland (Helena Davis interview 2012).[21] Maurice Collins was sent to a joint Hashomer–Habonim *hakhsharah* at Terenure in Dublin, and whilst there received his call up papers for National Service in the Royal Air Force. He was ordered to desert and work underground for the movement and, upon refusing to do so, was duly expelled (Maurice Collins interview 2012).[22]

The process of self-realization and *aliyah* could be a source of intergenerational conflict. Gabby Dover's *garin* resisted attempts to send them to Kibbutz Yasur as they regarded its close proximity to Haifa as contravening the pioneering ethos. He regrets, however, going to Kibbutz Nachshonim near the West Bank rather than Zikim where the preceding generation had settled. The older generation had been an

inspiration to Gabby in his own self-realization (Gabby Dover interview 2012). Both peer group comradeship and interpersonal relationships with leaders were therefore highly significant in maintaining commitment. Despite working full-time for the movement, in the end, both Michael Saffer and Ivor Stilitz decided to leave it rather than emigrate. In the latter case, the desire for a university education proved decisive; for Michael Saffer, his tenure as *mazkir* meant that he had to remain in England after his peers had departed and so was isolated at the liminal moment of *aliyah* (Ivor Stilitz interview 2012; Michael Saffer interview 2013).

Conclusion

In retrospect, it would be easy for the historian to dismiss Hashomer Hatzair as insignificant in the British context. The historical importance of this short-lived British satellite of an enduring transnational youth movement should not, however, be overlooked. Hashomer acted as a brief but intense arc light for young Jews in London and other English urban centres who sought an autonomous form of youth culture, not only from the social constraints of their parents' world, but also from that of the new garish teenage consumerism that emerged as an analogue of 1950s capitalism. For the movement's initiates, Britain's post-war iteration of modernity had little obvious appeal, either as Jews or as young people looking to find their way in society. Hashomer projected a clear alternative based on the ideal of the "New Jew" animated by manifest destiny in Israel. This served to catalyse positive identity formation and counteract subaltern feelings, whilst opening new cultural vistas.

The autonomous youth spaces that the movement created became, for activists, intimately associated with Israel as a symbolic habitus, representing independence and fulfilment in adulthood. Israeli folk dancing, singing and visual culture, displayed on the walls of the *bayit* and in the pages of *On Guard*, engendered what Abba Kovner described (in reference to Hashomer in Vilna) as a sense of "otherness … in the face of our usual surroundings" (Kovner quoted in Porat 2010, 10). This "otherness" echoes sonorously in the interviewees' memories and speaks to the essential power of the inner life in Hashomer and its capacity for transcendence. The symmetry of collectivism and introspection in the movement's original ethos was reproduced socially in England as it had been in Lithuania and other parts of Europe.

This cultural immersion took place in a highly esoteric environment where the truly committed represented an elite vanguard. Staying the course in Hashomer meant a covenant to forsake one's homeland to build a new one, and perhaps to fight for it. This totalizing commitment placed considerable pressure on youngsters at a crucial developmental stage, and when isolated from peers or the reassuring social spaces created by the movement, even senior members could succumb to doubt. The relative autonomy from adult authority distinguishes Hashomer from many contemporary youth movements, who vested their members with far less responsibility and freedom. Autonomous youth spaces can, however, represent only transient social phenomena. Intergenerational interference and conflict with authority figures in the form of parents and *shlihim* were, in this respect, inevitable. The tension between Hashomer's status as a "youth orientated agency" politically aligned to Kibbutz Artzi and MAPAM, and its "spontaneous youth life" was exacerbated by the political exigencies of its Israeli

leadership. The responsibility of building a new nation and society after 1948 necessitated both a disciplined organization and a rigid command structure.

Jacqueline Rose has written of Zionism that it asks "too much" of its believers, wherein "to achieve the dream of Zion," they have to place themselves in a "psychically unoccupiable place—high or low, exalted or in despair" (Rose 2005, 65). Perhaps here lay Hashomer's greatest attraction and the root cause of its failure. The movement's cultural fervour not only inspired the exaltation of self-realization, but in some cases, feelings of self-transcendence which have resonated independently throughout the lives of those who experienced them. It could also ask "too much" of its believers by predetermining their future life choices in an era when Britain's social sands were shifting.

The Jewish community in London experienced significant upward social mobility after World War II, in no small part as a result of the battles fought by the previous generation. Hashomer's young recruits were the heirs of that generation, but also had their own social aspirations. By the 1960s, the relative amelioration of young working-class people's living conditions and their increased visibility as a socio-economic group meant that a range of power elites, including the government, was prepared to offer youth a bigger stake in society as voters and consumers. Other uniformed youth movements, in particular the Scouts and the Girl Guides, redesigned themselves during the 1960s in response to this social change. Habonim and Bnei Akiva likewise adapted themselves to the post-*halutzic* environment and the new Israeli political landscape. Hashomer could not abandon the pure ideals of its Galician antecedents, however, and consequently, the appeal of its frontier alternative to urban life receded. Hashomer's Socialist Zionism was based on ideological precepts that could not ultimately be synthesized and its Tolstoyan land-based collectivism jarred with the modernizing impulses of contemporary socialist and capitalist discourses that advocated urbanized scientific and technological advance. The social experience of Hashomer as preserved in collective and individual memory is nevertheless an important document of a unique alternative youth culture, and may well provide impetus for further study of the hitherto largely neglected area of Zionist youth movements in Britain.

Acknowledgements

Disclosure Statement

Notes

1. Manchester-born Leon served as *mazkir* of the British organization in the late 1940s.
2. *Hakhsharah* is translated hereafter both as "training" and "training farm".
3. For an overview of Hashomer Hatzair in the Israeli context, see Benin 1990, 25–39.
4. Avraham Shomroni (b. Vienna, 1927, né Alfred Helfgott), correspondence with the author, 27 September 2013. Avraham served as *maskir* 1950–1953. The *shlihim* Arthur and Naomi Ben Israel from Kibbutz Beth Alpha in Palestine were prime movers in the early British organization. Other key figures included Yaakov Morris, Charlie Nomis (killed in action during the 1948–1949 Arab-Israeli War) and Jake Levitsky.
5. Maurice Collins (b. Clapton, 1934), interview 5 November 2012; Norman Rose (b. Hampstead, 1934), interview 6 November 2012; Diana Lazarus (b. Clapton, 1942; née Barbanel), interview 1 November 2012; David Merron (b. Goodman's Fields, 1931; né Malina), interview 25 September 2012; Helena Davis (b. Spitalfields, 1934; née Esterson), interview 27 September 2012; Michael Saffer (b. Clapton, 1943), interview 26 March 2013.
6. The Yiddish term *luftmenschen* (literally "people of the air") was used to describe diaspora Jews severed from their Israeli roots.
7. On the Labour left and Israel, see Kelemen 2013, 78 and 121–122.
8. Habonim was politically aligned to Mifleget Poalei Eretz Yisrael (MAPAI, Workers' Party of the Land of Israel). The Orthodox religious BACHAD and Bnei Akiva were affiliated to Hapoel Hamizrahi (The Mizrahi Worker). See Wendehorst 1999, 152–156.
9. A *boger* was a "mature" member over 17 years of age. The term may also be translated as "adult". For the *shomer*, self-realization and *aliyah* marked the transition to adulthood on the kibbutz.
10. *Kovshim* were the equivalent of "cubs" in Scouting. At the age of 13–14, members would become *tzofim* (scouts) and would then graduate to become *bogrim* in readiness for *aliyah* at 18.
11. Helena Davis, correspondence with the author, 21 September 2013; David Merron, correspondence with the author, 23 September 2013.
12. Ivor Stilitz (b. Hockcliffe as an evacuee, 1939), interview 27 September 2012.
13. Diana Reich (b. Paddington, 1943, née Ruckenstein), interview 17 January 2013.
14. Meir Weiss (b. Baden, Austria, 1925), interview 14 November 2012. *On Guard*, May–June 1946, 16–17; *Forging the Link*, 27.
15. Gabriel (Gabby) Dover (b. Manchester, 1937), interview 7 December 2012.
16. See the discussion with reference to Jewish collective memory of the Shoah in Feldman 2006, 31–32.
17. Avraham Shomroni, correspondence with the author, 27 September 2013. Kovner was Avraham's *madrikh* when he lived on Kibbutz Ein Hachoresh where Korczak also settled after the war. See also Porat 2010.
18. Camps were modelled on the international jamborees of the Scout movement but were also conduits for key ideological messages from the MAPAM leadership.
19. Stanley Rowe (1924–1992) was a youth and community worker based at Henriques House, the headquarters of the Manchester JLB, between 1954 and 1972.
20. Ivor was paid a stipend by MAPAM to work as an activist.
21. Helena and Barrie eventually settled on Kibbutz Zikim after reconciling with the movement.

22.   Maurice was subsequently re-admitted to Hashomer and went on *aliyah* to Kibbutz Zikim in 1958.

References

Abrams, Lynn. 2010. *Oral History Theory*. London: Routledge.

Aridan, Natan. 2004. *Britain, Israel and Anglo-Jewry 1949–1957*. London: Routledge.

Baden-Powell, Robert. 2005. *Scouting for Boys*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benin, Joel. 1990. *Was the Red Flag Flying There? Marxist Politics and the Arab-Israeli Conflict in Egypt and Israel, 1948–1965*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bentwich, Norman. 1956. *They Found Refuge*. London: The Cresset Press.

Biale, David. 1992. "Zionism as an Erotic Revolution." In *People of the Body: Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective*, edited by Howard Eilberg-Schwartz, 283–307. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bolchover, Richard. 1993. *British Jewry and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brotz, Howard M. 1955. "The Outlines of Jewish Society in London." In *A Minority in Britain: social studies of the Anglo-Jewish Community*, edited by Maurice Freedman, 137–197. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Cohen, Stuart. 1982. *English Zionists and British Jews: The Communal Politics of Anglo-Jewry 1895–1920*. New Jersey, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. 1956. *From Generation to Generation: Age Groups and Social Structure*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Endelman, Todd M. 2002. *The Jews of Britain 1656 to 2000*. London: University of California Press.

Feldman, David. 1994. *Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture 1840–1914*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Feldman, Jackie. 2006. *Above the Death Pits, Beneath the Flag: Youth Voyages to Poland and the Performance of Israeli National Identity*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Fishman, William J. 1975. *East End Jewish Radicals 1875–1914*. London: Duckworth.

Friedman, Maurice S. 1955. *Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Halpern, Ben, and Jehuda Reinharz. 1998. *Zionism and the Creation of a New Society*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hashomer Hatzair. 1952. *Forging the Link: A Handbook of Hashomer Hatzair in England and Israel*. London: Hashomer Hatzair.

Hechalutz. 1942. *How Jewish Youth in Britain Regain New Life on the Land*. London: Hechalutz.

Husbands, Christopher T. 1982. "East End Racism 1900–1980: Geographical Continuities in Vigilantist and Extreme Right-Wing Political Behaviour." *The London Journal* 8 (1) (Summer): 3–26.

Kadish, Sharman. 1995. *A Good Jew and A Good Englishman: The Jewish Lads' and Girls' Brigade 1895–1995*. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Kelemen, Paul. 2013. *The British Left and Zionism: History of a Divorce*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kimmerling, Baruch. 1983. *Zionism and Territory: the Socio-Territorial Dimensions of Zionist Politics*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, University of California.

Kramer, Arnold. 1974. *The Forgotten Friendship: Israel and the Soviet bloc, 1947–1953*. Chicago, Il: University of Illinois Press.

Krausz, Ernest. 1964. "The Economic and Social Structure of Anglo-Jewry." In *Jewish Life in Modern Britain*, edited by Julius Gould and Shaul Esh, 27–40. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Krausz, Ernest. 1969. "The Edgware Survey: Occupation and Social Class." *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 11 (2) (June): 75–95.

Lacquer, Walter. 1962. *Young Germany: A History of the German Youth Movement*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lacquer, Walter. 2003. *A History of Zionism*. London: Tauris Parke.

Lipman, V. D. 1954. *Social History of the Jews in England 1850–1950*. London: Watts.

Margalit, Elkana. 1969. "Social and Intellectual Origins of the Hashomer Hatzair Youth Movement, 1913–20." *Journal of Contemporary History* 4 (2): 25–46.

Matless, David. 1998. *Landscape and Englishness*. London: Reaktion Books.

Mintz, Matityahu. 1997. "Ber Borokhov." In *Essential Papers on Jews and the Left*, edited by Ezra Mendelson, 122–144. New York, NY, and London: New York University Press.

Near, Henry. 1992. *The Kibbutz Movement: A History Volume 1 Origins and Growth 1909–1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peres, Jochanan. 1963. "Youth and Youth Movements in Israel." *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 5: 94–110.

Porat, Dina. 2010. *The Fall of a Sparrow: the Life and Times of Abba Kovner*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rechter, David. 1996. "Bubermania: The Jewish Youth Movement in Vienna, 1917–1919." *Modern Judaism* 16 (1): 25–45.

Rose, Jacqueline. 2005. *The Question of Zion*. Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Samuel, Raphael. 2006. *The Lost World of British Communism*. London: Verso.

Shimoni, Gideon. 1995. *The Zionist Ideology*. Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press.

Silberklang, David. 1993. "Jewish Politics and Rescue: The Founding of the Council for German Jewry." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 7 (3): 333–371.

Waterman, Stanley, and Barry Kosmin. 1986. *British Jewry in the Eighties*. London: The Board of Deputies of British Jews.

Wendehorst, Stephan E. C. 1999. "Between Promised Land and Land of Promise: The Radical Socialist Zionism of Hashomer Hatzair." *Jewish Culture and History* 2 (1) (Summer): 44–57.

Wendehorst, Stephan E. C. 2012. *British Jewry, Zionism, and the Jewish State, 1936–1956*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jim Gledhill was Curator of Social and Working History at the Museum of London between 2009 and 2013. His main research interests at the museum were twentieth-century youth cultures and radical political movements. He is currently studying for a doctorate at the University of St Andrews in Scotland, c/o Museums, Galleries and Collections Institute. *Address*: School of Art History, University of St Andrews, 79 North Street, St Andrews, Fife KY16 9AL. [email: jmg24@st-andrews.ac.uk]