

Mission to Morocco
(1863-1864)

DAVID LITTMAN

An offprint from

THE CENTURY OF
MOSES MONTEFIORE

EDITED BY

SONIA AND V. D. LIPMAN

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1985

The Century of Moses Montefiore

Edited by

Sonia and V. D. Lipman

Published for
THE LITTMAN LIBRARY OF JEWISH CIVILIZATION
IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE JEWISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF ENGLAND
by
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1985

Preface

The century of Sir Moses Montefiore's life spans the period from the age of enlightenment to the late Victorian era. When he was born the American Revolution had just ended and the French Revolution had not begun; he died two years before Queen Victoria's Golden Jubilee. He grew up in the world of the stagecoach and the sailing ship; he lived through that of railways, steamships and the electric telegraph. His life began in the aristocratic and elegant England of the eighteenth century; it ended in the respectable, bourgeois, and increasingly democratic society of Victorian Britain.

There were correspondingly dramatic changes in the Jewish world of which he formed part. When he was born, Jews nowhere in Europe enjoyed civic rights and their conditions in parts of Central and Eastern Europe could justifiably be described as medieval. During his years of youth and maturity, Jews — beginning with the French Revolution — gained civic rights in Western and Central Europe. It was widely believed by many, including Montefiore, that this progress would be maintained and would in time extend to Eastern Europe. There was a movement to reform Judaism as a religion, which Montefiore vehemently opposed, and also to acculturate Jewish life socially to that of their neighbours, which Montefiore approved. But the last decades of his life saw the resurgence of anti-semitism in modern form in Central Europe and the pogroms in Russia, developments which troubled him not only for the present suffering they caused but because they called into question much of his view of the Jewish future.

In addition to Montefiore's civic, business and social life, the missions he undertook on behalf of oppressed Jews in many countries and his seven visits to the Holy Land (which in part were in the nature of pilgrimages) brought him into contact with an immense variety of milieux — ranging from English county society through western courts, Russian autocracy and the Vatican, to the oriental regimes of Turkey, Egypt and Morocco. Montefiore's life touched modern Jewish history at perhaps more points than that of any other single figure, because he was concerned with so many Jewish communities, in widely varying environments and stages of cultural development. Yet there was an underlying continuity about his life and attitudes, as well as about the objectives which he pursued with the aid of his wife, Judith, and a small group of trusted and long-serving associates.

When preparing to commemorate the bicentenary of Montefiore's

birth in 1984 and the centenary of his death in 1985, the Jewish Historical Society of England decided that the celebrations should include the publication of an appropriate book. No major biography of Montefiore has appeared for half a century; and Montefiore had already in his life-time become such a legend that myth often obscures reality. It was felt that such a major figure merited a reassessment, taking account of original material which had become accessible, or specialized research which had been undertaken, in recent years. But because he lived so long and did so many different things, the sources and other relevant literature required knowledge of many different languages and areas of scholarship. It seemed unlikely that at this stage any one author could compass the whole field with an authoritative biography. It was decided therefore to invite a number of authors each to contribute a study on a subject, connected with Montefiore, of which he or she had expert knowledge. The object was to provide new information not only about Montefiore's life but on the background to the problems with which he had to deal. The authors have corrected previously accepted statements about Montefiore, brought to light new facts from archival sources, and given a new evaluation of many of his activities. In doing so they have sometimes expressed different views on certain issues. The editors have tried, however, to exclude passages in which authors have duplicated material covered in other studies in the volume, although in studies devoted to different facets of the life of the same man, it is impracticable to avoid any overlapping at all.

This volume has been planned as one of a number of publications due to appear before or during the Montefiore celebrations; it was therefore decided to avoid duplication with material in them. In particular, the Jewish Historical Society has been associated with the publication of the 1983 facsimile reprint of the *Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore*, with an introduction by Professor Raphael Loewe; and of the papers given at a symposium at Yarnton Manor, Oxford and published in 1982 as *Sir Moses Montefiore: A Symposium*, edited by V. D. Lipman. There is therefore in this volume no introduction to the sources for the study of Montefiore, no general survey of Sir Moses and Palestine, and no narrative of the Damascus Affair because papers on these subjects were included in the Yarnton volume.

The editors thank Mr Cordy, Miss Bayley and Miss Ashby and other members of the Oxford University Press for constant help and guidance.

V D LIPMAN

Contents

Preface	V. D. LIPMAN	v
Chronology of Montefiore's Life		ix
<i>List of Illustrations</i>		xi
<i>Notes on contributors</i>		xii

Part I The Man and his Circle

1. The Making of a Victorian Gentleman	SONIA L. LIPMAN	3
2. The Business Man and Financier	P. L. COTTRELL	23
3. The Uneasy Victorian: Montefiore as Communal Leader	ISRAEL FINESTEIN	45
4. Friends and Philanthropists: Montefiore and Dr Hodgkin	AMALIE M. KASS	71
5. Louis Loewe: Aide and Confidant	RAPHAEL LOEWE	104
6. Montefiore and the Visual Arts	HELEN ROSENAU	118

Part II Foreign Affairs

1. 'The Year of the Pride of Israel': Montefiore and the Blood Libel of 1840	TUDOR PARFITT	131
2. A Diary that Survived: Damascus 1840	R. D. BARNETT	149
3. Mission to Morocco	DAVID LITTMAN	171
4. Journey to Romania, 1867	U. R. Q. HENRIQUES	230
5. The Visits to Russia	CHIMEN ABRAMSKY	254

Part III The Holy Land

The Saga of 1855: A Study in Depth	A. SCHISCHA	269
------------------------------------	-------------	-----

Part IV The Myth Emerges

1. The Testimonials and the Legend	MARILYN LEHRER with PETER SALINGER	349
2. The Verdict of <i>The Times</i>		362
<i>Index</i>		369

Transcripts of Crown Copyright records in the Public Record Office appear by permission of the Controller of H.M. Stationery Office.

Transliterations have been left as written by each contributor.

Chronology of Montefiore's Life

- 1784 Born in Leghorn during a visit by his parents
- 1803 Member of London Stock Exchange
- 1804 Death of his father, Joseph Elias Montefiore
- 1809 Captain in the Surrey Local Militia until its disbandment in 1814
- 1812 Marries Judith, daughter of Levi Barent Cohen and sister-in-law of Nathan Mayer Rothschild. Becomes a freemason, though no evidence that he was actively involved, and resigns in 1819
- 1814 First visit to Paris
- 1816 Travels in France and Italy
- 1817–18 First visit to his birthplace Leghorn
- 1824 Death of his younger brother Abraham. Retirement at the age of forty. Continues as a company director.
- 1827 First visit to the Holy Land
- 1831 Buys East Cliff Lodge, Ramsgate.
- 1835 Elected President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. Holds presidency (except for brief periods when travelling) until 1874.
- 1837–8 Sheriff of London and Middlesex. Knighted. In 1838 appointed to City Lieutenancy
- 1838 Second visit to the Holy Land
- 1840 The Damascus Affair. Obtains firman from the Sultan in Constantinople. Achieves international fame and becomes a roving ambassador to ameliorate sufferings of persecuted Jewish communities
- 1845 High Sheriff of Kent
- 1846 First visit to Russia
- 1849 Third visit to the Holy Land
- 1850–1 Member of Committee organizing Great Exhibition and Chairman of its Fine Arts section

- 1855 Fourth visit to the Holy Land
1857 Fifth visit to the Holy Land
1859 The Mortara affair. Journeys to Rome but fails to rescue Edgar Mortara who had been baptised by his nurse.
1862 Death of Judith Montefiore
1863 Visit to Constantinople where firman renewed by the new Sultan
1863-4 The Moroccan mission
1864 Endowment of Judith Lady Montefiore College at Ramsgate
1866 Sixth visit to the Holy Land. Death of Dr Hodgkin at Jaffa
1867 Mission to Romania
1872 Visits Tsar Alexander II of Russia.
1875 Last visit to the Holy Land
1884 International celebrations of his hundredth birthday
1885 Death of Montefiore on 28 July

List of Illustrations

Part of a map of London in 1795 (between pages 5 and 6)

1. Sir Moses Montefiore in the uniform of the City Lieutenancy
2. The Rothschild Family in 1821
3. Judith Montefiore as a young woman
4. Judah Kursheedt
5. Dr Thomas Hodgkin
6. Dr Louis Loewe
7. Plan of the projected Jerusalem hospital
8. Montefiore visiting the Sultan of Morocco in 1864
9. Sir Moses at 100
10. East Cliff Lodge, Ramsgate
11. Russian testimonial to Sir Moses

Notes on Contributors

- *C. ABRAMSKY MA: Former Goldsmid Professor of Hebrew and Jewish Studies at University College London; Senior Fellow St Antony's College, Oxford
- *R. D. BARNETT CBE, Litt.D., FBA: Former Keeper, Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities, British Museum
- P. L. COTTRELL BSc. (Econ.), PhD.: Senior Lecturer in Economic and Social History and Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Leicester, is a financial historian interested in the development of the Modern European Capital Market 1815–1939
- *I. FINESTEIN QC, MA: Circuit Judge; Honorary Research Fellow, University College London
- URSULA R. Q. HENRIQUES MA: Former Professor in the Department of History, University College, Cardiff; has written extensively on British nineteenth century history
- AMALIE M. KASS BA, M.Ed.: Research Associate, Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine, Harvard University, is engaged, with her husband, Professor Edward H. Kass, in writing a major biography of Dr Thomas Hodgkin
- MARILYN LEHRER MA: Chairman, Jewish Book Council. Her associate, Peter Salinger, is Hebrew Librarian at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London
- DAVID LITTMAN MA: Historian of the Jews of North Africa and the Levant
- *RAPHAEL LOEWE MC, MA: Former Goldsmid Professor of Hebrew and Director of the Institute of Jewish Studies, University College London
- TUDOR PARFITT D.Phil.: Lecturer in Hebrew, School of Oriental and African Studies, London
- HELEN A. ROSENAU D.Phil. (Hamburg), PhD. (London): Former Reader in the History of Art, University of Manchester. Dr Rosenau died on 27 October 1984
- A. SCHISCHA: Scholar and bibliophile, London

THE EDITORS:

- SONIA L. LIPMAN BA: Writer on Anglo-Jewish history
- *V. D. LIPMAN CVO, D.Phil., FSA: Former Director of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings for England; Honorary Research Fellow, University College London

*Has served as President of the Jewish Historical Society of England

Mission to Morocco (1863–1864)

DAVID LITTMAN

Two centuries before Sir Moses Montefiore landed at Tangier on 11 December 1863, Joseph Addison's father (chaplain to the English garrison in Tangier) observed that the condition of Moroccan Jewry was '... no other than a better sort of Slavery'.¹ Six years after Sir Moses' death in 1885, Budgett Meakin, editor of *The Times of Morocco* and probably the most knowledgeable expert on Morocco of his time, wrote:

It is seven-and-twenty years since the mission of Sir Moses Montefiore to Marrakesh obtained some slight concessions to the Jewish subjects of the Sultan, for which they have been ever thankful; but there is much more to be done. Bad as the position of the Moor himself is, under a rotten government, that of his Israelitish neighbour is much worse²

A glance at the long history of Moroccan Jewry will provide an introduction to their condition of degradation, which — notwithstanding the ephemeral rise to royal power of a few powerful families³ — was to last into the twentieth century.⁴ Montefiore believed that he might improve their wretched status. It was this hope and not merely that of liberating those unjustly imprisoned, which inspired him to undertake so hazardous a voyage in his eightieth year.

Whereas legend associates the first presence of Israelites in North Africa with the earliest settlements of the seafaring Phoenicians, their history in that region only really begins in Graeco-Roman times, about a thousand years before the Arab conquest of the late seventh century.⁵

During the subsequent half-millennium, the flourishing Christian population of the region was virtually eliminated.

The Jewish communities, however, did not represent a threat to Muslim power and were often considered economically indispensable on account of their onerous *jizya* (poll-tax) and their inestimable trading experience. They managed to survive successive conquests and dynastic upheavals, even the cruellest of destructions under the fanatic Almohads of the twelfth century when some of the worst persecutions occurred. As an example, the widespread catastrophe

which took place between 1145 and 1148 was described by the poet Abraham ibn Ezra in a poignant elegy, and by the equally renowned contemporary chronicler, Abraham ibn Daud, who wrote: '[The Almohads . . .] had crossed the sea to Spain, after having wiped out every remnant of Jews from Tangiers to al-Mahdiya [in Tunisia]'.⁶ During this period Maimonides and his family fled from Cordoba (1148) and then Fez (1165), to Egypt, by way of the Holy Land.

It is still debatable whether, as claimed by Arab historians, at the outset of the Muslim conquest the Jewish and Christian inhabitants of the Byzantine provinces had generally welcomed the invaders. It is certain, however, that specific discriminatory regulations affecting non-Muslims were becoming systematized throughout the Islamic territories by the eighth century. The *dhimma*, traditionally considered a 'pact of protection', and also known as the Covenant of Umar,⁷ fixed the relationship between the dominant Muslim community (*umma*) and the subjected peoples of the revealed religions (*dhimmi*) living under an Islamic regime. The resulting disabilities and humiliations, of which the *jizya* was but one example, stigmatized both the individual and the community. The status of the *dhimmi* was intended to be inferior in every respect to that of the Muslim. So long as the *dhimmi* observed all the conditions of this pact of toleration, he was entitled to protection from the *umma*, generally within the framework of his community.⁸

With the gradual disappearance of the Christians from North Africa, the Jews became virtually the only *dhimmi*s of the region. The Muslim historian of the Almohads, al-Marrakushi (d. 1224), has left us a vivid description of the conspicuously ugly and discriminatory garments which they were obliged to wear throughout Spain and North Africa towards the end of the twelfth century.⁹ (The constant renewal of these vestimentary regulations century after century probably influenced the Catholic Church which, at the IV Lateran Council of Rome in 1216, ruled that all non-Christians residing in Europe — mainly Jews — had to wear a distinctive badge.¹⁰) In spite of this, their numbers were increased by some of the Jewish refugees fleeing from Christian Spain and Portugal at the end of the fifteenth century who settled in the Maghreb, including Morocco.

From the thirteenth to the nineteenth centuries, the persistence of the *dhimma*, the *jizya* and the discriminatory vestimentary regulations in Morocco (and elsewhere) is confirmed by innumerable Arab, *dhimmi* and European sources.¹¹

In his letter of 1841 to the French consulate at Tangier, the Sultan Mulay Abd ar-Rahman characterizes the traditional status of

the Jews in mid-nineteenth century Morocco: 'Our glorious faith only allows them the marks of lowliness and degradation, thus the sole fact that a Jew raises his voice against a Muslim constitutes a violation of the conditions of protection.'¹²

Budgett Meakin, whilst acknowledging the concessions which some Jews living in the coastal towns had gained through European intervention, stressed the daily indignities of the Moroccan Jews in general, particularly those in the interior: 'From the day of his birth till all trace of his last resting-place has disappeared, the Hebrew of Morocco is despised and scorned.'¹³

The Moroccan scene and European politics

The Moroccan royal chronicler, evoking the prosperity and security of the country at the end of Mulay Ismail's long reign (1672–1727), employed a convincing quip: 'A woman and a *dhimmi* [i.e. a Jew] could go from Wajda to Wadi Nun without . . . [hindrance].'¹⁴ This affluence is attributed by Captain Braithwaite – a member of the British embassy to the new sultan in 1728 – to Mulay Ismail's remarkable foreign policy. Whereas he considered himself at war with all Christian nations,¹⁵ nonetheless European consuls, merchants and other foreigners could reside in the Moroccan ports in complete security, conducting their trade and business exactly as in peacetime.¹⁶ A hundred years later this pragmatic policy had been completely reversed and scarcely more than a hundred Europeans resided in the two ports of Tangier and Mogador (Essaouira), where their presence was barely tolerated.

Morocco was already a useful commercial partner for England from the sixteenth century and eventually became a vital and regular supplier of fresh provisions to Gibraltar after its acquisition by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713. Following Nelson's victory at Trafalgar in 1805, Morocco's trade with Great Britain, mainly via Gibraltar, became paramount, whereas her contacts with Spain, France and other European countries were gradually reduced, mainly to negotiations relating to captives of their respective nations held hostage in Morocco. By 1844, the US consul at Tangier neatly summed up British policy as 'keeping Morocco at peace with Europe'.¹⁷ This was however no easy task, for the sultan would not heed British warnings to cease aiding the Emir Abd al-Kader in his struggle against the French in Algeria. When the latter reacted strongly by bombarding Tangier and Mogador and by crushing the Moroccan army at Isly near Wajda in August 1844, it was only the British government's firmness which persuaded Louis-Philippe to settle France's differences with Morocco by negotiation rather than war. A treaty was

forced upon the sultan who was traumatized by the first Moroccan defeat at the hands of a European army for more than two hundred years. Thereafter, it was no longer possible to ignore demands from European powers.

In 1845, John Drummond Hay was appointed British consul general in Tangier. By 1850 he had become, like his father before him, the sultan's adviser on foreign policy and he was to retain this unusually influential position of trust for thirty-five years, during which period he never ceased to uphold the principle of Morocco's political and territorial independence, a basic tenet of British policy. Drummond Hay's perseverance obliged the sultan to sign the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Morocco and Great Britain in 1856, compared by Miège to the 1842 Treaty of Nanking which opened up China to Western trade. Most European states adhered to the new treaty — thereby benefiting from the wide commercial and other opportunities it offered (including the sultan's responsibility for any treaty infractions by his subjects), but France and Spain desired its advantages, whilst retaining specific rights from earlier treaties. The rivalry between France, Spain and Great Britain was consequently heightened and, paradoxically, the treaty itself, which its architect had believed would contribute to Morocco's prosperity and development, became — for a number of economic reasons little understood at the time — one of the chief causes of its accelerated decline.

France's successful colonization of Algeria exacerbated Spain's traditional ambitions (her 'natural rights') regarding Morocco, especially in the Riff. The Darmon case had almost led to a Hispano-Moroccan war in 1844,¹⁸ but it was the contemptuous refusal of the Moroccan government to grant an indemnity for a Spanish ship captured and pillaged in 1856 by Riff pirates — and their retention of seven Spaniards as hostages — which soon developed into a *casus belli*. National fervour and patriotism were aroused, rekindling sacred remembrances of crusading days against the Moors, in what was a serious affront to Spanish pride, particularly as French claims after a similar incident had been generously satisfied by the sultan. Grave internal problems were forgotten, all classes and parties rallied round the new government of the moderate General O'Donnell, supported by the Liberal Union, which was formed in 1858. France and Spain rapidly reached an agreement and most of the European powers sided with Spain against Morocco. The British government, thus isolated, preferred neutrality, as Spain had provided written guarantees that Tangier would not be occupied (thereby endangering Gibraltar) and that Spanish troops would

be withdrawn from Morocco after an eventual treaty between the belligerents.

War broke out in September 1859, soon after the death of the sultan and the accession to the throne of his son, Muhammad IV. Tetuan — totally abandoned and pillaged by local tribes — was easily captured on 6 February 1860 by the Spaniards, whereas Tangier resisted with clandestine British aid after the departure of its European and Jewish inhabitants to Gibraltar and Algeciras.¹⁹ Spain's limited objectives were rapidly achieved, but the cost of continuing the war was prohibitive, especially when the Mexican question required attention. On the Moroccan side, the loss of so important a town and the immediate transformation of its principal mosque into a catholic church was felt as a greater national disaster than the defeat at the hands of the French in 1844. The town's recovery became a *sine qua non* for the new sultan and the *makhzen* ('treasury', i.e. government).

Drummond Hay's good offices were now acceptable to all and a treaty was rapidly negotiated and ratified in May 1860. Its principal provision was the payment by Morocco of twenty million duoros (about £5,000,000) in exchange for Spain's evacuation of Tetuan. A commercial treaty followed in 1861, more favourable to Spain than that of 1856, particularly on the thorny question of local *protégés*. Tetuan was finally evacuated in 1862 under another convention, whereby Morocco — now virtually bankrupt — agreed to pay fifteen per cent of its war indemnity and the balance from customs' duties over a period of twenty-four years. Even this initial payment proved beyond the means of the Moroccan treasury and a loan of £500,000 was raised in London; it was guaranteed by the British government on condition that her vice-consuls and consuls were granted the same status in the ports — enabling them to collect their agreed share from the customs — as had been conceded to the Spanish *recaudadores* (customs' officials). The new French minister took advantage of the absence of Drummond Hay in August 1863 — when his country's good offices were solicited by the sultan — to conclude an even more favourable commercial treaty with Morocco.

The myth of Moroccan military force, inspired mainly by fear of Barbary pirates, had been shattered forever.²⁰ The victors' *recaudadores* and vice-consuls were omnipresent and every two months an appropriate quantity of coinage was despatched from Tangier to Spain in a Spanish warship. Permanent European residents in the port towns rose from 130 in 1820, to 350 in 1854, 600 in 1858 and reached 1,400 in 1864. The Moroccan chronicler, al Nasiri, acknowledged the extent of the national defeat and humiliation: 'The

Tetuan affair brought about a loss of prestige in the Maghreb and the invasion of the country by the Christians. Never had such a disaster fallen upon the Muslims.²¹

The war gave Spain a dominant role in Morocco, yet it was Great Britain which became the principal beneficiary. By the autumn of 1863, Drummond Hay was again appreciated by the humiliated sultan. An Anglo-French *entente* developed when the almost daily quarrels between the Spanish and British representatives in the ports heightened Anglo-Spanish rivalry, which was to last throughout the sixties.²² It was no secret that the Spanish minister in Tangier, Francisco Merry y Colom (1860–1872), haunted by the possibility of either Britain or France controlling Morocco, preferred the country to stagnate. Drummond Hay, on the contrary, aspired, like Stratford de Redcliffe in Constantinople, to be both the protector and reformer of Morocco.²³

Montefiore, Britain and the Ottoman Reforms

In May 1863, Sir Moses Montefiore was received in private audience by the new sultan following a warm welcome at Constantinople by the British ambassador and by Turkish ministers. His social contacts with Britain's ruling classes, from prime ministers down, his important financial position, his close relationship with the senior Rothschilds by marriage and his presidency of the Board of Deputies of British Jews gave him a unique position of authority at home and abroad.

This was a period of imperial grandeur, but also of messianic aspirations in certain aristocratic and ecclesiastical circles. In an age of liberalism, the Jews were recognized as the heirs to a glorious past, and certainly worthy of commiseration, particularly where Britain had political and strategic interests.²⁴ As foreign secretary in 1839, Lord Palmerston had instructed Britain's first vice-consul in Jerusalem, 'to afford Protection to the Jews in general' (to the young Queen Victoria he even quoted the prophet Jeremiah: 'Judah shall be saved and Israel live in peace at home' – 23:6).²⁵ Montefiore may well have helped to develop this policy following the Damascus Affair of 1840.²⁶

The *Tanzimat* Reforms in the Ottoman Empire had begun with the promulgation of the Gülhane edict (*Hatt-i Sherif*) on 3 November 1839. Sultan Abdülmecid, with British prompting, had granted a special *firman* to Montefiore on 6 November 1840, which explicitly confirmed for the Jews of the empire the 'equal rights' recently accorded to all his non-Muslim subjects. The more important imperial rescript of 1856 (*Hatt-i Humayun*) was issued under strong European

pressure following the Crimean War.²⁷ Sultan Abdülaziz provided Montefiore in May 1863 with a confirmatory *firman* similar to his brother's of 1840.

In the Maghreb, the scandal over the Sfez Affair induced Napoleon III to despatch a fleet to Tunis, forcing the bey to concede a 'Pledge of Security', followed by a Constitution in 1860 – which was repealed in 1864.²⁸

When Montefiore returned home in late June 1863, after an absence of six months, Lord Palmerston (also seventy-eight) was still prime minister, Earl Russell his dynamic foreign secretary and, at the Foreign Office, Henry Layard was under secretary and Edmund Hammond the permanent under secretary. Montefiore knew them all very well, through close collaboration on missions abroad concerning foreign Jews.

It is hardly surprising that once the news of the 'Moroccan atrocities' began circulating (involving Catholic Spain), Britain's diplomatic aid and prestige were available to Montefiore, after he had decided to undertake his mission. The appropriate Biblical reference was not forgotten: 'Whom shall I send and who will go for us?' (Isaiah 6:8) – and on his successful return, the *Daily Telegraph* could proclaim enthusiastically: 'What is Christianity, if not such deeds as his!' This was the spiritual and humanitarian mood of a part of the nation's élite before and after the Safi Affair.²⁹

The Safi Affair and its antecedents

The London Board of Deputies of British Jews, under the official presidency of Sir Moses Montefiore, had established a Morocco Relief Committee to aid their coreligionists from Tetuan and Tangier who had fled to Gibraltar and Algeciras during the Hispano-Moroccan war. The committee's activities and the situation of Moroccan Jewry (including a correspondence with Drummond Hay) are detailed in the confidential report prepared in late 1860 by the Board's delegate, Moses H. Picciotto, after his return from a mission of enquiry to Morocco (Tangier, Tetuan, Rabat, Mogador) and Gibraltar.³⁰ In June 1861, Picciotto sent to Narcisse Leven, secretary of the recently-formed Alliance Israélite Universelle (AIU) in Paris, a precise plan for the foundation of a school in Tetuan. By the end of 1862, the first AIU school was ceremoniously opened with over a hundred pupils under joint French and British protection.³¹

The first news on the 'Safi Affair' to reach Sir Moses Montefiore, 'in the course of the latter holidays' (probably on Friday 1 October), was a letter in Spanish, dated 17 September 1863, from Moses Pariente, president of the Jewish *Junta Gobernatura* of Tangier

(identical letters were addressed to Adolphe Crémieux, president of the AIU, the Delegates of American Israelites, and elsewhere). As the foreign secretary, Earl Russell, was in Scotland, Montefiore wrote from Ramsgate on Sunday 4 October, to the under secretary enclosing a copy with an English translation.³² In the absence of Layard, Edmund Hammond, the permanent under secretary, replied on Monday and also sent a forceful telegram to Consul Reade in Tangier for clarification, stating: '... The story as represented affords a shocking instance of barbarous cruelty and you will press upon the Moorish authorities in the strongest terms the evil effect which such transactions must produce on the British government'. The next day, Earl Russell himself telegraphed Reade, who replied on the 7th, and at greater length on 10 October. These contacts continued throughout the month, and on the 27th Hammond sent an FO dispatch to Ramsgate and wrote again to Sir Moses on Saturday the 31st in reply to the latter's letter of 28 October.³³

The Board of Deputies first met urgently on Thursday 8 October to discuss this affair, as well as a separate case concerning two Jews (Azuelos and Benattar), bastinadoed and imprisoned in Tetuan.³⁴ It is therefore incomprehensible that the narrative of these events provided by Hodgkin (1866), Guedalla (1880) and Wolf (1884) is described as having commenced with 'a packet of letters' (from the Jewish community in Gibraltar!), received by Sir Moses Montefiore on Saturday 31 October; and even Loewe (1890) relies on an entry from Montefiore's diary of 21 October concerning a packet thoughtfully sent to him at Ramsgate by A- (probably A.H. Layard at the Foreign Office), telling of 'the warm and generous efforts of Her Majesty's Government on behalf of the two unfortunate Jews now in prison at Safi'.³⁵

The highly complicated and confusing 'Safi Affair' had originated three months earlier when Senor Montilla, the *recaudador* at Safi, died unexpectedly on 30 July after an illness of three to five days. The Spanish vice-consul had the man's servant arrested — probably before his colleague's death — and charged the youth with having administered poison to his master, in complicity with other Jews.³⁶ The fourteen or fifteen-year-old Jacob Benyuda (also referred to as 'Accan' or 'Akkan' — and, in some later publications, as Jacob Wizeman), a native of Mogador, was bastinadoed, in the customary manner, for lack of any proof. Constant flagellation, coupled with a promise of leniency from the Spanish vice-consul, elicited from him the desired 'confession', in which he implicated Eliahou Lalouche (also referred to as Elias Beneluz, or Lallas). The latter suffered an even harsher treatment (references are made to various gruesome

methods of torture, including being pressed in a wooden box, and the 'palo', probably the first stage of impaling) at the hands of the local Moroccan authorities and he too eventually 'confessed'. Both Benyuda and Lalouche recanted several times, only to 'confess' anew under the lash and worse, incriminating two other Jews — Makluf Aflalo and a certain Saïdo (or Shido). A pregnant woman, who sold milk daily to the *recaudador*, joined the accused in gaol for a time, as did those members of the families of the accused who had demonstrated forcefully in front of the mosque, crying out for justice. Lalouche escaped briefly at one stage and his father, mother, brothers and other Jews were imprisoned and flogged indiscriminately.

The various sources are not only confusing, but sometimes contradictory. The *recaudador* is successively described as being: 'very old and sick', 'over seventy', having left 'a widow and a son' (from Jewish sources); and 'about fifty, a former colonel, living alone' (from a Christian, living in Mogador). Moses Pariente's letter of 17 September shows that the Jewish community leaders were still awaiting 'a detailed report' on the whole affair — four days after Lalouche had been beheaded in the main market-place of Tangier! A private letter sent from Tangier to Gibraltar a few days later comments on this situation:

Do not depend on the gentlemen of this *Junta*. They do not possess the energy or unanimity so much required. They are full of dread lest they should come into collision with one or the other [representative of a European] government.³⁷

One of the more interesting texts is also one of the most garbled. It is an eight-page, undated (end Sept. 1863?), scribbled translation from Spanish into French, being only an 'extract of an enquiry made under the auspices of the Jewish community of Tangier on the juridical murder of two Jews of Safi, in Morocco.'³⁸ The number of lashes administered to each of the four prisoners is recorded — from 150 to 500 blows, Shido receiving three times 300. Certain minor details are revealing: it is stated that 'Accan' had stolen a pistol and a watch from his master during his illness — because the latter had retained his wages; after the first scourging, being left alone in a room with Lalouche, he admits that through fear of more beatings he had 'confessed' and incriminated him. Lalouche replies: 'Is it not a sin to have implicated me, father of two children, and my own father now blind?' — thus confounding the vice-consul who steps out from his hiding-place. Lalouche is clearly referred to in this text as a 'British subject' who was handed over to the Spanish vice-consul by the French vice-consul (Gombaro), acting for the British

vice-consul during the latter's absence from Safi. The narrative then becomes incomprehensible: it is the 'English vice-consul' who, returning to Safi from Mogador two days after the *recaudador's* strange illness, but before his death, arrests 'old Makluf Aflalo' on suspicion of complicity in the alleged crime — simply because he had failed to greet the vice-consul. It is the same 'English vice-consul' who sends the accused men before the pasha for scourging. This must be an error in transmission, originating either in Safi, Tangier, or through the French translator in Paris who condensed the long report into an 'extract' — perhaps a confusion arose over the fact that the Spanish vice-consul had an English name: Butler. In this text, the Jews possessing European protections appeal to the pasha (via their consuls) 'to conform to the law of the country'; the pasha consults his wise son as well as the *cadi* (judge), who confirms that confessions obtained under torture are invalid, but that the sultan is certain to condemn the men to death in view of the Spanish request. A similar report in the *Jewish Chronicle* describes the Spanish minister's brutal opposition to the fair-minded *cadi* of Safi, and his precipitate message to the sultan demanding that the death sentence be applied forthwith. The newspaper's commentary is devastating:

Now let the world see the contrast between this inhuman and barbarous Christian, Senor Merry y Colon, the Spanish Minister, and the God-fearing and conscientious Mohammedan Caddi, Mohammed Ben-abd-El-jaleck, the Moorish judge.³⁹

Yet most of the letters from Morocco end with a general appeal to the British and French governments 'to relieve the Jews of Morocco from being oppressed by the Moorish authorities'.⁴⁰

Useful data comes from other documents in Spanish, preserved in the AIU archives in Paris.⁴¹ One is an undated copy of the attestation of Rabbi Saadiah Rebboh, the *dayan* of Safi. With two Muslim *adules* (notaries), he visited 'Accan of Mogador' in prison before his execution and declared that the boy explained how he had twice been forced to confess. 'The truth is that I have done nothing . . . but if they question me once more, I will say anything, as I am terribly afraid to be beaten again.' The rabbi appeals to the *cadi*, asking him, rhetorically, 'does the law of the *ulama* (religious scholars) of Morocco decree that all the Jews should die?' One letter, dated 8 October, is from David Serusi of Safi to Moses Pariente at Tangier: he explains that Benyuda had a good reputation in Mogador where he had worked for two years for a Senor Manuel Batto and that he had been in the *recaudador's* service for no more than six weeks. The local pasha did not even allow him the chance of reciting the *shema*

(declaration of faith in one God) with the assistance of a rabbi, before execution. He also refers to the difficulty of obtaining any signed attestations from the French and British (Carstensen) vice-consuls of Safi, because of instructions from Consul Reade in Tangier not to act without instructions from him. The third letter, dated 25 October, is from Pariente to Crémieux in Paris. It refers to Rabbi Rebboh's attestation and Serusi's letter (he is an 'Italian subject') and also mentions that the vice-consuls have certified that the 'very old and sick' *recaudador* was not poisoned; he also described in detail the more recent incident involving the flogging of two Jews in Tangier (Shalom Elcaim and Jacob Benharosh) by order of the Spanish minister.

It is strange that Lalouche's British connection was not stressed publicly by the Jewish communities in Morocco and England at the time. His father held an old passport issued in Gibraltar by a Mr Cardoza who had apparently acted as Tunisian consul. On these grounds, Frederick Carstensen, the British vice-consul in Safi (1858–1865), had granted British protection to the son. After Sir John Drummond Hay's return to Tangier, he endeavoured, in a long letter of 12 November, to reassure Earl Russell on this delicate point involving British honour, whereby an allegedly British-protected person could have been handed over to the Moroccan authorities – at the request of the Spaniards – and executed publicly in Tangier under the eyes of the European representatives. Firstly, it was difficult to refuse the Spanish requests; secondly, they did not then know what had actually taken place in Safi and what were the intentions of the Spanish government. Lalouche is here described as a man of bad character, a swindler, already convicted of theft, who treated his wife cruelly (Drummond Hay remained hostile all his life to what he called 'irregular protections'⁴²). Sir John mentioned Butler's message to Carstensen, and Merry's formal letter to Reade, as being dated on 25 and 26 August respectively. Unless this is yet another error of transcription, it would seem to indicate, either that the *recaudador* died at the end of August (not July), or that the sequence of events as recorded elsewhere is flawed.⁴³

Perhaps this seemingly minor aspect of the Affair, which appears to have rankled in London, might have further prompted the British government's decision – on humanitarian and political grounds – to provide Sir Moses with every possible aid for his forthcoming mission.

Although Reade in his 10 October letter to Russell quoted the words of Muhammad Bargash the Moroccan minister in Tangier stating that the two Jews had 'suffered death by order of the sultan in accordance with a decree of the *ulama*', he added:

I cannot however refrain from expressing to your Lordship, in the meantime, my conviction that the investigations of this horrible affair has been attended with much cruelty and injustice, as well as my extreme surprise and regret that such proceedings should have been enacted if not under the direct patronage of the Spanish Authorities, with at any rate, their apparent sanction.

He confirmed that no autopsy had been carried out by the Spanish naval doctors on the spot; that Benyuda was beheaded on 14 September at Safi (Carstensen considered him guilty) without a trial; that the same fate had befallen Lalouche, who was sent to Tangier at Merry's request and executed there on 13 September by order of the sultan (he proclaimed his innocence to the end, whilst pronouncing the *shema*). Makluf and Saido were expected to be executed, although 'these two had nothing approaching even to a trial — and yet they are sentenced to death.'⁴⁴

Merry is again portrayed in the worst possible light by Sir John in a 29 October despatch.⁴⁵ Two young Jews of Tangier (Elcain and Benharosh) had accidentally splashed the Spanish minister's Muslim servant with mud from a puddle and were rudely treated by him, at which they replied, 'Are you going to kill us as you did the Safi Jews?' The servant reported these words at the Spanish legation and one of the Jews was immediately bastinadoed and both imprisoned by order of Consul Rizzo.⁴⁶ On Merry's return from Madrid ten days later they were taken back in chains to the scene of the incident, and there received several hundred lashes on 25 October (instead of the 50 requested by Merry) under the window of two British subjects, who hastened to report the matter to the British consulate. The pasha confirmed to Consul Reade that Merry had insisted 'that the Jews who had been flogged shall not be set at liberty until they change their European attire for the costume of the country'.⁴⁷

When Drummond Hay called on the Moroccan Minister Bargash, the latter referred to 'dark menaces made by Merry if blind compliance was not granted to their demands', and Sir John felt powerless to act unless the British government was ready to shield the Moorish authorities from Spain should they refuse Merry's dictates. He advised diplomatic action in Madrid. In his letter of 12 November to the foreign secretary he declared that the British vice-consul in Tetuan (Kirby Green) had confirmed the truth of a previous complaint of 18 September from the Jewish committee of Tetuan (see note 34), concerning 'an old cobbler' and 'a poor lad' (Abraham Azuelos and Jacob Benattar) who were still chained and imprisoned, having received from 600 to 800 lashes by order of the local authorities two months earlier at the request of the Spanish vice-consul.

A Spaniard had been robbed, one shoe was left behind by the thief in his flight and all the Jewish cobblers were summoned by the pasha to identify it; old Azuelos unaware of the incident, readily recognized his workmanship, but was unable to remember the client's name: 'I have made so many shoes'. On these grounds alone, he and the boy were arrested, imprisoned and bastinadoed.

All these events reached the British public through the newspapers, first in the columns of the *Jewish Chronicle and Hebrew Observer*, and in other articles of the national press.⁴⁸ The anti-Spanish tone was very strong and the language of the editorials unrestrained:

Would it not be sheer madness in a great nation just emerging from an unparalleled state of prostration and barbarism, the consequence of the terrible crimes of the past of which it is now conscious [. . .] to rouse the indignation of the civilised world by misdeeds [. . .] and thus to alienate from it that public opinion which within the last few years began to veer round, and to believe in the extinction of the race of those delighting in the shrieks of men and women — aye of youths and maidens — expiring in the flames [. . .] If Damascus had its Ratti-Menton [. . .] why should not Tangiers be afflicted with a Merry, following in the same bloody track . . .⁴⁹

There seems to be a fatality about Spain compelling her, against her will, to act the part of Israel's evil genius [. . .] And now, when the fires of the auto-da-fes have ceased to cast their lurid reflection over the Spanish sky; when happily, the eyes of inquisitors can no longer feast upon the writhing forms of tortured tender maidens [. . .] It is as though the Spaniard had stood for centuries on his coast watching for an opportunity when he could conveniently cross the sea and complete beyond it the work of destruction commenced in his own land [. . . Spain] knows well enough that Morocco would not offer any determined opposition even if Senor Merry should require the whole Jewish population as a sacrifice, in order to pacify her wrath . . .⁵⁰

Prompt, even heroic, action seemed necessary. By Friday 30 October, Sir Moses had informed his nephew, J. M. Montefiore, of his readiness to embark on the long journey, as he considered a general persecution of the Jews of Morocco, of which the actual outbreak was only a forerunner, as imminent; the Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, Dr Nathan Adler, in a letter sent to the Board of Deputies on 2 November, suggested that 'it needs but your solicitation to induce our esteemed friend' to set out for Morocco and succeed 'in rolling off the foul reproach of murder from our nation'. On the 4th, J. M. Montefiore requested assistance from Earl Russell for Sir Moses' mission and Sir Moses wrote to his nephew the next day:

It is my earnest hope, that with the continuance and assistance to be afforded me in support of the mission, it may under God's Blessing be my happy privilege to become the instrument not only of accomplishing the liberation of the two

Jews now in prison under fearful imputations but also of establishing their innocence and of vindicating the honour of the Jewish community of Morocco.⁵¹

On the 11th, Sir Moses thanked Hammond the permanent under secretary for his letter of confirmation, adding, 'I propose to leave as quickly as I can and am only awaiting the letters [of recommendation for Madrid and Morocco] so kindly promised.'⁵² He collected them himself the following day at the Foreign Office, called on the Lord Mayor of London and wrote from the Alliance Office for funds to be made available.

My dear Baron Rothschild,

Leaving for Morocco in 2-3 days. Request letters of Credit for £5,000 on Paris, Bayonne, Madrid, Cadiz, Gibraltar, Malta, Naples, Beyrout, plus letters of introduction to any persons at these places. Will call tomorrow at New Court.⁵³

(Why Malta and Beirut, but not Tangier, one wonders?)

The editorial comment which appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle* of 13 November not only poured forth its literary wrath and anathema on Spain, but rose to new heights of hyperbole when describing Sir Moses:

. . . the most illustrious son of the patriarchs [who must] once more gird up his loins [. . .] a man verging upon eighty [. . .] we tremble for so precious a life [. . .] But since it [the mission] has arisen, let us confess that no coreligionist all over the globe is so well qualified for it as Israel's veteran champion.⁵⁴

Prayers were offered up in all the synagogues, and on 17 November Sir Moses left Dover for Madrid accompanied by Haim Guedalla,⁵⁵ Sampson Samuel, solicitor to the Board of Deputies, Dr Hodgkin⁵⁶ and two attendants.

Madrid and Tangier

The Montefiore party arrived in Madrid after a week. Aside from spending the Sabbath in Bayonne, his only other recorded rest was at Bordeaux where Montefiore found time to inspect the local installations of the Imperial Continental Gas Association of which he was president.⁵⁷ The British ambassador in Madrid, Sir John Crampton, was on friendly terms with the liberal ruling circles and had instructions from the Foreign Office (Montefiore himself was carrying one such letter) to provide every assistance to the octogenarian. Within twenty-four hours of his meeting with Crampton, Montefiore was received by the Spanish prime minister, the Marquis of Miraflores, who was most co-operative: in fact, a stay of execution for Makluf and Saido had already been granted eight weeks earlier, after Baron James de Rothschild (youngest brother of Nathan Mayer) had

interceded with the government of Madrid through the Spanish embassy in Paris.

Montefiore's six days in Madrid show him skilfully practising his usual style of diplomacy. Apart from the prime minister, whom he saw twice and from whom he obtained an official letter of introduction to the Spanish minister in Tangier, he also met Generals Prim and O'Donnell (the Duke of Tetuan), as well as various ambassadors and other distinguished personalities. His contacts were facilitated by the British ambassador whom he met regularly, by the Rothschild letters of recommendation, and also thanks to Mr W. Weisweiller (described as a friend and relative) who occupied an influential position in Madrid as a financier and lavish consul of foreign countries.⁵⁸ He remained an extra two days in order to have a private audience of the Queen of Spain and the Prince Consort who assured him 'of their respect for all religions'.

The party continued on the long journey south by train and diligence to Cordova and then Seville. There, introduced by a letter from Weisweiller, he met Merry's father (Don Antonio Merry y Colon), the acting consul for Russia and Prussia. He obtained from him a personal letter of recommendation to his son in Tangier, where he arrived early on 11 December from Cadiz, twenty-five days after his departure from Dover.

Success in Tangier

The old man was carried ashore in a princely manner on a portable couch, whilst a great number of Jews, led by Moses Pariente, enthusiastically welcomed him. Dr Hodgkin noted 'the peculiar sound uttered by the Jewish females in Morocco when they wish to give expression to their joyful greetings with distinguished honour.'⁵⁹ The same Friday Montefiore received various deputations and communications from Jewish communities throughout Morocco, before resting on the Sabbath.

He met the British minister and Consul Reade on Sunday and delivered Earl Russell's letter of 12 November, which instructed Drummond Hay 'to afford to him all such assistance as you can with propriety', not only regarding the Safi prisoners, but also 'in the hope of improving the condition of the Jews [of Morocco]'.⁶⁰

In a letter to Russell dated 15 December, Sir John described Montefiore's rapid success in obtaining the immediate release of the two youths (Elcaim and Benharosh) who had been imprisoned in Tangier for two months and publicly bastinadoed on 25 October, as well as the assurance that the two Safi prisoners would soon be released (doc. 1). In a separate letter, he related how Montefiore

had been directly responsible for his own reconciliation with Merry (doc. 2). This was not just a note of courtesy, for he sent a private letter the next day to Hammond in which he lavishly praises 'the good old man', who had not only achieved so much for his co-religionists, but had been of great personal service to him; his bad relations with the Spanish minister — a matter of serious concern to the Foreign Office — were now ended. As for Montefiore's intended voyage to thank the sultan at Marrakesh, Sir John wrote: 'It is a great undertaking for a man of 78 [*sic*] to travel in Morocco' and suggested that Carstensen accompany him on the visit.⁶¹ Montefiore asked for Reade, an old friend, and this wise preference was accepted (doc. 3).

In his report of 18 December to the Board of Deputies, Montefiore referred to the liberation, through his intervention, of a Moor imprisoned on suspicion of killing two Jews⁶² and his having been introduced by Drummond Hay to the European ministers at their respective legations: he also alluded to the lecture given by Dr Hodgkin (translated into Spanish) to the 'male and female members' of the leading Jewish families of Tangier, which was 'followed by the exhibition of philosophical experiments'. His long discussions with the *Junta* led to the opening in 1864 of an Anglo-French school for the children of the 7–8,000 Jews of Tangier, which was administered jointly by the Board of Deputies and the Alliance Israélite Universelle — the first AIU school of Tetuan having proved a big success in less than a year.

The determination of the Spanish government to be cleared of the accusation of launching an anti-Jewish 'crusade' is evident from the circular of 20 December (doc. 4) sent by Merry to the Spanish consuls and vice-consuls in all the port towns. This circular — almost certainly prepared in Madrid — and an exchange of letters between the minister and Montefiore were published in the *Gibraltar Chronicle* (28 December), the daily London newspapers (5 January) and the *Jewish Chronicle* (8 January). Spain's public act of contrition required a suitable response from the London Jewish weekly which was forthcoming: 'let us perform an act of justice, and repair in an hour of cheerfulness the wrong committed by us in an hour of gloom'. The warm reception given to 'Israel's champion' in Madrid and the withdrawal by the Spanish government of all proceedings against the two unexecuted Safi Jews convinced its editor (probably on instructions!) that — 'we were in error'. The *Gibraltar Chronicle* had refrained from involving the Madrid government (see *supra*, note 46) and was 'glad to see that the Spanish Government have now taken the best and most effectual means of removing the erroneous opinion . . . '.

The London *Morning Advertiser's* commentator, however, remained doubtful about 'the personal solicitude of Donna Isabella for the Jews and all other people who are not under the teaching of the Romish priests', and even referred sarcastically to the queen's 'favourite devotion to the Virgin of Atocha and the directions of her overtaxed confessor', going so far as to suggest that the same circular in favour of the Jews of Morocco should be reissued 'to prevent acts of cruelty on the part of the Spanish authorities against the *Protestants*.'⁶³

Gibraltar – Mogador – Marrakesh

On 22 December Montefiore and his party crossed over the straits to Gibraltar and were ceremoniously received by the Jewish community, whilst the guard on duty presented arms. Sir William Codrington had been particularly helpful to the Jewish refugees from Tetuan and Tangier four years earlier; both he and his brother (Admiral Codrington), and his father, were acquainted with Sir Moses. On this occasion the governor not only invited the Montefiore party to dinner, but also – and for the first time – some of the leading Jews of the colony. The *séjour* on the Rock in sunny weather, awaiting suitable transport to enable Montefiore to reach first Safi (symbolically) and then Marrakesh, lasted a fortnight.

Five days later, the Admiralty – under instructions from Earl Russell – 'despatched the frigate *Magicienne* from Malta to Gibraltar to convey Sir Moses Montefiore to Morocco'.⁶⁴ The British warship left for Safi on 6 January, Montefiore generously lodged in the captain's cabin, the latter in his saloon, whilst Dr Hodgkin and Mr Samuel had their hammocks slung between two guns near the captain's door. Although the sultan's escort was awaiting them, rough weather prevented the party's disembarkation for two days – with the exception of Montefiore's faithful courier, Ferrache, who got ashore during a calm moment. After the customary exchange of gun salutes and the reception by signal flags of a message from the authorities indicating that Makluf and Saido had been released on the very day that the *Magicienne* had set sail from Gibraltar, they continued south to Mogador, arriving there on 10 January.

The eventful sea and land voyage to Marrakesh has been vividly described by Dr Hodgkin, as well as by Montefiore in his letters and diary. Captain Armitage's unpublished official report is a useful complement.⁶⁵

The preparations for the inland journey lasted a week, during which the whole party, including Consul Reade (who had now joined

them), Captain Armitage and two of his officers were 'hospitably entertained by Mr Abraham Corcos [US consul at Mogador since 1862], one of the most opulent of the Jewish merchants at this port.'⁶⁶

The departure of the sultan's guests took place on Sunday 17 January. A caravan of fifteen camels, several baggage mules, and up to one hundred servants, followers and soldiers set off on the arduous 110 mile journey. The governor of Mogador and his officers accompanied this impressive company for an hour, whereas Abraham Corcos and some leading rabbis and members of the community remained with them for the first day and night. Montefiore had been provided with a *chaise à porteur* by the Portuguese minister in Tangier, which was harnessed to a mule in front and another behind, thus reducing the old man's hardships. Few Europeans before him – other than foreign embassies – had received an authorization, let alone an escort, to penetrate as far inland as the sultan's desert capital. The following Friday, a group of wealthy Jews from Marrakesh, led by Abraham Corcos' cousin, welcomed them and the whole caravan rested for the entire Sabbath period. A guard of honour met them at the entry to the town on the 25th and brought them to a disused palace, surrounded by a garden, which had been especially furnished for their *séjour*.⁶⁷

Guests of the sultan

The sultan's hospitality and extreme consideration for his guests lasted throughout the next fortnight at Marrakesh, until their return to the coast at Mazagan. There, they boarded HMS *Magicienne* – a month after their arrival at Mogador – for the return journey to Gibraltar. This privileged treatment of a Jew by a sultan of Morocco, who claimed direct descent from the Prophet Muhammad, can only be explained by the exceptional political and economic conjuncture – and especially by Britain's official patronage of the mission. Drummond Hay had already hinted at this in his letter to his friend the Vizier Yamani, written after Montefiore's initial success in Tangier (referred to in doc. 1). The stamp of total British backing was amply demonstrated by Montefiore's arrival on board a British warship (Merry had come to Safi on a Spanish warship to demand Benyuda's public execution four months earlier and to bring Lalouche to Tangier for execution) and the uniforms of his British escort to Marrakesh.⁶⁸ This patronage was amply confirmed to the *makhzen* by Consul Reade's letter to the vizier (doc. 6) and by Montefiore's own petition. In England, admiration was expressed in the House of Commons, as well as in the daily press.⁶⁹

Nothing was wanting on the part of England to give this Mission a semi-official character. An English man-of-war, in the company of an English Consul [only for the return journey], conveyed him to the coast of Africa and back again to an English possession; an English naval officer and the same English Consul accompanied him on his journey to the Court of the Sultan, and the latter, as a deputy of the English Government, presented him to the monarch; and again, it was the English Minister at Tangier who opened the path for him to the person of the Prince. The Sultan thus, in some measure, stands pledged to England [on the subject of the *dahir* or edict], the only Christian Power from which he knows he has nothing to fear and much to hope, and whose interest it is to support his throne.⁷⁰

The original instructions from Russell that Drummond Hay should give Montefiore 'all such assistance as you can with propriety' had grown into a diplomatic *cause célèbre*, with its own momentum, 'under the shadow of England's mighty protection'.

Consul Reade was taken by surprise when, on their arrival in Marrakesh, Montefiore showed him the petition he had prepared in Gibraltar and which he intended submitting to the sultan. His letter of 7 February to Drummond Hay explains the reasons why he felt that he had no alternative but to support strongly this initiative, so that the mission would not fail.

Reade emphasized the following points (doc. 5):

1. The sultan had to believe that it was a 'political necessity' for him to grant the petition.
2. It must be demonstrated that his 'personal interests' would benefit from its acceptance.
3. Montefiore was petitioning for the rights of Jews and Christians, but the latter were in no need of such intercession and he would not press this aspect.

To the vizier he emphasized (doc. 6):

1. The long-standing friendly relations between Britain and Morocco;
2. The British government's interest in Montefiore's mission, as he came 'in the name of the Hebrew Community of England and . . . on behalf of the civilized world'.
3. The solicitude of the 'Governments of Europe and America' for the Jews in Muslim countries. The 'protections' extended to them by these powers might be reduced if the Jews of Morocco were placed 'on an equal footing' with the sultan's Muslim subjects (see *supra*, note 42).
4. Turkey had been saved from Russia during the Crimean war by England and her allies because the Ottoman sultan 'had given repeated proofs of the just and tolerant spirit by which he was animated.'
5. Sir Moses Montefiore had presented to the Ottoman sultan a similar

petition in 1840 to the one he was now submitting to the Moroccan sultan. Its acceptance would promote the welfare and happiness . . . of mankind in general and would also be in the sultan's interests.

The sultan's ceremonious reception for the embassy took place early on 1 February. Montefiore speaks of soldiers in serried rank 'of great variety of hue and accoutrements'. Hodgkin noted that the soldiers were not dressed or armed in the old Moorish style, but had become 'a sort of degraded European army [. . .] These troops had very much the appearance of prisoners clothed in left off soldiers' garments'. But, as the party passed the avenue into the vast plain, the massed cavalry and foot soldiers (about six thousand) afforded a most impressive sight. The ministers came forward to greet them, white stallions with rich saddles were led past as well as the royal carriage covered in green. Trumpets heralded the monarch, riding a fine pure-white horse — a symbolical sign of esteem and welcome (a white horse also preceded Montefiore's sedan). The short public audience was said to have been one of the most grandiose ever given by the sultan. He expressed his pleasure at receiving subjects of the Queen of England, and referred to the close friendship between the two countries, adding a few kind words to Montefiore. The latter, standing before the mounted monarch wearing his uniform of the City Lieutenancy, declared that he came on behalf of his brethren and the English people. He presented a sealed petition (Memorial) in Arabic 'on behalf of the Jewish and Christian subjects of his empire'.

The vizier entertained all members of the English embassy at his palace the same evening and discussed a number of subjects with Montefiore, including the extension of the *mellah* of Mogador and the acquisition of a house to serve as a hospital at Tangier. Montefiore had decided not to leave without a royal edict (*dahir*) and this, he notes, was 'placed in my hands' on 5 February. It is clear, however, from Reade's narrative (doc. 5) that the *dahir* was not delivered to Montefiore, but — on the sultan's strict instructions — into the hands of the British consul. Reade made a copy and then sent the original to Montefiore.

The sultan received his guests two days later with the same honours as the first time, but more intimately, seated on an impressive divan. He reiterated to Montefiore his intention of protecting his Jewish subjects, conversed through interpreters (Reade and Nahon) and then had the party guided through his extensive royal gardens for several hours, Montefiore in his sedan, the others mounted.

A tour of the Jewish quarter followed. Ten days earlier, Montefiore had met numerous deputations, comprising up to four hundred

visitors. Now, led by the sultan's guards, he was welcomed in the *mellah* with such vociferous enthusiasm by virtually the whole population (about ten thousand) that his sedan could hardly advance through the narrow, dirty streets to the largest and oldest synagogue, which Sir Moses found to be 'a very humble structure' and Dr Hodgkin 'a small rudely decorated room', as well as to the houses of the wealthy Corcos and Nahon families.⁷¹ Their impressive departure the next day once more found the streets everywhere thronged, with many poor Jews seeking a last gift from their adored benefactor and being mercilessly beaten back by the guards, so as to allow a passage out of the town.

The triumphant return

The party reached Mazagan eight days later, considerable hospitality being offered them all along the 120 mile route by the district governors, amidst joyous manifestations from the Jewish village populations. The only disagreeable incident was the customary malediction of a local Moor who, oblivious to the imposing entourage, spat into the old man's sedan before he was arrested, undoubtedly considering that its occupant had no more rights to such honours than would a local *dhimmi* Jew.⁷²

The habitually variegated and vociferous crowd of Jews met them at some distance from Mazagan and their numbers increased as they entered the town.⁷³ Montefiore went straight to the synagogue and gave thanks for the success of the mission and their safe return. The group partook of a great feast the same evening, increasingly pressed by Captain Armitage to embark, which they did the following morning, whilst Mr Moses Nahon spent the entire night satisfying the claims of the countless attendants. Gibraltar was finally reached on the 17th, six weeks after HMS *Magicienne* had set out for the Moroccan coast.

There followed a much-needed rest for the 'champion of Israel' who caught up on his correspondence and prepared diligently for his return journey. A month later, he was once more received in private audience by the Spanish royal couple at Madrid, this time presenting to them a copy of the *dahir* and its Spanish translation. Then Paris, where the British ambassador arranged a private audience with Napoleon III on 31 March, at which Montefiore handed to the Emperor a copy of the sultan's edict and its French translation. Finally to Ramsgate, where on 5 April, twenty weeks after leaving, he sent his final letter to the Board of Deputies.

The mood in the country towards the octogenarian, particularly amongst the Jewish community, could fairly be described as reverential

awe, and its manner of expression overwhelmingly gushing. A month before his return, the *Daily Telegraph* in a leading article had referred to ‘. . . what one good old man had done to wipe away tears from streaming eyes and cause oppression to cease . . .’, before concluding on a moral note:

Fatigued and feeble with travel, the venerable suppliant has returned with the blessing of a population and the admiration of honest men accompanying him to his English home. His last of many such noble works is his greatest, and cannot fail to be followed by justice and amity along the shores of Africa . . . Honour to the good grey hairs of the aged baronet! we say; and may those who differ from him in ‘faith’ show, with their gold and influence, ‘works’ but half as bold and heroic as those of Sir Moses Montefiore.⁷⁴

Thousands of messages poured in from all over the country – and the world.

Intentions and achievements of all the parties

The British government had once more given its official support to a Montefiore mission on behalf of foreign Jews. The means displayed and the firmness adopted might suggest that – as in Palestine – their aims were not solely humanitarian. Britain’s desire was to keep Morocco at peace with Europe by reducing the opportunities for direct foreign interference and to guarantee regular provisions for Gibraltar, as well as maintaining her long-established and privileged economic position. There is no indication of a policy – either then or later – to use the plight of Moroccan Jewry as a stepping-stone to direct control of the country. The opposite is true. Britain did not want another European country to have an excuse to intervene.

As a young man, Drummond Hay had observed: ‘With Moors and Chinese you must be kind, but very firm, or the end would be great guns.’⁷⁵ Reade’s letter to Yamani (doc. 6) is a perfect example of this method of diplomacy. He was aware, as he explained to his minister in Tangier, of the difficulty of achieving the Ottoman-type reform which Montefiore was seeking, ‘opposed as it was to the religious and deeply rooted prejudices of a fanatical people’ (doc. 5). Drummond Hay knew this situation as well as anyone. He had joined his father in Tangier at sixteen (1832) and, in a noteworthy publication, described a journey from Tangier to Larache in 1839 to obtain blood horses for the young Queen Victoria; there, he observed that the condition of the Moroccan Jew (‘the slave of slaves’) was worse than that of the black Muslim slave.⁷⁶ On succeeding his father as British consul general in 1845, he was shocked (as well as humiliated) that his Jewish official interpreter, David

Sicsu, in the time-honoured *dhimmi* tradition, automatically removed his shoes whenever he passed near a mosque. He reminded Sicsu that the privileges of a British subject dispensed him from this humiliating act.⁷⁷ Now, twenty-five years later, he felt that the 'increase of trade and the general progress of civilization'⁷⁸ would modify these 'fanatical feelings . . . more especially of the inhabitants of the inland Towns' (doc. 7), and informed Russell in London that he was glad that 'a more direct interference on the part of Her Majesty's Government and myself' had not been required in order to obtain the important concessions contained in the *dahir*.⁷⁹

Montefiore's initial aims were clearly described in his letter of 5 November to his nephew, the acting president of the Board of Deputies, as 'the liberation of the two Jews now in prison' and 'the vindication of the honour of the Jewish community of Morocco' – essentially the same aims as were adopted for the Damascus Affair.⁸⁰ But in 1840 he had been able to follow up the initial success by obtaining an imperial *firman* in Constantinople which exonerated the Jews from the accusation of ritual murder and specifically confirmed their rights throughout the Ottoman Empire on the lines of the *Tanzimat* reforms. Because the Jews of the Orient had kept a low profile and had not flaunted their 'equal rights' with Muslims, they had been spared in the violent backlash of 1860 which struck the Christians, particularly in Damascus and the Lebanon, leading to European intervention.⁸¹

As 'he considered a general persecution of the Jews of Morocco . . . as imminent', Montefiore probably envisaged, from the outset of his mission, an appeal to the Sultan of Morocco along the lines of this *firman* – reconfirmed to him by the new Ottoman sultan in May 1863 – even though he did not divulge his intentions until the last moment in Marrakesh for fear of losing British support.⁸² He was obviously aware of the actual situation in Morocco from relatives and from the recent reports (both written and verbal) emanating from the Morocco Relief Committee founded in 1859. He had seen with his own eyes the misery of the Jewish population and the ambiguous situation of a few wealthy families. In his first letter from Marrakesh (26 January) to the Board he referred to the obligation for all Jews without distinction to walk barefooted in the streets of the town, adding that these 'degradingly distinctive marks' (the discriminatory clothing as well) were common to all the towns and villages of the interior. Six days before his meeting with the sultan, he was not sure if there 'is the remotest possibility of success', consoling himself with the thought that he would nonetheless have done his utmost and that whatever the outcome his visit would

provide his co-religionists with a moral boost. Yet a month later, writing from Gibraltar to Earl Russell on 23 February (whilst transmitting in all directions countless copies of the *dahir*), he expresses his hopes that the edict 'will be of immediate benefit to the Jews of Morocco, and tend to secure their future welfare'. To the Board of Deputies, the next day, he was even more optimistic, declaring his belief that 'this degrading distinction [walking barefooted], together with every other will, I trust, now be speedily removed'.⁸³

There was a natural tendency to exaggerate somewhat and to consider hopes and dreams as achieved before the results were actually confirmed. It is revealing in this respect that in his letter to Russell from Gibraltar, Montefiore restricted himself, for obvious reasons, to the condition of the Jews, although in all published letters and declarations – before leaving London and after returning home – he often referred jointly to the 'Jews and Christians' of Morocco. Clearly, the Christian residents of the Moroccan sea-ports, as fully-protected nationals of European powers, were in no need of the traditional Islamic toleration conceded to the *ahl al-dhimma* in accordance with the Pact, or Covenant of Umar. However, public opinion in England and Europe would be more sensitive to a universal humanitarian plea. The demographical importance of Moroccan Jewry was also magnified. An initial estimate of 200,000 in November 1863 soon reached 500,000, whereas the actual Jewish population of Morocco was then probably not more than 100,000 persons – any estimate in excess of 150,000 was a pure figment of the imagination.⁸⁴ On the other hand, this exaggeration also might have been dictated by the desire to impress once again liberal public opinion with the magnitude of the injustice.

But there was a point where such aims and hopes foundered on the rock of reality. There seems to have been an inability to grasp the basic difference between the contemporary situation in the Ottoman Empire and that of Morocco. Reforms such as those initiated in the eighteenth century and extracted from Turkey in the preceding generation – in the teeth of a popular and traditional refusal to recognize the *dhimmi* as an equal – were inconceivable in a country such as Morocco (which was similar to Yemen and Persia⁸⁵ in this respect), where the *ulama* were powerful, the people fanatical, and the ruler's authority tenuous. This is expressly indicated by the terminology which effectively divided the country: *bled al-makhsen* ('lands of the treasury', i.e. the area controlled by the sultan); and *bled al-siba* ('lands of freedom' – virtually autonomous regions).⁸⁶

Moroccan opinion on the event is summarized by the court

chronicler, al-Nasiri. Although chronicled probably twenty years afterwards, we find here the principal elements – except its origins, the Safi Affair – from an Islamic standpoint. The humiliation of the war with Spain (Tetuan), the problem of ‘protections’, the desire of the Jews for ‘emancipation’, the important position of ‘Rothschild’ in England, the latter’s appointment of his relative (Montefiore) to head a delegation and the English government’s backing are all recounted. The sultan, not wishing to send Montefiore away as a failure (he had brought gifts), granted the *dahir*, which merely provided ‘a clear statement of the Religious Law . . . upholding the pact of protection.’ Nasiri explained how the *dahir* had been granted in favour of ‘the respectable Jews and their poor’, but other Jews (especially those in the ports) had become ‘arrogant and reckless’; another *dahir*, ‘clarifying’ the first one, was soon after circulated.

The closing paragraph of the *dahir* of 5 February 1864 refers to the fact that nothing new is being promulgated, merely what is ‘already well established, well known, and recorded’. There can be no doubt that the ‘Pact of Umar’ is implied here, as well as its corollary, the traditional *dhimmi* condition. The language was elegant and sounded magnanimous to European ears, for it was not fully realized that the key to the text was the significance of the words ‘justice’ and ‘injustice’, which might mean one thing in Europe, but quite another in Morocco when applied to *dhimmi*s, in a strict Islamic sense. ‘Emancipation’ was never envisaged and Nasiri is categorical that the (*dhimmi*) Jews were not to be granted the same rights as the (foreign) Christians in the ports. He regretted that the first *dahir* had even been issued and warmly approved its nullification (he was a deputy judge of Salé at the time).⁸⁷ His ill-humour was similar to that of much Muslim reaction in the aftermath of the promulgation of the Humayun edict of 1856 (and in Tunisia after the 1857 Pledge of Security).⁸⁸ The explosion of a huge store of gunpowder, which ravaged an area of the town two days before Montefiore’s arrival in Marrakesh, was considered as a sign of ill-omen. Be that as it may, explosions of wrath – both from the populace and from many local governors – towards the Jews of Morocco, guilty of ‘arrogance’ and ‘recklessness’ for attempting to avail themselves of the *dahir*’s explicit protection (intended ‘to strike fear into those who would commit aggression against them’), were not slow in multiplying.

However, the pomp and circumstance of Montefiore’s reception and the noble imperial edict were highly appreciated in London. Layard, at Question Time in the House of Commons, praised the sultan’s great generosity, and the expression in the edict, ‘that not

even a fractional portion of the smallest imaginable particle of injustice shall reach any one of them [the Jews]' seemed equitable, even if this example of 'the exaggerated style of Oriental decrees' drew a laugh.⁸⁹ At the public meeting held in the London Tavern a month later on 13 April, it was resolved to send an official vote of thanks through the British government to the sultan for his 'noble conduct'. A particularly eloquent speaker suggested that if a new subject for a Westminster Palace fresco were required, why not this mission — Sir Moses presenting his petition for 'equal rights to Jew and Christian alike' and the sultan granting it. Yet another speaker 'hardly knew whom to admire most — Sir Moses Montefiore, the champion of a great cause, or the Emperor of Morocco who gave him so gracious a reception'.⁹⁰ The possibility that the imperial edict might become a 'dead letter' was also raised, but immediately dismissed as virtually impossible — 'it bears the character of a semi-international treaty'.⁹¹

But local realities were quite another matter. A memorandum of complaints from various Jewish communities of the interior had reached the *Junta* in Tangier, who in turn alerted the British minister in Tangier and also wrote to London, Paris and elsewhere. Drummond Hay acted promptly and firmly by sending (20 April) a strong circular to all British vice-consuls in the country (doc. 9) and on 2 May wrote to Russell in London (doc. 8) enclosing a copy of both the circular and a translation of the memorandum. In another letter he advised the British government 'to defer, for the present, communicating to the Sultan the sense entertained by the meeting at the London Tavern'.

Montefiore wrote an ornate, diplomatic, letter to the Vizier Yamani on 1 June recounting how he had handed a copy of the *dahir* to the Spanish and French monarchs, adding: 'The Imperial Edict of his Sheriffian Majesty has obtained a world-wide celebrity, and has everywhere received the eulogies to which it is so eminently entitled.' He told of 'sad tidings' having reached him that some governors and officials were disregarding the sultan's instructions and implored him to keep aglow the 'beam of light' (the edict), so that 'anticipations of a brighter future' (for the Jews of Morocco) and 'fond hopes' may not become 'a vain shadow' and 'a delusive dream'. Two months later he received an eloquent reassurance from Yamani, who stressed that 'injustice' is forbidden for 'people professing our religion' and likewise for 'people professing any other religion', and that the sultan had ordered that the Jews of his empire should be treated with kindness 'and strict justice'.⁹²

The memorandum referred to events in Salé, Azemmour, Mogador,

Fez, Meknes, Dar al-Baida (Casablanca) and Demnat, but other complaints some trivial, others horrific, were received.⁹³

One of the most revealing and moving reports is from Chechuan (doc. 10), which portrays the drab everyday life of misery which the Jews of this village of fanatics accepted with resignation. Twenty years later, the explorer Charles de Foucauld, disguised as a Jew, described Chechuan (south of Tetuan — in the *bled al-siba*) as 'renowned for its intolerance' and the Jews as suffering the worst treatment, including regular stoning. Foucauld remarked that he and his companion were cursed by every Muslim who passed them with the formula: 'May Allah assure that the father who gave you birth shall burn for eternity, Jew!'⁹⁴ On this same voyage, Foucauld singled out the towns of Sefrou and Demnat, where he found the Jews to be 'the happiest' whom he had seen in Morocco. Yet, in early 1864 the Jews of Demnat were so harrassed that they petitioned Montefiore and Reade during their visit to the sultan and redress was promised, but to no avail. They were forced to work on the Sabbath and Holy Days, many of their houses had been confiscated so that a mosque might be built (the Muslim version states — because the houses were too close to the existing mosque's source of water), the men had found refuge in a Muslim sanctuary but were not allowed food, whilst their wives and daughters 'suffer the most brutal outrages from the caïd and his servants'. Six months later, on 4 August, a Foreign Office letter informed Sir Francis Goldsmid that the British, French, Italian, Portuguese and United States representatives had intervened with some effect, but Drummond Hay felt that any attempt to compel the sultan's officers 'to carry into effect the Edict . . . might place in jeopardy the lives of the Jews'. However, he was optimistic 'that the gradual progress of civilization and commerce, and the influence of the agents of the European Gov^{ts} must be looked to for improving the state of the Jews in Morocco rather than any sudden reforms imposed upon an ignorant and fanatical people'. Twenty years later (1884–5), the year after Foucauld's visit, many of the six to seven hundred Jewish inhabitants of the town were once again undergoing unbearable persecutions by the governor, although 'they are on very good terms with the Arabs'. By the turn of the century, Budgett Meakin was writing that, 'until many of them were driven, by persecution, to the capital [Marrakesh], it was the home of a large number of well-to-do Jews, but now the mellah is the scene of poverty and filth alone'.⁹⁵

All these complaints show that, paradoxically, the *dahir* might have had the opposite effect from that intended. As an observer noted in 1876, the *firman* was drawn up in too vague a manner to

have any practical value (doc. 12). In view of the ever-worsening climate, Drummond Hay had — like the sultan but for different reasons — circulated a second message to the British vice-consuls restricting their interference on behalf of Jewish plaintiffs to cases where extreme cruelty was employed, advising that the utmost caution was to be used where individual Jews might have behaved in a provocative manner. In London, Hammond, on instructions from the foreign secretary, forwarded a copy of this circular and another despatch of 7 August from Tangier to Montefiore. The latter, greatly disturbed by the implications of the new circular, wrote immediately to Earl Russell on 7 September enclosing a diplomatic letter for eventual forwarding to Drummond Hay, as well as a draft of his proposed address to 'The Rabbis, Elders and Congregational Authorities of the Jews of Morocco' (doc. 11). He hoped thereby to convince the foreign secretary of his own good faith, of the mistaken policy being adopted by the British representatives and of the general pacific qualities of the Jews of Morocco. Montefiore's direct influence is evident in Russell's letter, dispatched on 10 September to his minister in Tangier, now advised to 'reconsider the terms of your circular with a view to relieve the apprehension which, in its present terms, it is calculated to excite in the minds of the Jewish population in Morocco and of their friends in this country'. The form of the draft letter was carefully modified by a second, authoritative, hand (Russell, Layard or Hammond?) so as not to offend Drummond Hay, and the last, most revealing, phrase was added — 'and of their friends in this country' (i.e. Jews and non-Jews).⁹⁶

Queen Victoria received Montefiore in audience on 20 June 1864 (he arrived at Windsor Castle on the same day as the Turkish ambassador, Mustapha Pasha) and three months later, whilst resting at his favourite retreat, Smithembottom, he optimistically confided in his diary:

I have great cause for thankfulness. Since I was here in November last, I hope that by Divine blessing, I have been of some use to my fellow-creatures, both Jews and Christians, and, I believe, I may add, 'Moors'. To God alone, who helped and sustained me, be honour and glory.⁹⁷

Two weeks later, near to his eightieth birthday, he was honoured by the Lord Mayor in a moving ceremony at Guildhall as 'a distinguished member of the Hebrew community' who in a lifetime of altruistic effort had alleviated 'the sufferings and miseries of people of all creeds and denominations (Cheers)' and he handed Sir Moses a resolution of thanks on behalf of the Common Council.

The pomp and circumstance in London was a continuation of that of Marrakesh — manifestations of the best intentions, but quite irrelevant to the realities of the situation. The condition of the Jews, based on religious dogma, could not be changed by 'fond hopes' or the magic wand of foreign individuals or governments — this was indeed 'a delusive dream'!

The Moroccan reality

The contemporary official Moroccan viewpoint has already been observed. A recent Moroccan historian, Abdallah Laroui, confirms Nasiri's assertion that the purpose of those Jews living in the seaports, in contact with Europeans, was to abolish the *dhimma*; whereas the *ulama*, and the people in general, were determined to maintain the pre-eminence of Islam which required the humiliation of the *dhimmis*.⁹⁸ He shows how in 1837 the religious authorities had advised against allowing the Jews of Fez even the authorization to build a public bath in their own *mellah*, for this precise reason: the possibility that they might thereby escape from their providential inferiority, through cleanliness. Laroui emphasized that this period witnessed a renewed interest in the works of the fifteenth century theologian, Muhammad al-Maghili (d. 1503), whose opinions on the *dhimmis* and the strict application of the *dhimma* (Pact of Umar), were copied and distributed in large quantities, being twice lithographed towards the end of the nineteenth century.⁹⁹ The force of Maghili's argument in the fifteenth century had been astutely turned against the rich and influential Muslims, guilty of employing 'the worst enemies' of the Prophet, instead of maintaining them in their natural state of humiliation. The significant distribution of the tracts during this period was clearly in reaction to the 'emancipation' of a small number of Jews in the seaports of Morocco, a situation which, paradoxically, probably reached its culmination with Montefiore's visit, after which a strong reaction on all levels developed to maintain the traditional norm.

For ample proof of the lack of progress in the changes predicted by both Montefiore and Drummond Hay, it is enough to recall, not only the increased numbers of murders and incidents involving Jews over the next generation, but also the deteriorated situation of those living in the interior of the country.¹⁰⁰ The respected orientalist Joseph Halévy, who had already been on missions to Ethiopia and southern Yemen,¹⁰¹ has left us a graphic description of the unchanged condition of misery and humiliation endured by the Jews of Marrakesh a dozen years after the sultan had granted

the famous *dahir* to Montefiore, whose efforts had 'roused so much legitimate applause amongst all men of generous spirit' (doc. 12).

The reality, clear in 1876, should have been as clear to someone of Montefiore's experience in 1864. Yet, relying on his instincts, his strength of purpose, his diplomatic skills and an extraordinary stamina, the octogenarian was determined to succeed, as he had in the past (except in the Mortara Case of 1859 concerning the papacy). The ostensible success of the mission — to the general applause of liberal European opinion¹⁰² — gave it a symbolic aura which gain-said any criticism, then or later, during the hero's lifetime.

When on 3 December 1880 at the time of the Madrid Conference, the London *Jewish World* published an article on the Montefiore mission by 'an Englishman' (dated Gibraltar, 10 November), the sixty-five-year-old Guedalla took up his pen to defend his ninety-five-year-old uncle in a forty-page refutation, which was printed within two weeks of the incriminating text's appearance:

It is difficult to account for the object of this dastardly attempt to substitute falsehood for truth [. . .] It makes one's blood boil to read such attempts to detract from eminent service, as will be seen from the perusal of the risks encountered on the mission by the venerable baronet, to say nothing of the enormous expense incurred.¹⁰³

The article errs on many details concerning the Safi Affair itself and Montefiore's intentions and achievements, giving a somewhat garbled and even tendentious version.¹⁰⁴ However, some of the statements quoted 'from a most respectable resident' of Marrakesh (perhaps a Corcos or a Nahon) have the ring of authenticity and the anonymous writer's own contemporary conclusion is most incisive.

The Vizier Yamani (Tiebi Bouarshrin) is supposed to have asked the leading Jewish notables of Marrakesh what answer might be given their distinguished English co-religionist's petition to the sultan on their behalf, and was told by them, 'write anything you like', as anyhow *they* would make sure it became a dead letter after Montefiore's departure. The author's confidant added, seventeen years after the event: 'Sir Moses did not bring any guns or regiments behind him; he came to beg, and we all can play at that game.' The notable added that he himself (a favourite at the sultan's court, then and now) had walked barefoot on the very day Montefiore had left Marrakesh (see doc. 13 for the same situation in 1911).

The anonymous — yet courageous — 'Englishman' writing from Gibraltar deplores this lack of moral courage, but, with a profound understanding of the psychological motifs behind such behaviour, he concludes thus — in 1880!:

Yet, we must make allowances for their weakness, produced by years of oppression, and the fact of the Jewish bodies who possess influence in Europe allowing themselves to be cajoled by mellifluous words and 'chats over' matters which are not only of national importance, but concern the existence and freedom of their brethren from cruel oppression in a land not very far away.

Two years after Sir Moses Montefiore's death in 1885, the orientalist, Dr Louis Loewe, who had accompanied his friend on nine of his missions abroad (but not to Morocco) gave his own thoughts on the subject:

Some readers who have attentively perused the narrative of Sir Moses' Mission to Morocco, will perhaps say that since the issuing of the Sultan's edict twenty-three years ago, His Sheriffian Majesty's commands contained therein do not seem to have been very strictly adhered to. The Moors say, and apparently with good reason, 'To promise is not the same as to perform'. Their observation seems just, when we find that, notwithstanding the promises made by the Sultan to Sir Moses, he continued to receive complaints from almost every Hebrew community of the oppression and ill-treatment to which they had been subjected.¹⁰⁵

Aftermath and Conclusion

It was too early to expect a voluntary change of attitudes from the *ulama*, the people, the ruling classes or even the sultan; and Montefiore had not come with either 'guns or regiments', nor would he have considered such an eventuality.

Half a century later, on 30 March 1912, the sultan Abdul-Hafiz signed a treaty with France establishing thereby the French Protectorate over most of Morocco, the Spanish Protectorate being confined to a small area in the north of the country. This followed a decade of intense internal revolt and disorder, including French intervention, since 1907. During this period the situation of the Jews became particularly precarious — scores of them were killed and hundreds of women and children were abducted for ransom, mainly in Taza, Settat and Casablanca. On 17 April 1912 the sultan's mutinous troops, joined by a civilian mob, attacked Europeans — principally French — in Fez, and then turned on the defenceless population of the *mellah*. Throughout three days and nights — 'Assassination, rape, fire, looting — nothing was spared this unfortunate Jewish community'. More than sixty men, women and children were killed, fifty wounded and 10,000 left homeless, of whom 2,000 found a welcome shelter and safety on the first evening in one of the sultan's courtyards adjoining the menagerie and stables.¹⁰⁶

The director of the Alliance boys' school at Fez had sent his vivid

description of this catastrophe to Paris. Scarcely fifteen months earlier he had advised the president of the Alliance Israélite Universelle not to intervene with the Moroccan authorities on behalf of Rabbi Vidal Sarfaty. The old man had bitterly complained that all Jews still had to go barefoot when entering the palace courtyard on community matters. Amram Elmaleh, like Drummond Hay and Montefiore before him, declared his faith in 'the passing of time and the penetration of modern ideas into the Muslim world' (doc. 13).

But the guns and the regiments had come to stay for forty years. New laws were passed and customs adopted. Soon, it no longer mattered whether the Moroccan Jews wore European attire, nor shoes or *babouches* outside of their quarters in all the towns and villages of the interior, even in front of the sultan. Like their Muslim compatriots, they entered upon a new era in which for them the shackles of the past – the *dhimma* – would no longer keep them rigidly in a condition of inferiority.¹⁰⁷

Unfortunately this era did not begin in 1864 after Montefiore's peace mission, but only in 1912 under foreign rule.

Yet Moroccan Jewry's destiny was not to take place in Morocco, where 2,500 years earlier their ancestors had settled. Paradoxically, messianic aspirations within some British circles had coincided with Britain's political interests in the Eastern Mediterranean, and these circumstances provided the basic conditions for modern political Zionism to flourish in Palestine. Montefiore himself had laboured philanthropically throughout his life in the Holy Land, mainly in Jerusalem. He could not have been unaware of the messianic dreams of Moroccan Jewry,¹⁰⁸ but never could he have imagined that one hundred years after his mission to Morocco the greater part of the descendants of those whose honour he wished to vindicate in 1863 would have gathered together in a massive exodus towards their ancestral homeland.¹⁰⁹

MISSION TO MOROCCO: DOCUMENTS

1

British Minister Drummond Hay (Tangier) to Foreign Minister Earl Russell (London)

Your Lordship's Despatch marked 'Separate' of the 12th ultimo [November] was delivered to me by Sir Moses Montefiore, who arrived here from Cadiz on the 11th instant.

Sir Moses called on Mr. Merry and obtained from him a letter to

the Moorish Minister, declaring that the Spanish Government withdrew from further prosecution of the two Jews [Makluf and Saido] now imprisoned at Saffee on a charge of being concerned in the alleged murder of a Spanish subject, and requesting that the Sultan would give orders for their liberation.

At Sir Moses' request I presented him to the Moorish Minister Seed Mohammed Bargash and supported both verbally and in a letter I addressed the Minister for transmission to the Sultan, the petition of Sir Moses Montefiore.

Seed Mohammed Bargash has assured me that he is persuaded the Sultan will give orders that the prisoners be released, now that the Spanish Government has withdrawn from further prosecution of this case.

It is Sir Moses' intention to go to Saffee, and thence he will proceed to the Moorish Court at Morocco to thank the Sultan. I have written to the Moorish Oozeer [the Vizier 'Seed Taib Ben Yamany'] to request that a kind reception be given by His Majesty to Sir Moses Montefiore.

I have given also to Sir Moses Montefiore letters of recommendation to the British Vice Consuls and to the Moorish Authorities at the Western ports which he intends to visit.

Sir Moses has also obtained the release of the two Jews [Elcaim and Benharosh] who had been bastinadoed and imprisoned at Tangier, at the demand of Mr. Merry, on account of some dispute with his servant.

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE (LONDON)

(F.O. 99/117, Drummond Hay to Russell, N^o 15, Tangier, 15 Dec. 1863)

2

Through the good offices of Sir Moses Montefiore a reconciliation has taken place between the Spanish Minister, Mr Merry and myself, and all matters of discussion between us have been mutually and amicably dropped.

PRO

(F.O. 99/117, Drummond Hay to Russell, N^o 14, Tangier, 15 Dec. 1863)

3

Sir Moses Montefiore (Tangier) to Sir John Drummond Hay (Tangier)

It being my intention D.V. to carry out my projects of a visit to the Sultan to thank him for his liberation of the prisoners at Saffi,

and to solicit the continuance of his humane protection of his Jewish subjects, I shall esteem it a very great favor if you will give your permission to Consul Reade to accompany me.

The companionship of a gentleman possessing so much intelligence and justly occupying so influential a position in this country cannot fail to be of the utmost utility to me, and I shall also be truly delighted to have this pleasing opportunity to enjoy the society of so old a friend.

To you Sir John, I can but reiterate my gratitude for your efficient aid and constant attention.

PRO

(F.O. 99/117, Montefiore to Drummond Hay, 17 Dec. 1863)

4

Merry y Colon to Spanish consuls and vice-consuls (Morocco)

The Government of Her Majesty the Queen has seen with much displeasure the gross calumnies which have been written against Spain, in the belief that the Spanish Consuls in Morocco have undertaken a crusade against the Israelites established in this empire.

Such calumnies must not in the least influence your feelings, nor ought they to occasion any alteration in the proceedings of the agents of Spain in Morocco, regarding the Israelites, as relates to aiding and protecting them.

On the contrary, the best mode of successfully combating such calumnies is increasing your solicitude for this race, which is so sadly circumstanced in this country.

Thus you will avail yourselves of every opportunity which may arise to prevent acts of cruelty on the part of the Moorish Authorities against the Israelites, and also in cases of notorious injustice, and when it is the question to inflict the punishment of the lash, in order to extort confession, in any case you will resolutely interpose your influence with the local authorities to prevent the commission of such act of barbarity.

(Extract from a circular by Spanish Minister (Tangier), Merry y Colon, 20 Dec. 1863 — the above translation is from Guedalla, p. 37, slightly different from that published in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 8 Jan. 1864)

5

Consul Thomas F. Reade (Marrakesh) to Sir John Drummond Hay (Tangier)

Before leaving this city, which we purpose doing tomorrow, I think it my duty, to dispatch to you, by express courier, the following

brief sketch of the proceedings and results of Sir Moses Montefiore's mission to the Sultan's Court, since our arrival here on the 25th ultimo.

Up to the latter date, I had been given to understand that the object of Sir Moses' mission was simply to thank the Sultan for the liberation of the Jews in prison at Saffi, as well as to solicit that His Majesty's Hebrew Subjects might in future be treated with more mercy and justice than, as a body, they have hitherto been. The support required from me, as an officer of Her Majesty's Government, would, in such a case, have been little more than nominal, and my course of action clear and simple.

To my surprise, however, I learnt from Sir Moses, on our arrival at Morocco [Marrakesh], that it was his intention to submit to the Sultan a petition, which he had drawn up at Gibraltar, subsequently to his visit to Tangier, and which he shewed to me for the first time, praying that, in all matters connected with the administration of justice in this country, Jews and Christians might be placed on an equal footing with Mohamedans.

The attainment of a reform so important as that which Sir Moses was desirous of bringing about, opposed as it was to the religious and deeply rooted prejudices of a fanatical people, would, under any circumstances, have appeared to me a difficult matter. I felt, however, that Sir Moses had seriously enhanced the difficulties of our task by starting upon his mission, without submitting his petition, in the first place, to your consideration, and obtaining from you a stronger representation in support of it than the letters of recommendation to the Oozir with which you had provided us.

I was, at the same time, aware that, unless the Sultan could be brought to regard as a political necessity the concessions sought for, the mission upon which we had come would prove a failure.

To ensure success it was necessary to shew by argumental demonstration that His Majesty's personal interests were consulted in the negotiation as much as those of his Hebrew Subjects.

Under these circumstances, and in my inability to await a reference to Tangier, I thought it my duty to back Sir Moses' petition, by addressing to the Oozir a strong representation in its support. Of that representation I beg herewith to inclose a translation.

In all my communications with the Oozir, on the subject of Sir Moses Montefiore's Petition, I carefully abstained from all allusion to the treatment of Christians, as, although Sir Moses' demands purported to be on behalf of Christians as well as Jews, the former did not stand in need of any such intercession in their favour, the privileges they enjoy in this country being even greater than those accorded to Mohamedans.

On the 1st instant, our first audience of the Sultan took place. His Majesty received Sir Moses Montefiore, Captain Armytage, and the rest of our party, with much kindness and courtesy, and spoke in the most friendly terms of the Queen of Great Britain and the British Government and nation. During the interview, Sir Moses presented to the Sultan his petition; and His Majesty graciously received it, and promised to favourably consider it.

Four days afterwards, an Imperial Edict, of which the inclosed is a translation, was brought to me by an Officer of the Sultan's body guard, who had been instructed to deliver it into no other hands but mine. After taking a copy of the original document, I delivered the latter to Sir Moses Montefiore, who has expressed to me his intention of conveying it himself to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

We had another audience of the Sultan, this morning, when we took leave of His Majesty and thanked him for the very gracious and satisfactory reply he had given to Sir Moses' petition. His Majesty expressed himself to us in the same friendly terms as on the former occasion.

PRO

(F.O. 99/121, Reade to Drummond Hay, 7 Feb. 1863. Inclosure N^o 1 in Drummond Hay's Despatch N^o 16 of 20 Feb. 1864)

6

Consul Reade (Marrakesh) to Moroccan Vizier Yamani (Marrakesh)

The friendly relations which so happily subsist between the British Government and that of His Majesty the Sultan, are, as Your Excellence is aware, of long standing, sincere, and durable. It is under the inspiration of those friendly relations that I have been directed by Sir John Hay Drummond Hay, H.B.M^s Minister at Tangier, to accompany the Baronet, Sir Moses Montefiore, to the Exalted presence, and assure His Majesty of the deep and lively interest that is taken by the British Government in the object of that gentleman's mission. He comes to express, in the name of the Hebrew Community of England, and, I may add, on behalf of the civilized world, his acknowledgements to the Sultan for past acts of favour done to his coreligionists in this country, and more especially for the late gracious liberation of the two Israelite prisoners at Saffi. He comes also to pray that His Majesty's favour may continue to be extended to the Hebrews of this country, and that the latter may be placed on an equal footing with their Mussulman neighbours, in as far as their personal protection and claims for justice are concerned.

On the 1st instant, our first audience of the Sultan took place. His Majesty received Sir Moses Montefiore, Captain Armytage, and the rest of our party, with much kindness and courtesy, and spoke in the most friendly terms of the Queen of Great Britain and the British Government and nation. During the interview, Sir Moses presented to the Sultan his petition; and His Majesty graciously received it, and promised to favourably consider it.

Four days afterwards, an Imperial Edict, of which the inclosed is a translation, was brought to me by an Officer of the Sultan's body guard, who had been instructed to deliver it into no other hands but mine. After taking a copy of the original document, I delivered the latter to Sir Moses Montefiore, who has expressed to me his intention of conveying it himself to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

We had another audience of the Sultan, this morning, when we took leave of His Majesty and thanked him for the very gracious and satisfactory reply he had given to Sir Moses' petition. His Majesty expressed himself to us in the same friendly terms as on the former occasion.

PRO

(F.O. 99/121, Reade to Drummond Hay, 7 Feb. 1863. Inclosure N° 1 in Drummond Hay's Despatch N° 16 of 20 Feb. 1864)

6

Consul Reade (Marrakesh) to Moroccan Vizier Yamani (Marrakesh)

The friendly relations which so happily subsist between the British Government and that of His Majesty the Sultan, are, as Your Excellence is aware, of long standing, sincere, and durable. It is under the inspiration of those friendly relations that I have been directed by Sir John Hay Drummond Hay, H.B.M^s Minister at Tangier, to accompany the Baronet, Sir Moses Montefiore, to the Exalted presence, and assure His Majesty of the deep and lively interest that is taken by the British Government in the object of that gentleman's mission. He comes to express, in the name of the Hebrew Community of England, and, I may add, on behalf of the civilized world, his acknowledgements to the Sultan for past acts of favour done to his coreligionists in this country, and more especially for the late gracious liberation of the two Israelite prisoners at Saffi. He comes also to pray that His Majesty's favour may continue to be extended to the Hebrews of this country, and that the latter may be placed on an equal footing with their Mussulman neighbours, in as far as their personal protection and claims for justice are concerned.

The social condition of the Israelites who dwell in Mohamedan countries has long been a subject of solicitude with the Governments of Europe and America; and in Morocco, or rather in certain parts of Morocco, their position has been found to be one of peculiar hardship and degradation. It is this circumstance, more perhaps than any other, which has influenced the Agents of Foreign Powers to extend, of late years, the protection of their respective flags beyond the limits of Treaty Stipulations; and thus the Sovereign attributes of His Majesty have been infringed upon, and his authority materially weakened.

For this state of things, however, there is a remedy; and a better one cannot be found than that of graciously acceding to the terms of Sir Moses Montefiore's petition.

The philanthropic disposition of the Sultan is well known to us, as also the facilities which, under His auspices, are so happily accorded to persons of every denomination and creed to dwell in this country, engage in mercantile pursuits, and observe the rites of their religion. We are therefore convinced that it will also be His Majesty's pleasure to ordain, that the remaining vestiges of the intolerance of former administrations in this country shall be effectually wiped away, that no humiliating badge shall remain to mark a distinction between one class of His Majesty's Subjects and another, and that equal justice shall henceforth be meted out to Mussulman and Israelite.

His Majesty will thus not only more closely and lastingly cement His alliances with the Sovereigns or Potentates of other countries, but he will remove the principal, if not only, cause that is, or can be, assigned in justification of the abuses that are from time to time perpetrated by some of the Foreign Representatives, with regard to the protection they accord to Subjects of these Dominions.

The Israelites are essentially an industrious and loyal class. Raised to a higher social position, they would become even more useful, as has been seen in other countries where some of them have become great public benefactors.

Not many years ago, the independence, and I may add the very existence of the Ottoman Empire were seriously menaced by the grasping schemes of Russia, when England, France and Sardinia, tending a helping hand to the injured Sultan, broke, in the Crimean war that followed, the aggressor's power, and secured the future peace and tranquillity of Turkey. Now, this would not have been the case if the late Sultan Abdul Mejid had not given repeated proofs of the just and tolerant spirit by which he was animated. A singular manifestation of this spirit took place in 1840, when he acceded to

a petition of a similar nature to the one we are now treating – which petition was, as on the present occasion, submitted to His Imperial Majesty by the distinguished Baronet Sir Moses Montefiore.

His Majesty the Sultan will, I am sure, do all in his power to promote the welfare and happiness, not only of the whole of his subjects, but of mankind in general. And it is this conviction, as well as that that [*sic*] a compliance with Sir Moses' present petition would tend largely to advance His Majesty's interests, which has emboldened me to address to Your Excellency the preceding remarks. I beg that they may be submitted to the favourable consideration of His Majesty. Peace.

PRO

(F.O. 99/121, Reade to Taib Ben Yamany, 28 Jan. 1863, Inclosure N^o 2 in Drummond Hay's Despatch N^o 16 of 20 Feb. 1864)

7

Sir John Drummond Hay (Tangier) to Foreign Minister Earl Russell (London)

Sir Moses Montefiore and Mr Reade returned from the Moorish Court on the 17th Instant, in Her Majesty's ship 'Magicienne'.

I have the honour to inclose, herewith, the copy of a report addressed to me by Mr. Reade from Morocco, inclosing the copy of a Note he had delivered to the Moorish Oozeer, Seed Tayeb El Yamanee, urging The Sultan to accede to the Petition, which had been made to His Majesty by Sir Moses Montefiore in behalf of his coreligionists in this Country, – and, further, a Translation of a Firman or Edict, issued by the Sultan to his Governors and Officers, ordaining that the Jews be treated with lenity and justice.

Taking into consideration the fanatical feelings of the Mohamedans of Morocco, more especially of the inhabitants of the inland Towns, I am of opinion that The Sultan could not have granted greater concessions, than he has done in this Edict, for alleviating the grievance of his Jewish Subjects without endangering his own position, and indeed, the safety of the Jews themselves.

The residence and intercourse of Europeans with the Mohamedans, the increase of trade and the general progress of civilization will, I trust, gradually tend to bring about modifications in the system of government, and also in the general conduct and feelings of the Mohamedan population towards Christians and Jews. There is no doubt that the present Sultan and his Chief Minister, Seed Tayeb, are far more enlightened and advanced in liberal ideas than the

Moorish Governors or other officers of state or of the Mohamedan population in general.

Sir Moses Montefiore has spoken very highly of the important services rendered to him by Mr. Reade, in aiding to bring to a successful issue the object of the mission. I have signified to Mr. Reade my approval of his conduct, and of the prudence and tact he has shewn in the peculiar position in which he was placed, and in having succeeded in inducing The Sultan and his Ministers to make such important concessions without a more direct interference on the part of Her Majesty's Government and myself. [. . .]

PRO

(F.O. 99/121, Drummond Hay to Russell, 20 Feb. 1864, N^o 16 — reached the Foreign Office on 3 March)

8

Sir John Drummond Hay (Tangier) to Foreign Minister Earl Russell (London)

I regret to inform your Lordship, that the Elders of the Jewish Committee at Tangier have reported to me several acts of tyranny and cruelty, which are alleged to have been recently perpetrated, by the Governors of the Interior upon the Jews.

It appears, that the Edict delivered by the Sultan to Sir Moses Montefiore had caused considerable dissatisfaction amongst the Mohamedan population and especially the fanatical Governors and Chiefs of the Interior, and that the Sultan had not ventured to send copies of the Edict to all his Officers, but is said to have merely addressed letters to some of the Governors and Chiefs, recommending that the poorer class of Jews should be kindly treated. On the other hand, the Jewish population, naturally elated by the success of Sir Moses Montefiore's mission to the Sultan, had assumed a more independant manner in their dealings with the Mohamedans and had, on several occasions, refused to submit to such arbitrary acts of the Governors, as were supposed to be at variance with the wording or spirit of the Edict.

I enclose a translation of the various cases of cruelty and tyranny, which have been reported to me by the Jewish Elders, but of which, I have not as yet received any confirmation from the Consular Officers at the Ports. On receiving the first report, of the tyrannical conduct of a Governor of Algarb towards some Jews, I wrote a private letter to the Prime Minister, Seed Tayeb El Yamanee,

expressing my surprize, that any Governor should venture to disobey the Sultans Edict, and requesting that immediate steps should be taken to prevent a repetition of such tyranny. The Minister in reply, sent me the report of the Governor of his proceedings, which was at variance with the Jewish account.

I learn from the Jewish Elders, that at Morocco [Marrakesh] the Sultan had severely punished some Mohamedans of that city, who had been accused of ill-treating the Jews, showing that though the Sultan has the will and disposition to act humanely, His Majesty has not sufficient power or authority over his people in the Interior to enforce his wishes.

Whatever may be the cause of the present reaction and revival of the persecution of the Jews by the Mohamedan Governors and Chiefs, I could not remain a passive spectator of such acts of tyranny and fanaticism, and allow the step, which the Sultan has voluntarily made, in favour of religious tolerance, to be retraced. I have therefore addressed a circular to the British Vice Consuls at the Ports, directing them to act in concert with their Colleagues in checking acts of tyranny or cruelty, and if it be necessary to take temporarily under their protection any innocent Jew or family, who are persecuted by the Mohamedans. The Circular has been drawn up more especially with the view of having an effect on the minds of the Mohamedan Authorities — I have sent an Arabic translation to the Vice Consuls, in order that they may communicate it to each Governor — I have also communicated a copy to Seed Mohamed Bargash, and have told him distinctly, that the British Government and people will lose all confidence in the Moorish Government, and cease to take the same interest in the independance and welfare of this Country, they have hitherto felt, if such barbarities are allowed to be perpetrated.

In adopting the course I have done, I think it may tend to support the Sultan's liberal intentions, and lead the Moorish Officers at the Ports to understand that by further acts of cruelty, they may not only incur the displeasure of the Sultan, but bring about the direct interference of European Governments in behalf of the oppressed Jews.

Several of my Colleagues have acquainted me, they have adopted a similar course — Monsieur de Tallenay, The French Chargé d'Affaires, has assured the Jewish Elders, he has reported to his Government these occurrences, but that he cannot take any step, until he receives instructions, as the French Government had not taken any notice of the late persecutions of the Jews at Saffee who were accused of the murder of a Spanish Subject.

7th May

P.S. Monsieur de Tallenay has informed me that he has addressed a Circular to the French Consular Officers at the Moorish Porte regarding the ill treatment of the Jews.

PRO

(F.O. 99/121, Drummond Hay to Russell, N^o 26, Tangier, 2 May 1864)

9

Sir John Drummond Hay's circular (Tangier) to British vice-consuls, etc.

The object of the mission of Sir Moses Montefiore to the Moorish Court, and the success that attended his representations to the Sultan in behalf of his coreligionists in this country, have no doubt come to your knowledge. The liberal and benevolent sentiments manifested by the Sultan in the instructions issued to his Governors and Officers in the late Edict which he delivered to Sir Moses Montefiore regarding the Jews, have received the approbation of Her Majesty's Government, and, of the civilized world and have tended generally to create a more favorable feeling and lively interest towards the Sultan of Morocco, and this Country than had hitherto been entertained.

Under such circumstances I have felt the deepest regret and dissatisfaction on learning that various recent cases of arbitrary and cruel treatment of the Jews have occurred, shewing that, though the Sultan — Seed Mohamed — is a wise and benevolent Sovereign, his Officers are not worthy to serve so excellent a master and that, whilst His Majesty is seeking to promote civilization, and Commerce and to act with justice and humanity towards all persons in his realms, there are Officers in His Majesty's employment who through their ignorance, cruelty, and venality will bring the Moorish Government, not only into disrepute, but even place in jeopardy the peaceful relations of European Powers with the Moorish Government.

The days of persecution and intolerance towards persons of different creeds have passed away and must not be allowed to return in Morocco. The Sultan of Turkey and the Princes of other Mohamedan Powers have enacted laws placing Christians and Jews on an equal footing with the Mohamedans in the eyes of the law; in fact, granting that reciprocity of rights which has long been given to Mohamedans in Great Britain and by other nations of Europe and America. [A very important point.]

The Christian Governments of the world, whilst they applaud

these reforms and have drawn more closely the ties of friendship and alliance towards those Mohamedan Powers who have shewn a spirit of liberality, will not remain silent should the Edicts that have been issued or the Laws that have been enacted become dead letters, and the old persecution of religious sects be revived.

My predecessors as well as myself have on several occasions given instructions to British Consular Officers in Morocco to use their good Offices in behalf of any Jews or Mohamedans who might be tyrannically and cruelly persecuted by the Moorish Authorities, but at the same time, to avoid, as far as it was possible, the appearance of an undue interference with the rights of the Sultan's Officers to govern Moorish subjects.

You are also acquainted with the opinions I entertain regarding irregular protection being afforded to Moorish subjects by Consular Officers, and, with the steps I have taken, and continue to take, in supporting this Government in checking like irregularities; but I have to desire that you take an opportunity of stating distinctly to the Local Authorities at the Port of your residence that, acts of tyranny and barbarity towards the Jews, or others, cannot be tolerated, and that I shall be compelled to report to Her Majesty's Government and to the Governments of Austria, Denmark, and the Netherlands, which I have the honour to represent, if I learn that acts of cruelty and tyranny towards the Jews continue to be perpetrated. You will further state that, I am convinced that orders will ultimately be given, not only to myself, but to the Agents of all the Governments represented in Morocco, to restore protection in its fullest sense when it becomes manifest that confidence can no longer be placed in an impartial administration of justice by the Moorish Authorities. I trust, however, that the future conduct of the Morocco Authorities towards the Jews, and indeed towards all persons under their jurisdiction, may be such as to render it unnecessary, for me, or other Representatives of Foreign Powers, to make an appeal to our Governments.

In the meantime, as the Representative in this country of several civilized Powers from whom I have recently received strong instructions regarding the interest they take in the Jewish race, and the signification of their approval of the late Edict of the Sultan, I cannot allow that the Officers under my jurisdiction should remain passive spectators of the cruel acts of Governors or other Officers who appear to have set at naught the Sultan's Mandate. I have therefore to direct that you, not only continue to use your good Offices in behalf of the Jews as heretofore instructed, but I authorize you to join with your Colleagues in remonstrating with the Moorish

Authorities against any persecution or cruel treatment of the Jews, in contravention of the orders in the Sultan's Edict, of which I inclose a copy and translation. Should no attention be paid to your remonstrances by the Moorish authorities you are authorized to take temporally [*sic*] under your protection, or if you find no other Colleagues disposed to act with you, under the protection of the Consular Representatives of Great Britain, Austria and the Netherlands, any innocent Jew or Jewish family who may be cruelly persecuted by a Moorish Authority. You will at the same time be careful to collect such evidence as may tend to substantiate your right of interference in accordance with my instructions and the dictates of humanity. You are of course desired not to interfere with the course of Moorish justice when properly administered, or to take undue notice of the complaints of Jews in trivial cases.

I send you a translation of this letter into Arabic to enable you to communicate it to the Governor or other Authorities at your Town.

The Consular Officers of Great Britain, Austria and the Netherlands will keep copies of this Circular and its inclosures. You are at liberty to give a copy of the Arabic translation of this letter or of any document it contains to the Authority who may wish to possess them. Under any circumstances you are to cause the translations to be read to the Governor at your Port, so that, he may not declare hereafter he ignored the line of conduct you are instructed to adopt. You may further freely communicate this Circular to any one of Your Colleagues.

I further inclose a list in English and Arabic of the outrages which the Jewish Elders of Tangier allege to have been committed since the Sultan issued his Edict.

PRO

(F.O. 99/121, Drummond Hay to British vice-consuls & Austrian & Danish consular Offices at the Western Ports of Morocco, 20 April. Inclosure N^o 2 in Drummond Hay's Despatch N^o 26 of 2 May 1864)

Jewish Community of Chechuan (24 March 1864)

Chechuan is a small village surrounded by Arab tribes whose members are given to permanent feuding and the anger generated by their constant failures often rebounds on us. Moreover, all government in this region is, so to speak, purely nominal and powerless.

Here, the feeling of being trapped grips us in the day as well as at night; lucky are those who manage to get away, never to return.

As for the rest of us, we have almost abandoned any hope other than in the power of God the Almighty.

To give you an idea of what we have to endure, we will proceed to relate some incidents which punctuate the drabness of our daily life.

Upon leaving the Jewish quarter we have to take off our shoes and fully expect to be hit by stones aimed at us, as we cross the Arab part of the village. Nobody will ever come to our assistance. Before the judge one argues, 'It's a Jew.' Thefts are committed openly here: 'An Arab buys something from a Jew but, instead of paying tells him: 'I have already paid you, O Jew, son of a dog!' It is better for the poor, luckless wretch to keep quiet. The Jewish quarters are frequently entered surreptitiously. In the daytime they infiltrate under the very noses of the abetting and indifferent guards by whatever means offer themselves. Any house found unlocked is entered and, having thoroughly looted it, the intruders leave again, not without having ill-treated any child or woman they find on the way. At night they get into the houses by breaching their walls.

Since all this can be done with impunity, they go even further. Finding a Jewish woman in the street they make so bold as to tear away her head-scarf, frightening her out of her wits so that she hardly knows what to do. It happens that Jews from the interior come to live in this town but, finding life here no improvement, prefer to convert to Islam. This happened last year. A married Jew with several children tried to escape martyrdom by becoming a Muslim. As usual this had grave consequences for us.

This renegade wanted to take his wife and children along but they refused to follow him, whereupon he sent some Arabs to track them down. However luckily, or perhaps unluckily, someone managed to spirit the family away from the howling mob to Tetuan. When the Arabs heard of this they threw all of us into jail the day after Pass-over, compelling us to track down and deliver the fugitives into their hands. We had to do this although those in Tetuan had refused to return the family.

After three days they were sent back to us, and managing once again to hide them from the Arabs, we had to raise 300 douros at an exorbitant rate of interest to allow the affair to be forgotten without the family actually being handed over.

This occurs so frequently and to such an extent that we have long ceased to worry about our material misery.

We should also speak about the condition of the Jewish quarter. This is a street of about 20 tumble-down houses in an advanced state of disrepair which we leave very rarely. All in all, we are about 64 families with about 60 boys and 50 girls.

Of these 64 families, only about 10 can afford to give their children some kind of instruction; the others are obliged to take their children early to work and these are even more to be pitied than the rest of us.

Please let us know what you can do for us.

This ends our report and we hope, as always, that God will improve our lot in the future.

(Archives, *AIU*, Maroc, IVC 11)

Letter in Judeo-Arabic, dated 16 Adar 5624 (24 March 1864), from the Community of Chechuan, sitting in council and signed Aserruya, sent to Mr Carmona, 'for the Alliance Israélite Universelle (Paris)'. Trans. David Littman (into English from the original French translation of 1864)

11

Sir Moses Montefiore's Circular (Ramsgate) to the Jews of Morocco

Throughout the World, a chief characteristic of the Jews, is that of being loyal obedient, and peaceful Subjects of their Sovereign – From what I have seen and know of my Brethren in Morocco, I feel assured they are not exceptions to this universally admitted truth. The precepts inculcating this conduct are enforced on us by the sacred Scriptures and by the wise exhortations of our Sages.

Unless due respect be paid to the just exercise of legally constituted authority, there can be neither order nor safety. Happily, the Imperial Edict of your August Sovereign is intended to sustain the cause of justice and humanity throughout the Moorish Empire and though it may be that in some places the subordinate authorities abuse the powers with which they are entrusted, let it not be said that their severity or wrongdoing is attributable to any manifestation of disrespect on your part. You must never for a moment forget the loyalty, the affection and the respect, due to your Sovereign, on whom you must rely, and to whom in case of need, you must appeal for protection against oppression, and redress for injury.

Let neither actions nor words from you induce your fellow countrymen of the Mahomedan Faith to suppose that you are in any way unmindful or regardless of your duties, as Subjects of His Imperial Majesty, but on the contrary, that it is your ardent desire and most anxious wish, to testify your love and obedience towards him, and also to cultivate the esteem and good-will, of your fellow countrymen.

It is by conduct such as this we may hope that under the Almighty's Blessing, the hearts of those who would molest or injure you, will

be softened, so that should injustice be done, it will be speedily and surely punished.

Most ardently and most anxiously do I desire your welfare, to promote this I have laboured with intense anxiety. I know full well that these my words are conveyed to willing listeners, to those who fully recognize their truth, and I feel sure that you will to the utmost of your ability, seek and give effect to my wishes.

Over the poorer and less educated classes of our Brethren in Morocco, let your watchfulness be exercised, so far as in you lies — so that they pay due obedience and respect to the constituted authorities — let them be patient under small annoyances but firm and reliant on their August Sovereign who will not fail to punish those who abuse his commands, disregard his Edict or venture to impose serious wrong upon his Jewish Subjects.

I trust and believe that in such cases the ear of your August Sovereign will ever be open to your cry.

May it be the will of God to remove from you all further suffering, to inspire your rulers with the spirit of humanity and justice, and to grant to your August Sovereign a long and happy reign.

PRO

(F.O. 99/123, Montefiore (signed in English and Hebrew) to the Rabbis, Elders and Congregational Authorities of the Jews of Morocco. Draft letter 6 Elul 5624 (7 Sept. 1864), sent to Earl Russell with letters of 7 Sept. 1864 to him and Drummond Hay)

12

Marrakesh in 1876 — twelve years after the dahir

On entering the town, I was not able to distinguish the different groups of the population in the midst of the crowd that gathered through curiosity around my little caravan; but as I advanced the crowd divided itself into two parts, each recognizable from its attire. On one side, men of an aggressive expression, clad in magnificent burnouses with rich edgings, their heads covered with large turbans neatly folded and their feet shod with beautiful yellow sandals, largely embroidered with gold and silver filigrane; on the other side a shy and shoddy crowd, whose only headgear was a blue kerchief with black spots, carelessly knotted around their necks, carrying in their hands rustic sandals while continuing to walk bare-foot, despite the sharp stones in the road. Need it be said that the latter were the Jews, for whom it is prohibited to wear a turban, which is the only sure protection for the head against the rays of the tropical sun, and who cannot, thanks to a cruel refinement, even

wear shoes outside of their quarter, the Mellah. It is impossible to imagine the sufferings of these wretches, who, amid the jeerings of the Muslim population along the road, jump and cringe with pain, their feet torn and their nails crushed by the stones. (pp. 50–51)

In the course of my conversations, I was not a little surprised to learn that the condition of our coreligionists in Morocco [i.e. Marrakesh] has in fact worsened since Sir Moses Montefiore's visit to the former sultan. The venerable baronet's philanthropic action, which had roused so much legitimate applause among all men of good will, had resulted in a *firman* (i.e. *dahir*), whose terms were too vaguely formulated to be of any practical use. (p. 52)

The Arab system has always aimed at dominating the mass of the people by a small number of privileged individuals dependent on the government. This tendency has brought about within the population of the *mellah* the formation of quite a powerful oligarchy which the authorities quite openly favour and which, through fear or gratitude, always collaborates with the administration in order to stifle the voice and complaints of the population. This group of *gebirim* (i.e. notables) is made up of ten families who have become rich by trading with the money which the sultan lent to them some years ago. They reside in spacious houses which are sumptuously furnished; their table is well garnished with meats and even wines from Europe, but upon leaving their houses they are assimilated with the others and subjected to the same discriminatory laws as the least commoner [...]. Caught between the fear of the Arabs and the hardly disguised animosity of their fellow Jews, the *gebirim* of the Mellah appear to me rather to be pitied than envied. Their life is torn between the need to survive and remorse, so much so that they have little time left to enjoy their riches. (pp. 54–55)

Our coreligionists in Meknes believe that their brethren from Morocco [Marrakesh] are better off than is the case. The edict of the late sultan remains a dead letter throughout the kingdom and the better situation of the Jews living in the sea-ports is entirely due to [the presence of] the representatives of the European powers. (p. 69)

Joseph Halévy, Archives (AIU), France IX A 73, and also *Bulletin, AIU*, 1st. Sem. 1877. (Text of his detailed report on his mission, July 1876, prepared in August 1876)

Muslim conception of the Jews of Morocco (Fez, 1911)

[...] It is my opinion that it would be impossible to obtain an order from the sultan to allow Jews to enter the palace with their shoes on.

It is a concession which his pride would not permit, and one quite contrary to the Muslim conception of the relative positions of the Jews and themselves [...]. In itself, the matter is neither serious nor urgent: with the passing of time and the penetration of modern ideas into the Muslim world, as well as the increase in the number of protected persons, this mark of servitude imposed upon the Jews will eventually disappear; those able to adopt European dress would rid themselves of it immediately.

Archives (AIU), Maroc XV E 246. Letter, 30 Jan. 1911 from Amram Elmaleh (director, AIU, Fez boys' school) to president, AIU, Paris. Full text translated in Littman, *Jews . . . late 19th century*, 28, n.s. 35/36 *WLB* (London, 1975), 75–76. See n. 4.

NOTES

1. Lancelot Addison, *The present State of the Jews, more particularly relating to those in Barbary* (London, 1675), p. 7. He was 'Chaplain to His Majesty in Ordinary' during the first seven years of the English occupation of Tangier (1662–1683), acquired from Portugal by Charles II as part of Catherine de Braganza's dowry. The celebrated essayist was his eldest son. On Addison's comparison, see Budgett Meakin's more precise appreciation: 'their position [the Jews] is in some respects even worse than that of negro slaves, who being Mohammedans, may benefit at law from certain rights denied to those who spurn their prophet.' (Article 'Morocco', *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, ix (New York & London, 1901–1916); 27. See note 76 *infra*.)
2. J. E. Budgett Meakin, 'The Jews of Morocco', *The Jewish Quarterly Review* iv (1892), 369. In his many books on Morocco, Meakin frequently refers to the Jews, particularly in *The Moors* (London, 1902), pp. 425–487. For an interesting reference to Montefiore's visit, see *The Moors*, pp. 427–8.
3. See Samuel Romanelli's vivid description (1787–1790) of these Jewish *sahab al-sultan* (friends of the sultan), in his *Massa Ba'arav (The Oracle of Arabia)* (Berlin, 1792), English trans. in H. Z. Hirschberg, *A History of the Jews in North Africa* (Leiden, 1974), vol. i, pp. 290–291. The late David Corcos, scion of a famous Moroccan Jewish family of merchants, repeatedly stressed the crucial role of these *gebirim* (notables) in shielding the Jewish masses. See, particularly, his last article, 'Trois documents inédits sur les relations judéo-musulmanes dans le vieux Maroc', *Michael V* (Tel Aviv, 1978), 94. This apologetic viewpoint is in contradiction to the descriptions of Romanelli, of Joseph Halévy in 1876 (See document 12, *infra*) and cannot stand against the overwhelming documentary evidence.
4. David Littman, 'Jews under Muslim rule in the late nineteenth century', *Wiener Library Bulletin* 28 n.s. 35/36 (1975), 65–76; 'Jews under Muslim rule II: Morocco 1903–1912', *WLB* 29 n.s. 37/38 (1976), 3–19; Norman Stillman, 'L'expérience judéo-marocaine: un point de vue révisionniste',

- in *Judaïsme d'Afrique Du Nord aux XIXe–XXe siècles* (Jérusalem, 1980), pp. 5–24.
5. H. Z. Hirschberg, vol. i, pp. 1–25; André Chouraqui, *Between East and West: A history of the Jews of North Africa* (Philadelphia, 1968), pp. 2–9.
 6. Abraham ibn Daud, *Sefer Ha-Qabbalah (The Book of Tradition)*, trans., G. D. Cohen (London, 1967), p. 96.
 7. Traditionally attributed to Umar I (634–644) but by most orientalists to Umar II (717–720), or later. See A. S. Tritton, *The Caliphs and their non-Muslim subjects: A critical study of the Covenant of Umar* (London, Reprint 1970).
 8. Bat Ye'or, *Le Dhimmi: Profil de l'opprimé en Orient et en Afrique du Nord depuis la conquête arabe* (Paris, 1980). The revised English edition (with an enlarged document section) is announced for 1984, under the title, *The Dhimmi: Jews and Christians under Islam* (New Jersey & London, 1984). See, *inter alia*, Tritton; Eliyahu Strauss (Ashtor), 'The social isolation of *Ahl adh-Dhimma*', in *P. Hirschler Memorial Book* (Budapest, 1949) pp. 73–94; Antoine Fattal, *Le statut légal des non-Musulmans en pays d'Islam* (Beirut, 1958); Bernard Lewis, 'L'Islam et les non-Musulmans', in *Annales* no. 3–4 (Paris, mai-août 1980), 784–800.
 9. al-Marrakushi, *Al-mujib fi talkhis akhbar al-maghrib (Histoire des Almohades)*. Trans., E. Fagnan (Algiers, 1915), pp. 264–265. English trans., doc. 12, Bat Ye'or, *The Dhimmi*
 10. Louis Gardet, *La Cité musulmane: Vie sociale et politique* (Paris, 1954), p. 348; Robert Brunschvig, *La Berberie orientale sous les Hafsidés* (Paris, 1940), vol. i, p. 404.
 11. Documents are to be found in English (as well as a useful bibliography) in Bat Ye'or, *The Dhimmi*; and in Norman A. Stillman, *The Jews of Arab Lands: A History and Source Book* (Philadelphia, 1979). See also André Chouraqui, *La condition juridique de l'Israélite marocain* (Paris, 1950). Georges Vajda, *Un recueil de textes historiques judéo-marocains*, Hespéris 12 (Paris, 1951) provides Moroccan Jewish chronicles from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century: some of these texts may be found in English in H. Z. Hirschberg, vol. ii (1981), pp. 191 ff; Bat Ye'or, *The Dhimmi*, documents 97, 101.
 12. Eugène Fumey, *Choix de correspondance marocaine (50 lettres officielles de la Cour chérifienne)* (Paris, 1903), p. 15 (letter 18). English trans. in Bat Ye'or, doc. 63.
 13. Budgett Meakin, 'The Jews', *Jewish Quarterly Review* (London, 1892), 380 *idem*, *The Moors* (London, 1902), p. 431.
 14. H. Z. Hirschberg, vol. ii, p. 254. Wajda is in the north-east of Morocco; the estuary of the Wadi Nun reaches the Atlantic south of Agadir. It is noteworthy that the Muslim woman is mentioned before the *dhimmi*. This extraordinary situation resulted from the great fear of the sultan.
 15. This might well be a reference to the traditional *jihad* (holy war), a fundamental Islamic conception which divides the peoples of the world into two irreconcilable camps: that of the *Dar al-Harb*, the 'Territory of War', which covers those regions controlled by the infidels, and the *Dar al-Islam*, the 'Territory of Islam', the Muslim homeland where Islamic law reigns. See, *inter alia*, E. Tyan 'Djihad', in *Encyclopaedia Islam*² 2 (1965); Majid Khadduri, *War and peace in the law of Islam* (Baltimore, 1955); Rudolph Peters, *Islam and Colonialism: The doctrine of Jihad in modern history* (The Hague, 1979).
 16. John Braithwaite, *The History of the Revolutions in the Empire of Morocco*

- upon the death of the late Emperor Mulay Ishmael (London, 1729), p. 449, in Jean-Louis Miège, *Le Maroc et l'Europe 1830-1894*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1961-65), vol. ii, p. 25, n. 6. Miège's remarkable study (the 5th volume, containing an invaluable index, appeared in 1969 under the title, *Documents d'histoire économique et sociale marocaine au 19e siècle*) has been used extensively for the subsequent brief summary on Morocco.
17. Miège, vol. ii, p. 197.
 18. Victor Darmon, a Tunisian Jew, was the Spanish consular agent at Mazagan. His execution in January 1844 was followed by a Spanish ultimatum. The crisis was only overcome by the Hispano-Moroccan convention of 6 May 1845.
 19. Nearly five thousand Jews from Tetuan and Tangier sought refuge in Gibraltar, and others in Algeciras. In 1860 a committee was set up by the Board of Deputies of British Jews to aid these refugees. See *infra*, n.30.
 20. Barbary corsairs had been active from the 16th century, beginning with Khayr al-Din Barbarossa. When the Sultan Mulay Ismail died, aged ninety-three, his harem contained 1400 concubines, many from European nations; he also used innumerable Christian captive-slaves for his vast building projects. This traditional system of piracy was ended in Algeria after the British naval attack in 1816 and the European ultimatum to the Dey of Algiers of 20 November 1818; Christian slavery was ended in Morocco at the same period, but tribute money continued to be paid by Denmark and Sweden until 1845.
 21. al Nasiri, *Kitab el Istiqsa . . . History of Morocco* (Cairo, 1894), vol. ii, p. 238, quoted in Miège, vol. ii, p. 387.
 22. Drummond Hay left for England on 17 June and only returned in October. Thomas Reade, consul in Tangier since 1859, replaced him during absences. The French minister Béclard observed that 'the dominant trait of Reade was his pronounced animosity against Spain and particularly the officials of the Spanish Legation in Tangier'. (*Archives Générales*, Rabat, AA 31, Tangier 1-7-1863, in Miège, vol. ii, p. 392, n. 3).
 23. Miège, vol. iv, p. 203, quoting A. J. P. Taylor: 'British policy in Morocco 1886-1902', *English Historical Review* 66, no. 260 (London, July 1951), 342. Before succeeding his father as consul general in Tangier, John Drummond Hay had been posted, aged 24, to Constantinople (1840-1845), where he greatly admired Sir Stratford (de Redcliffe) Canning. There he came to know the 25-year-old Henry Layard, fresh from his extraordinary discoveries at Nineveh, and now under Canning's wing.
 24. Bat Ye'or, *Le Dhimmi* (French), pp. 81-83.
 25. FO 78/368 (No. 2), dated 31 Jan. 1839, in Albert M. Hyamson, *The British Consulate in Jerusalem in relation to the Jews of Palestine: 1838-1914*, 2 vols (London, 1939-1941), vol. i, p. 2 (and Introduction); *idem*, 'British projects for the restoration of the Jews to Palestine', *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, 26 (New York), 134 ff. Meir Verete, 'The Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought, 1790-1840', *Middle Eastern Studies*, 8, no. 1 (1972). On this subject, see the interesting letter (and proposition) from Charles Henry Churchill to Sir Moses Montefiore, 15 Aug. 1842. Minute Book (MB), BD (Board of Deputies), MB5 May 1841-Feb. 1846, f. 144. See also A. A. Bonar and M'Cheyne, *Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews from the Church of Scotland in 1839* (Edinburgh, 1842), pp. 321-2.

26. On the Damascus Affair, I know of no earlier reference, since the nineteenth century, to the grotesque 'Ratti-Menton version' of events, published by a member of the Oriental Society of Paris, Achille Laurent, in vol. ii (pp. 407) of his *Relation historique des Affaires de Syrie depuis 1840 jusqu'en 1842; Statistique générale du Mont-Liban et Procédure complète dirigée en 1840 contre des Juifs de Damas à la disparition du père Thomas, etc.* (Paris, 1846). See study by Tudor Parfitt in this volume.
27. Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford University Press, 1961; paperback 1968), ch. 4; Moshe Ma'oz, *Ottoman Reform in Syria and Palestine 1840–1861* (O.U.P., 1968); for the full text of the 1856 edict, see Stillman, *The Jews*, pp. 357–60 (and also pp. 95–100 for the background).
28. Samuel (Batto) Sfez, a Tunisian Jewish carter, was accused in 1857 of insulting Islam and executed within twenty-four hours. Armed bands attacked the Jews, who barricaded themselves in their *hara* (quarter); the Europeans prepared to defend themselves. Since 1856 the British and French consuls advised the bey to apply or adapt the Ottoman reforms to Tunisia. See Jean Ganiage, *Les Origines du Protectorat Français en Tunisie*, pp. 71–88; Hirschberg, vol. ii, pp. 112–115.
29. *Jewish Chronicle*, 13 Nov. 1863, p. 4; 11 March 1864, p. 7, reproducing 'a leading article' from the *Daily Telegraph*.
30. Moses H. Picciotto, *Jews of Morocco* (London, 1860); see also Narcisse Leven, *Cinquante Ans d'Histoire: L'Alliance Israélite Universelle*, 2 vols (Paris, 1911–20), vol. ii, p. 12; André Chouraqui, *L'Alliance Israélite Universelle* (Paris, 1965), p. 152; Hirschberg, vol. ii, pp. 306–7.
31. Leven, vol. 2, pp. 12 ff; Chouraqui, *L'Alliance*, pp. 152–3. 'Fifty years later about 50,000 boys and girls were receiving an education from 1500 teachers at approximately two hundred primary and vocational schools in nearly one hundred towns throughout the Ottoman Empire, Persia and the Maghreb.' (See D. G. Littman, 'A General Introduction to the Archives on Oriental Affairs of the Alliance Israélite Universelle (1860–1920) and a selection of fourteen unpublished letters from Morocco', *Int. Conference on Jewish communities in Muslim Lands 31 March–2 April 1974* (Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1974).
32. *Public Record Office (PRO) London*, FO 99/119 (4 Oct. 1863 with letter of 17 Sept.); *Alliance Israélite Universelle* (Paris), Maroc VIII B (17 Sept. 1863).
33. FO 99/116 (5 Oct. 1863); FO 99/117 (6, 7, 10 Oct. 1863) and FO 99/119 (27, 28, 30 Oct. 1863). See also translation of letter from Pariente to Drummond Hay (Tangier), 27 Oct. 1863, FO 99/117.
34. *Jewish Chronicle*, 16 October 1863, p. 5; and FO 99/119, 9 Oct. 1863, including letter from Moses Bentala, President Jewish committee Tetuan.
35. Thomas Hodgkin, *Narrative of a Journey to Morocco in 1863–1864* (London, 1866), p. 1; Haim Guedalla, *Refutation of an anonymous article in the 'Jewish World', entitled: 'Secret History of Sir M. Montefiore's Mission to Morocco in 1863–4'* (London, 1880), p. 5; Lucien Wolf, *Sir Moses Montefiore: A centennial biography* (London, 1884), p. 214; Louis Loewe, *Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore, comprising their life and work as recorded in their Diaries from 1812–1883*, 2 vols. (London, 1890), vol. ii, p. 145 (facsimile 1 vol. edn., 1983).
36. The name of the Spanish *recaudador* and his alleged date of death are given by Miège, vol. ii, p. 561, and p. 564, n. 4; he refers, *inter alia*, to

- Archives Générales, Rabat (AGR) AA 31, Tanger, 27/9/1863 and USA Foreign Affairs (UFA), 1863–1864, pp. 416 ff. Documentation on the Affair and its aftermath is also available at the PRO (London), scattered in FO 99/116–123; Alliance Israélite Universelle (AIU), Maroc VIII B, Maroc IV, C11 (Tanger); and various newspapers, particularly the *Gibraltar Chronicle*, and (from 16 October) the *Jewish Chronicle*, as well as a few issues of national newspapers, such as the *Morning Advertiser*, the *Daily Telegraph*, etc. The descriptions up to 31 October which are referred to in the above-mentioned published works (*supra*, n. 35) are repetitive summaries, obviously based on incomplete reports. These 'preliminaries' were considered of little importance compared to the mission itself.*
37. Letter (22 Sept. 1863) from S. Benhayon and Haim Labos (Tangier) to Judah de Azar Serfaty (Gibraltar), in *Jewish Chronicle*, 16 Oct. 1863, pp. 5–6.
 38. AIU, Maroc IV C11 (Tangier). This 'enquiry', originating probably in Safi, was posterior by about a fortnight to the *Junta's* letter of 17 Sept. The latter showed that, after the first two executions, 'Shido and Mocluf' were still in danger of death; whereas, in the last line of the 'enquiry', mention is made of a stay of execution as a result of an intercession having been made with the Spanish government. This seems to be a reference to the 'démarche' made to Madrid by Baron James de Rothschild, via the Spanish ambassador in Paris (*Jewish Chronicle* editorial of 16 Oct.), probably as a result of the letter of 17 Sept. which had also been sent to Crémieux at the AIU in Paris.
 39. *Jewish Chronicle*, 6 November 1863, p. 6.
 40. FO 99/119 Hammond to Sir F. Goldsmid (Auckland House, Farington) and to Drummond Hay (Tangier), 9 Dec. 1863. See also translation of letter from Pariente to Drummond Hay, Tangier, 27 Oct. 1863, FO/117.
 41. AIU, Maroc VIII B, of 8 & 25 Oct. 1863.
 42. Drummond Hay's visit to the sultan at Fez (12 April 1863) was intended to resolve a few differences and double the yearly supply of cattle to Gibraltar (from 3,000 to 6,000 head). Once again he expressed his views against the system of 'protections', which hardly benefited Britain's import trade (from Manchester) with Morocco, but was indispensable for France and other European states engaged in Morocco's export trade. PRO FO 99/117, 12 April, 1863; FO 99/176, and Miège, vol. ii, pp. 318–320, pp. 401–407, pp. 553 ff. See also, letter signed 'Veritas', in *Jewish Chronicle*, 20 Nov. 1863, p. 6.
 43. FO 99/117, 12 November 1863.
 44. FO 99/117, 10 Oct. 1863.
 45. FO 99/117, 29 Oct. 1863.
 46. This incident was also recorded by the *Gibraltar Chronicle* in an article (reprinted in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 11 Dec. 1863, p. 8) which concluded by stating that these various injustices should not be considered as a policy of the Spanish government, but the mistakes of its agents. In his memorandum of 26 Oct. (FO 99/117), Consul Reade noted that, 'Consul Rizzo is Merry's evil genius'. Miège indicates that Felipe Rizzo was later dismissed from the Spanish Legation for embezzlement (vol. ii, p. 392, n.2).
 47. The Spanish minister was still in Spain when this conversation took place and Consul Rizzo was in charge at the Legation. This reference is an interesting confirmation concerning the situation at that time in Tangier,

the first town of Morocco where Jews, who did not have European protection, adopted European dress as a form of liberation from their discriminatory garb . . . and status. This was not appreciated by the Moroccan authorities, nor, so it is suggested here, by the Spanish consul and his minister (and certainly not by their Muslim groom). See Hay and Brooks, *A Memoir of Sir John Drummond Hay* (London, 1896), p. 132: 'It is only within the last thirty years that Jews in Morocco – not foreign employés or protected subjects – have been allowed to assume the European dress, or to wear yellow slippers or red caps when in native costume. Formerly they were compelled to confine themselves to black slippers and the Jewish gaberdine.'

48. *J.C.*, from 16 Oct. 1863 onwards; first article in *Morning Advertiser* of 18 Oct. 1863.
49. *J.C.*, 16 Oct. 1863.
50. *J.C.*, 9 Nov. 1863.
51. Board of Deputies (BD), Letter Book (LB), MB9 1859–1864, f. 279. I thank Dr R. D. Barnett who drew this letter to my attention – and also those referred to in notes 53, 58, the penultimate reference in note 25, and the last reference in note 82.
52. FO 99/119, 11 Nov. 1863.
53. NMR, 12 Nov. 1863. Montefiore was one of the founders of the Alliance Assurance Company in 1824. This was his City office.
54. *J.C.*, 13 Nov. 1863.
55. Haim Guedalla (1815–1904) had married Montefiore's niece Jemima. The Guedalla family was from Mogador and a 'Ben Guidilla' is mentioned by a shipwrecked American captain in 1815 as one of the four richest Jewish merchant families of the town (with Macnin, Abitbol and Zagury), who, altogether, covered half of the humiliating *jizya* poll-tax payable by the Jewish community. (James Riley, *Loss of the American Brig Commerce – August 1815* (London, 1817), p. 440). Montefiore had other Moroccan connections. The daughter of his uncle Samuel had married Judah Guedalla (Haim's father) and one of Samuel's sons, a Hachevell or Hajwal. His aunt Sarah had married an Abraham Israel of Gibraltar and their son married a Bendahon. Sir Moses' grandmother (Esther Hannah) was the daughter of Massahod Racah, described as 'a Moorish merchant of Leghorn'. His own sister Sarah married Solomon Sebag (1783–1831) who had been sent to London from Mogador in 1799; their son Joseph (1822–1903), Jemima's brother, inherited Montefiore's Ramsgate estate in 1885. It was this same Sarah, his eldest sister, Mrs Goldsmid (after the death of her husband she had married Moses Asher Goldsmid), who died towards the end of December in Nice whilst Montefiore was in Gibraltar preparing to leave for Mogador; Guedalla left with Montefiore's faithful travelling attendant, Charles Oliffe, to handle the post-funeral arrangements of his deceased mother-in-law.
56. The most complete accounts of the journey are in letters from Sir Moses to J. M. Montefiore, president *pro tem.* of the Board of Deputies in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 1 Jan. 1864; 8 Jan. (letter of 18 Dec. M.M. to J.M.M.); 19 Feb. (letter of 26 January, M.M. to J.M.M.); 11 March (letter of 24 Feb., M.M. to J.M.M.); and Guedalla, particularly pp. 33–34 for letter of M.M. to J.M.M. of 5 April 1864. See also bibliographical references in note 35, *supra*; as well as Israel Davis, *Sir Moses Montefiore: A biographical sketch* (London, 1884); J. Weston, *Sir Moses Montefiore, the story of his*

- life* (London, 1885); Paul Goodman, *Moses Montefiore* (Philadelphia, 1925); S.U. Nahon, *Sir Moses Montefiore: A life in the service of Jewry* (Jerusalem, 1965).
57. Montefiore had been one of the founders of the Imperial Continental Gas Association which provided gas lighting to the principal European cities. He remained its president until his death.
 58. Weisweiller had been so helpful to Montefiore in Spain both in December and March that on Montefiore's stopover in Madrid on his way home — and before his second private meeting with the Queen — he wrote on 11 March from the Hotel de los Principes, Puerto del Sol to the Board of Deputies, 'I wish the Board to understand that we are under very great obligation to him'. (MD, BD, MB9, Jan. 1859—March 1864, f. 305).
 59. Hodgkin, p. 24; Guedalla, pp. 12—13.
 60. FO 99/116, 12 Nov. 1863 (draft).
 61. FO 99/117, 16 Dec. 1863; FO 99/116, 23 and 31 Dec. 1863.
 62. The assassination of Jews in Morocco — often those travelling between towns — was a common occurrence. A detailed list of 307 Jews murdered by Muslims in Morocco between 1864—1880 (it did not include the whole country, i.e. Marrakesh, etc.) was prepared by the Alliance Israélite Universelle at the time of the Madrid Conference of 1880 (*Bulletin AIU* 2 (2e sem. 1880): 17—18). It was difficult to obtain justice, as the oath of a *dhimmi* was not valid in an Islamic court of law and it was extremely rare for a Muslim to testify against another Muslim when a Jew was involved. Monetary compensation was more likely to be obtained for the widow and orphans when the victim had the 'protection' of a European state. See letter in Spanish dated 20 Oct. 1863 in the Archives (Maroc VIII B) of the *AIU* (Paris), from Isaac Benros of Larache to Adolph Crémieux (Pres. *AIU*), describing the assassination of three Jews, the disappearance of their bodies (often they would be cut into pieces and thrown down disused wells) and a demand for justice. It is interesting that Montefiore had hardly delivered Merry's letter to Bargash abandoning all charges against the imprisoned Safi Jews, when on returning to his lodgings he found the deputation of fifty Moors requesting his intervention with the minister in favour of one of their tribe.
 63. In 1851, Spain had signed a Concordat with the papacy recognizing the Catholic religion as the sole authorized faith of the country. Six months after Montefiore's second meeting with Isabella II (March 1864), General Narvaez returned to power at the head of a strongly Catholic and reactionary government. The reference to her 'overtaxed confessor' was not mere slander. Donna Isabella (1830—1904) became queen when she was three, was declared of age under Narvaez's rule in 1843, and was married to her cousin Francis, Duke of Cadiz, at sixteen. By 1868, at the time of Narvaez's death, the scandals involving the queen's name were ruthlessly exposed in the Spanish press by the liberals, particularly after she made her latest favourite — a cook's son and an actor — minister of state. During this revolutionary movement the queen fled and was deposed.
 64. FO 99/123, Admiralty letter of 4 Jan. 1864 to Hammond for Earl Russell, confirming his instructions; same date, from Montefiore to Russell thanking him for all assistance: 'the influence and power of our own loved country, are never better nor more gracefully exercised than in the cause of humanity and justice.'

65. FO 99/123, Report of 17 Feb. 1864 from Capt. Armitage to Capt. (soon to be Admiral) Ommaney, senior naval officer, Gibraltar. Enclosure in Admiralty letter to Hammond of 15 March 1864.
66. Guedalla, p. 23, and Loewe, vol. ii, p. 152.
67. See Hodgkin's graphic description, especially on the extremely cold nights with only 'the kitchen chafing-dishes to give us a little warmth in the evening.'
68. This British backing was the prime 'influence at the palace', rather than any efforts by Abraham Corcos, as suggested in the article, 'Corcos', *Encyclopaedia Judaica* v (Jerusalem, 1971), 962.
69. Layard, replying to a question in the Commons, stated, 'The Foreign Office felt sympathy in his mission and did all they could [. . .] to support his representations', and he emphasized that, 'having had the honour of acting with him on various occasions', he could bear testimony to Montefiore's spirit of humanity and philanthropy, 'which extended to the people of every nation who were suffering wrong or injustice (Cheers).' Reported in London daily papers of 8 March and reprinted by *Jewish Chronicle*, 11 March 1864, p. 7.
70. *Jewish Chronicle*, 11 March 1864, p. 4.
71. The services rendered by both families should not be underestimated. Moses Nahon, vice-president of the *Junta* at Tangier accompanied the group from Mogador, dealing directly with all 'arrangements' and acting, whenever necessary, as interpreter.
72. References to this normal and traditional behaviour in Morocco are numerous. See *infra*, n. 94.
73. The Jews of Mazagan, as of virtually every Moroccan sea-port (and throughout North Africa to Tripoli), formed 20 per cent to 30 per cent of the town's population.
74. Reprinted in *Jewish Chronicle*, 11 March, p. 7.
75. Drummond Hay, *Journal of an expedition to the Court of Morocco* (Cambridge, 1848).
76. John Hay Drummond Hay, *Western Barbary: its wild tribes and savage animals* (London, 1844), pp. 1, 66; *idem*, *Journal*, p. 98; Hay and Brooks, *A Memoir*, p. 125. See *supra*, n. 1, and Riley, p. 455.
77. *A Memoir*, p. 132.
78. It is extraordinary to find him using the same arguments — almost the same words — in 1880 at the Conference of Madrid. He was then more determined than ever (he failed) to end the system of 'irregular protections', whilst recognizing, sixteen years after Montefiore's visit, that the Jews were still very much persecuted. *The Jewish World*, 26 Nov., 3 Dec. 1880.
79. Reade's skilful handling of a difficult situation probably helped his appointment as consul at Cairo on 3 June 1864, Horace Philip White replacing him in Tangier.
80. See *supra*, n. 51.
81. Ma'oz, pp. 202–9. Montefiore intervened twice on this occasion: by a dramatic humanitarian appeal on behalf of the Christian community of Damascus (over £20,000 was raised in England), and later through an official appeal to the foreign secretary on behalf of the Jewish community of Damascus, victimized by the surviving Christians, 'by reason that they have been murdered, plundered and maltreated, whereas the children of Israel were left uninjured'. See *The Times*, 12 July 1860; Montefiore to Lord John Russell (enclosing letter from the heads of the

- Jewish community at Damascus to Montefiore), 16 October 1860, in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1861, (2800) lxxviii, pp. 193–5. The last two letters appear as doc. 51 in Bat Ye'or, *The Dhimmi*. An account (24/9/1860) sent by the Prussian consul in Damascus to his ambassador in Constantinople is published in Stillman, *The Jews*, pp. 403–4.
82. See Montefiore's conversation on Friday 30 October with his nephew, J. M. Montefiore — referred to in meeting of Board of Deputies, Tuesday 3 November (*J.C.*, 6 Nov. 1863); see doc. 5, Reade to Drummond Hay, 7 February 1864. Montefiore had already tried without success to obtain a special edict from the Sultan of Morocco in 1845. After the Prince de Joinville's fleet had bombarded Mogador in August 1844, the neighbouring Kabyle tribes ruthlessly pillaged the town, killing some and raping many. The Jews, who formed one-third of its population (their importance can be gauged by the fact that this chief port of the empire was totally inactive on Sabbaths and Jewish holy days) appealed to their brethren in London. A Committee was formed which raised £2,500 to help them in their 'destitution and misery'. Montefiore, who had family connections with Mogador (*supra*, note 55), was delegated by the Committee to write to the foreign secretary, requesting him to transmit an address to the sultan, through the British consul in Tangier. The aim was to obtain an imperial *firman* in favour of Moroccan Jewry, 'that they shall be protected and defended; that they shall possess the same advantages and enjoy the same privileges as my Brethren who live in the Turkish Empire'. The Earl of Aberdeen accepted Montefiore's request and the address was transmitted to the sultan by Drummond Hay. In his reply, Mulay Abd ar-Rahman's vizier, Ben Idriss, explained to Montefiore that: 'The Hebrew nation enjoy throughout the whole of His Empire all that particular protection which can be obtained under the Shadow of Justice and Truth [...] How therefore can we now grant them other privileges more complete than those which they already have.' See FO 99/29, 9 Jan. 1845 (M.M. to E. of A.), 21 Jan. (draft reply), as well as copy of address to the sultan and his vizier's reply (dated 16 *Safer* 1261).
83. *J.C.*, 11 March 1864. This was wishful thinking. On the day he left Marrakesh, all the Jews continued to walk barefooted in the streets (*Jewish World*, 3 Dec. 1880) and they continued to do so in all the towns of the interior (with the exception of Meknes) until the French Protectorate fifty years later (see docs. 12 and 13).
84. Charles de Foucauld, *Reconnaissance au Maroc: 1883–1884* (Paris, 1888), pp. 401–3, provides detailed but incomplete statistics (number of families) by region, which would point to a total population of under 50,000 twenty years afterwards. Even allowing for emigration, this is far too low, yet 200,000 is far too high for 1864. The figure was probably in the region of 70,000–100,000 then.
85. On the situation of the Jews in the last half of the nineteenth century in Persia, see David Littman, 'Jews under Muslim Rule: the case of Persia', *Wiener Library Bulletin*, 32 n.s. 49/50 (1979), 2–15.
86. De Foucauld, *ibid.* (Appendice: 'Les Israélites au Maroc'), pp. 395–402. Foucauld's invaluable description of the Jews of Morocco at that time is flawed by his inveterate antisemitism. As an officer, at St Cyr and Saumur, the future mystic had been the close friend of the notorious Marquis de Morès (Michel Carrouges, *Foucauld: Devant l'Afrique du Nord* (Paris, 1961), p. 149).

87. For a biography of Nasiri by his two sons (1921) see *Archives Marocaines* 30 (Paris, 1923), pp. 1–26. For the *dahir* and all other relevant documents from Al-Nasiri, see his *Kitab al Istiqa*, vol. ix (Casablanca, 1956), pp. 112–14. English translation in Stillman, *The Jews*, pp. 371–3.
88. Bat Ye'or (*The Dhimmi*) has devoted two chapters of her study (French and English editions, part I, ch. 3 and 4) to the problems of the emancipation of the *Dhimmi* peoples, in relation to the *dhimma* on the one hand and European imperialism on the other. Ma'oz, p. 202, refers to the reflections of the Ottoman historian, Ahmed Cevdet Pasha (d. 1895); Stillman, *The Jews*, p. 361, gives the complete text of Cevdet, translated by Bernard Lewis (which Stillman spells 'Jevdet'); see also Lewis, *The Emergence*, pp. 123–8. After a rebellion, the Tunisian Constitution of 1860 which followed the earlier 'Pledge of Security' was repealed (30 August 1864) by the Bey of Tunis, Muhammad al-Sadiq. Paradoxically, this suited the French. It was not desired that 'equal rights' should automatically end 'foreign protections'; see Jamil M. Abun-Nasr, *A History of the Maghreb* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 263–8.
89. *J.C.*, 11 March 1864, p. 7 (copying daily papers, 8 March). Layard here refers to the figure of '500,000' Jews of Morocco to be found in Montefiore's letter to Drummond Hay of 23 February (FO 99/123).
90. *J.C.*, 22 April 1864, p. 5. G. J. Goschen, MP (included in the Cabinet in 1865) felt that, 'The Emperor of Morocco has taught the world at large a most valuable lesson respecting the value of civil and religious liberty'. Whilst Gladstone was meeting with Garibaldi on 12 April and was amongst the crowd pressing to welcome him at the Opera on the 14th, it was the Chancellor of the Exchequer's brother who seconded Sir Anthony Rothschild's resolution at the Tavern meeting of 13 April. See John Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, 3 vols. (London 1904), vol. ii, pp. 108–13.
91. *J.C.*, 11 March 1864, p. 4. Drummond Hay's circular letter to British vice-consuls of 20 April (doc. 9) stated that the 'Christian Governments of the world' will not remain silent should law reforms or edicts 'become dead letters and the old persecution of religious sects be revived'. In a letter of 31 May 1864, Sir Francis Goldsmid appeals to Earl Russell to do all he can to prevent the *dahir* 'becoming a dead letter' and check the 'fresh outbursts of persecution'. (FO 99/123).
92. Loewe, vol. ii, pp. 159–61.
93. The translation (Tangier) of the Memorandum sent by Drummond Hay to Russell on 2 May 1864 is dated 25/4/64. See also *Archives* (AIU), Maroc IVC11, IC1, VIIIB, etc. (March–August 1864); FO 99/123, Goldsmid to Russell (31/5/64), Russell to Goldsmid (3/6/64), Goldsmid to Russell (22/7/64) enclosing documents received from AIU (Paris), etc.; *USA Foreign Affairs*, vol. iii, p. 352, in Miège, vol. ii, p. 568, etc.
94. de Foucauld, *Reconnaissance au Maroc* (Paris, 1939 – in 1 vol.), p. 5. See *supra*, note 72; Meakin, *The Land of the Moors* (London, 1901), pp. 318–19.
95. For 1864, see Memorandum, *supra*, p. 196 and n. 93; the letter of Nahon (French vice-consulate, Tetuan), in *Archives* (AIU) Maroc IV C11, 24 June, 1864, etc.; FO 99/123 (documents received from AIU) via Goldsmid (*supra*, note 93), summary of contents relating to persecutions (Jews of Demnat), with the phrase: 'the Emperor of Morocco has himself very recently given orders that the Jews are to be treated with extreme rigour, in consequence of which new atrocities are daily being perpetrated'; and

- FO (draft) letter to Goldsmid, 24 August 1864. For the 1884–1885 period, see AIU letters published in Littman, *WLB* 28, n.s. 35/36 (London, 1975), 73–74 (reference to Montefiore's visit) and particularly the brochure published in Tangier on 25 August 1884 by the director of the newly-founded *Times of Morocco*, Budgett Meakin's father (copy in *Archives* (AIU), Maroc IVC11 (Tangier)); also Meakin, *The Land of the Moors* (London, 1901), p. 348. For a useful (restricted) Moroccan version of these events, see Ahmed Toufiq, 'Les Juifs dans la société marocaine au 19^e siècle: L'exemple des Juifs de Demnate', in *Juifs du Maroc* (Paris, 1980), pp. 153–66.
96. FO 99/120, no. 20 (draft) 10 Sept. 1864 to Sir John Drummond Hay.
 97. Loewe, vol. ii, p. 164.
 98. Abdallah Laroui, *Les origines sociales et culturelles du nationalisme marocain* (Paris, 1980), pp. 310–14.
 99. *Ibid.*; and for al-Maghili himself see Georges Vajda, 'Un traité maghrébin "adversus Judaeos"', in *Extraits des Etudes d'Orientalisme dédiés à la mémoire de Lévi-Provencal* (Paris, 1962), vol. ii, pp. 805–13.
 100. See *supra*, note 62; and, for texts in English, Littman, *supra*, note 4 and Bat Ye'or, *The Dhimmi*, docs. 64–80.
 101. His 'Etudes Sabéennes' were published in the *Journal Asiatique* (the result of his voyage to southern Arabia under the auspices of the French Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres) before his mission to Morocco for the Alliance Israélite Universelle, which had sent him eight years earlier to Ethiopia regarding the Falashas. See *supra*, doc. 12.
 102. 'The western world was in one of its generous moments . . . a liberal Europe was then a force and not a dream'. Morley (on the London reception of Garibaldi the same week), vol. ii, p. 109.
 103. Guedalla, pp. 3 and 39.
 104. Jacob Benyuda is here referred to as 'Jacob Wizeman' (executed at *thirteen*). A wealthy Mr Joseph Sriki, 'knowing that Sir Moses was on his way to Madrid', is alleged to have offered 'his whole fortune' as bail for Lalouche in exchange for three days of grace. As Lalouche was executed on 13 September and Montefiore first knew about the Affair more than two weeks later, this is probably Sriki's *post hoc* interpretation of events. Sriki (or Eshriqy) was the interpreter for Great Britain, Sweden and Norway until his brother Moses replaced him in 1865. On Montefiore's arrival in Tangier, he had dedicated a newly-finished synagogue 'for the benefit of the poor', in commemoration (as to one-half of the structure) of Montefiore's visit. See Hodgkin, p. 28; *Jewish Chronicle*, 8 Jan. 1864, p. 5; Miège, vol. ii, p. 561, n.3.
 105. Loewe, vol. ii, p. 165.
 106. Archives *AIU*, Maroc, letter (22 April 1912) from Amram Elmaleh to pres. AIU, Paris. See also his reports of 22 Nov. 1912 and Oct. 1913. English translations in Littman, *WLB*, 29, n.s. 37/38 (London, 1975), 16–19.
 107. The 'dawn' was a long one. The French government preferred the maintenance of traditional institutions, improving them where possible, rather than inaugurating a totally new régime. The result was that (in 1950) 'Even though their situation has progressively improved since the establishment of the French Protectorate, the Jews are still *dhimmi*, politically-speaking.' (Chouraqui, *La condition*, pp. 121 and 71). On 23 May 1948, after the massacre of Moroccan Jews by mobs in the towns of Oujda,

Jerada and Petitjean (Morocco was still under the French Protectorate), Sultan Muhammad V issued a proclamation which stated, *inter alia*, that the Jews of Morocco still retained 'a special status which had always been granted to them since the Muslim conquest'. They were ordered not to back the 'Zionist aggression or manifest their solidarity with it; because in so doing they undermined both their special rights and their Moroccan nationality'. These 'special rights' are evidently the traditional rights of toleration and protection under the Pact of Umar. (Ibid., Annex, ch. 2.)

108. It is curious that a few years before Montefiore's visit, a Prussian orientalist visiting Morocco spoke to Jews in Tetuan who asked him with emotion if it was true that 'Rothschild' was about to buy back Palestine from the Ottoman sultan which would then become a new Jewish kingdom. Heinrich Freiherr von Maltzen, *Drei Jahre im Nordwestern von Afrika: Reisen in Algerien und Morokko*, 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1863), vol. iv, p. 68. See his most interesting description of the Jews of Marrakesh, vol. iv, pp. 199–204.
109. In 1948, they numbered nearly 300,000. Over the next twenty years, three-quarters of this population left for Israel (others went to Europe and the Americas), and in 1984, 120 years after Montefiore's mission, barely 15,000 remained in Morocco. Those in Israel and their children constitute today almost fifteen per cent of its Jewish population – between 400,000 and 500,000 souls.