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Abstract

From “the Pharisee” to “the Zionist Menace”: Myths, Stereotypes and Constructions of the Jew in English Catholic Discourse (1896-1929)

University: The University of Manchester
Candidate: Simon D. Mayers
Degree Title: PhD
Year: 2012

This thesis is the result of an investigation into the representations of the Jew that existed in the English Catholic discourse during the final years of the nineteenth- and the early decades of the twentieth-century (1896-1929). As very little has been written about English Catholic representations of the Jew during this timeframe, the primary aim of this project has been to excavate a layer of discourse which, with the exception of the published works of a few prominent individuals, has hitherto remained largely unexamined. In order to increase our understanding of the English Catholic discourse as much as possible, a wide range of sources have been examined, including the published works of prominent, obscure and anonymous authors, the pastoral letters and sermons of cardinals, bishops and priests, articles and editorials in English Catholic newspapers and periodicals, pamphlets, personal correspondence, letters to the editors of newspapers, unpublished documents and a small number of oral testimonies.

Three main types of representation of the Jew have been uncovered in this project: the roles assigned to the Jew in traditional Christian myths, contemporary stereotypes of the Jew, and composite constructions which combine themes drawn from myths and stereotypes. Representations of the Jew which originated in traditional Christian myths include the Jew as Pharisee, Christ-Killer, fanatical murderer, diabolic sorcerer and Antichrist. Contemporary stereotypes portray the Jew as usurious, cowardly, unpatriotic and secretive. Composite constructions combining themes from traditional myths and contemporary stereotypes include the Jew-Freemason conspirator and the Zionist Menace. The material examined reveals that representations of the Jew in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century were not always modern in character. In the case of the English Catholic discourse, they were often pre-modern or anti-modern. Many existing studies of English antisemitism argue that by the late nineteenth century, constructions of the Jew based on traditional Christian myths had largely, though not entirely, been replaced by modern socio-political and racial forms of antisemitism. This study however demonstrates that traditional religious myths about the Jews continued to thrive and function in the English Catholic discourse. Their continued existence was not confined to a handful of narrative artefacts from a bygone era. English Catholic constructions of the Jew combined these persistent Christian myths with other more contemporary social stereotypes, though surprisingly, the one element that was usually absent from these constructions was “race.” Jews were rarely denigrated as racially inferior in the English Catholic discourse and there were few references to biology or pseudo-scientific “race” theories. They were however portrayed as greedy, cowardly, disloyal and secretive villains and diabolized as Pharisees, Christ-Killers, fanatical murderers, sorcerers and Antichrists. In some cases the language used to describe the Jew, the Pharisee, the Zionist and the Jew-Freemason, drew upon a vocabulary which suggested an apocalyptic conflict between the forces of good and evil.
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1. Introduction

This thesis is the result of an investigation into the representations of “the Jew” which existed in English Catholic discourse during the final years of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century. The main focus of this study has been structures of discourse (i.e. different types of representations of the Jew) rather than structures of thought (i.e. the underlying attitudes, beliefs or sentiments that gave rise to the representations). Three main types of representation have been considered in this thesis: the roles assigned to the Jew in traditional Christian myths, contemporary stereotypes of the Jew and composite constructions which combine themes drawn from myths and stereotypes. The distinction between each of these types of representation is discussed in the methodology section of this chapter. Sifting through three decades worth of newspapers, pastoral letters, sermons and other textual and oral sources to excavate, categorise and analyse English Catholic representations of the Jew has been a significant project in its own right. Penetrating beneath the representations to determine the actual beliefs and thoughts of their authors would have been a very different project to the one attempted here, and one highly speculative in nature and thwart with sociological and psychological challenges. The discourse rather than inner mental state of individuals is the main focus of this project for the pragmatic reason that another individual’s thoughts and attitudes are not an open book. It is impossible to know the extent to which representations reflect the beliefs of their authors. Authors may tone down or exaggerate their true feelings and attitudes. They may even be entirely disingenuous.¹

One advantage of focusing on discourse rather than thought is that it has made it easier to avoid using the semantically problematic terms, such as “antisemitism” and “anti-Judaism,” which are generally associated with attempts to describe hostile attitudes towards Jews.² There is little agreement about the meaning or appropriate usage of these terms. For example, in The Persistence of Prejudice (1989), Tony

---

¹ The emphasis on main is important, as whilst I have focused mainly on discourse, I have not been fanatical about focusing only on discourse. Though necessarily speculative, I do also refer to attitudes and motives.

² These terms are retained when referring to or citing existing studies that use them.
Kushner followed the definition of antisemitism laid down by James Robb (1954).\textsuperscript{3} According to Robb’s definition, antisemitism is “an attitude of hostility towards Jews as such, i.e. not towards a particular Jew, and not towards a number of people whom, apart from having an attribute that arouses hostility, also happen to be Jewish. The hostility, to be called anti-Semitism, must be associated definitely with the quality of being a Jew.”\textsuperscript{4} Kushner recognised that this definition has “serious problems,” one being that it “covers possibilities ranging from polite tearoom type attacks to advocating and embarking upon genocidal policies,” but he nevertheless used it for many forms of hostility towards Jews as Jews.\textsuperscript{5} Robert Wistrich also recognised the “problematic” nature of the term.\textsuperscript{6} Nevertheless, he used both antisemitism and anti-Judaism more or less interchangeably for Christian and secular forms of hostility towards Jews. For example, he referred to “Christian antisemitism,” “modern secular anti-Judaism,” “secularised anti-Judaism and antisemitism” and “Christian anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism.”\textsuperscript{7} Like Wistrich, Rosemary Radford Ruether and Gavin Langmuir used both terms, but they made distinctions between them. In Ruether’s “Anti-Semitism and Christian Theology” (1977), the main distinction is between modern secular and pre-modern theological forms of hostility. Ruether argues that Christian “anti-Judaism” was a theological development with its roots in the “Jewish refusal to accept Christ,” whereas “modern anti-Semitism” builds upon the image of the Jew as a “dangerous disease and demonic power” in order to make it difficult for Jews to escape vilification by assimilating and converting. Despite the distinction, Ruther contends that “modern anti-Semitism ... takes its chief mythology directly from the Christian legacy.”\textsuperscript{8} In Langmuir’s “Toward a Definition of Antisemitism” (1996), the distinction is between “faulty and inflexible generalizations” and “false fantasises

\textsuperscript{5} Kushner, \textit{The Persistence of Prejudice}, 2.
unsupported by evidence."9 According to Langmuir, the claims that Jews were usurers and Christ-Killers are examples of anti-Judaism as they were xenophobic generalisations based on “a central core of truth” or a “kernel of truth,” whereas the accusations that Jews engaged in “ritual murder, host desecration and well-poisoning” were antisemitic as they were totally chimerical fantasies.10 Some other studies narrowly confine the term antisemitism to racial hostility, excluding antipathies that can be traced to non-racial (e.g. religious or socio-economic) prejudices.11 These are just some examples of the myriad ways these semantically ambiguous terms have been used. The focus of this project has been on the discovery, categorisation and analysis of different types of representation of the Jew rather than an attempt to determine whether each instance of a myth, stereotype or construction is an example of antisemitism or anti-Judaism. This project thus sidesteps the messy complications that result from using the term antisemitism, a term which as Yehuda Bauer has rightly observed, is semantic “nonsense.” There is no such thing as a Semitic people, only “Semitic languages,” and hostile representations of the Jew are rarely concerned with languages.12 The term anti-Judaism may not be intrinsically nonsensical, but it is only slightly less problematic. It is certainly possible for Judaism to be criticised without criticising Jews as such, but few instances were found during this investigation of constructions of Judaism independent of the Jew.

Prior to the nineteenth century, the Roman Catholics in England consisted of a small recusant community which had maintained its identity despite the risk of persecution. According to an unofficial contemporary estimate, there were

10 Ibid, 61-62, 329. I agree with Langmuir that the “ritual murder” and “host desecration” myths were “false fantasies unsupported by evidence,” but his claim that the Christ-Killer accusation fits the ‘kernel of truth’ theory of prejudice” rather than the “false fantasy” is questionable. Certainly his claim that “it is well to remember that, so long as it was safe to do so, Jews readily asserted that they had killed Christ,” seems highly dubious (329).
11 This definition of antisemitism has often been used when defending individuals or institutions. For example, William Oddie defends Gilbert Chesterton from the charge of antisemitism by arguing that antisemitism is related to the question of race and that Chesterton was “brusquely impatient of current (and widespread) ideas about racial superiority.” William Oddie, “The Philosemitism of G. K. Chesterton,” in William Oddie, ed., The Holiness of G. K. Chesterton (Leominster: Gracewing, 2010), 125-126.
12 Yehuda Bauer, “Beyond the Fourth Wave: Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Radical Islam,” Judaism, 55. no.1-2 (Summer/Fall 2006), 55.
approximately 56,500 Catholics in England and Wales in 1780.\textsuperscript{13} The Catholic demographic changed significantly during the first half of the nineteenth century as a result of immigration. According to the 1851 census, there were nearly 520,000 Irish-born Catholics in England.\textsuperscript{14} Estimates for the total number of Catholics living in England and Wales at this time range from 679,000 to 800,000.\textsuperscript{15} Whilst these figures are very approximate, a large proportion of the total Catholic population in England and Wales was clearly Irish-born or of Irish descent. Another development during the mid-nineteenth century was a significant increase in the number of conversions to Roman Catholicism. This trend began in the 1830s as a result of the Oxford movement, was further encouraged by the re-establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in England in 1850 and continued well into the twentieth century. The new converts often found they had little in common with the so-called “old Catholics.” Many of the converts were attracted to an English form of Ultramontanism, whereas the descendants of recusant families tended to reject the intrusion of Ultramontane ideas.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13} John Hickey, \textit{Urban Catholics} (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1967), 11. According to Hickey, there is a “lack of reliable official sources” and thus “recourse must be had to unofficial contemporary estimates in order to gain some idea of the size of the Catholic population” (11). Michael Walsh similarly points out that “statistics of the Catholic community before 1850 are notoriously unreliable.” Michael J. Walsh, “Catholics, Society and Popular Culture,” in V. Alan McClelland and Michael Hodgetts, eds., \textit{From Without the Flaminian Gate: 150 Years of Roman Catholicism in England and Wales, 1850-2000} (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1999), 347.

\textsuperscript{14} See Walsh, “Catholics, Society and Popular Culture,” 347-348.

\textsuperscript{15} Hickey estimated that the Catholic population of England and Wales for 1850 was between 700,000 and 800,000 (based on the 1851 census and figures mentioned in the \textit{Catholic Directory} in 1840). Walsh estimated 679,000. Hickey, \textit{Urban Catholics}, 12; Walsh, “Catholics, Society and Popular Culture,” 348.

\textsuperscript{16} As Jeffrey von Arx has pointed out, Ultramontanism was not “uniform and monolithic across Europe,” and any definition of it must be located within the context of a particular place and time. Jeffrey von Arx, “Catholics and Politics,” in McClelland and Hodgetts, \textit{From Without the Flaminian Gate}, 266; Jeffry von Arx, ed., \textit{Varieties of Ultramontanism} (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1998), 2. A form of Ultramontanism was introduced to England following the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in 1850. English Ultramontanism was very different to, and at times in tension with, French Ultramontanism. The main focus of English Ultramontanism was the Pope’s infallibility and the primacy of his \textit{spiritual} authority. Whilst the close corporate connection to Catholics in other countries was emphasised in English Ultramontanism, its focus tended to be spiritual rather than political (for example, encouraging conversions and the penetration of Catholic ideas into English culture). In France, the term was often used to signify those who believed that the authority of the Church should penetrate into the political sphere. English Ultramontanism discouraged the idea of forming separate Catholic political parties, and unlike on the continent, Catholic parties never took shape in England. The nearest development was the Catholic Federation (discussed in chapter four). Bishop Casartelli of Salford launched the Catholic Federation in 1906 as a form of Ultramontane “non-political politics.” The Federation pressured Catholic voters to avoid political parties with an unsympathetic attitude towards denominational education (1908-1910) and a too sympathetic attitude towards socialism (from 1918). For the Catholic Federation, see Martin John Broadley, \textit{Louis Charles Casartelli: Bishop in Peace and War} (Koinonia: Manchester, 2006), 55, 178-199; Kester Aspden, \textit{Fortress Church: The English Roman Catholic Bishops and Politics, 1903-63} (Leominter,
It became common practice, especially among Ultramontane Catholics, to regard the descendants of the recusant families as “timid,” “weak,” “cold,” “insular” and “restrained.” These hostile stereotypes persisted into the twentieth-century. The differences and tensions which existed between them have often led scholars to distinguish between three varieties of English Catholics: the descendants of recusant families, converts, and Catholics of Irish descent. By the early twentieth century these divisions were largely blurred though not entirely erased by intermarriage and acculturation. This project does not prioritise or de-prioritise any of these divisions, treating all equally as English Catholics. Whilst it has sometimes proven impossible to determine whether the author of a representation was specifically from a recusant, convert or Irish background, or a combination of backgrounds, such biographical details are provided whenever possible.

Fixing the periodisation of a project such as this involves some difficult decisions. A number of events provide sensible possibilities for the boundaries of a project examining antisemitism during the early twentieth century. The most obvious events include the First World War, the interwar period, the Second World War and the Holocaust. However, as already discussed, “antisemitism” is not the focus of this investigation and these events, if given a defining role in the project, could be problematic. Representations of the Jew in the English Catholic discourse during the twentieth century can be traced back to events and representations during the late

---

17 See Mary Heimann, Catholic Devotion in Victorian England (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 1-10. Some of the stereotypes of the “old Catholic” appear to be similar to stereotypes of “the Jew.”

18 An example can be found in the letters of Hilaire Belloc. For example, he stated that the “old Catholics” are “like a stagnant pool (or puddle) of stinking water.” He explained that during the “Irish struggle they sided with the vilest form of Protestant hostility to the Catholic culture, during the whole of the Dreyfus struggle they sided with the filth of Zola and the anti-Catholic Freemasons.” Conversely he stated that “the Catholic converts are the most intelligent and strong of the English. They are very few, but they are each of an élite. But they are not appreciated by the woeful mass of old Catholicism.” Hilaire Belloc to Mrs. Reginald Balfour, 19 March 1932, in Robert Speaight, The Life of Hilaire Belloc (London: Hollis & Carter, 1957), 384-385.

19 Many English Catholic constructions of the Jew were by Protestant converts to Roman Catholicism (e.g. Cecil Chesterton, Gilbert Chesterton, Ronald Knox, Graham Greene and Cardinal Manning) and by Jewish converts to Catholicism (e.g. Hans Herzl and Hugh Angress). There were also a significant number of representations by Catholics of Irish descent (e.g. Canon William Barry and Charles Diamond).
One danger of focusing on the momentous and catastrophic events of the twentieth century is that the antecedents of English Catholic representations of the Jew are easily obscured. It may appear that the catastrophic events provided the catalyst for representations which were already pervasive. The timeframe of this project, 1896 to 1929, enables English Catholic myths, stereotypes and constructions in response to a nexus of important events in the final years of the nineteenth century to be considered, such as the Dreyfus Affair, the Diana Vaughan hoax and the Hilsner ritual murder accusation. The timeframe of this project also enables events during the early twentieth century to be examined whilst avoiding the period in which the Nazi Party started its rapid ascent to power. An investigation which moves into the 1930s becomes a very different project and there are already numerous studies which look at antisemitism and fascism during the 1930s and 1940s, including several which look at Roman Catholic attitudes. Conversely, Roman Catholic representations of the Jew prior to the 1930s have received little attention. The timeframe of this project enables representations of the Jew to be examined during a number of key episodes whilst reducing the risk that the evidence is read through a lens distorted, consciously or subconsciously, by the Shoah. The majority of findings in this project relate to important episodes, such as the Diana Vaughan hoax (1896-1897), the Dreyfus Affair (1896-1899), the Hilsner ritual murder accusation (1899-1900), the Marconi Affair (1912-1913), the Beilis trial (1913), the First World War (1914-1918), the foundation of the Catholic Guild of Israel (1917), the Balfour Declaration (1917) and the ratification of the British Mandate (1922). The Balfour Declaration and British Mandate had a lasting effect on English Catholic discourse, with constructions of the Zionist Menace continuing to be an important theme throughout the 1920s. The intervals between key episodes have also been examined

And they in turn can be traced back to even earlier events, but the boundaries of this project have to be drawn somewhere.

This is not to say that such events should be ignored. Certain stereotypes, such as the Jewish Coward and the Unpatriotic Jew, were prominent in English Catholic discourse during the First World War.

Fascism was already an important movement in the 1920s. However, its international significance increased dramatically in the 1930s. For example, in September 1930, the Nazi party won 18.3% of the vote during the Reichstag elections. This increased its number of seats from 12 to 107, making it the second largest party in Germany. See Robert S. Wistrich, Hitler and the Holocaust (London: Phoenix, 2003), 51. The significant impact of fascism and Nazism on English Catholic attitudes was recently examined by Ulrike Ehert (discussed in next section).

Some of these are mentioned in the next section.

The Catholic Guild of Israel was an organisation setup in London in 1917 with the aim of converting Jews to Catholicism. The Guild is examined in chapter six.
and have proven an important source of relevant material.\textsuperscript{25} Material prior to 1896 and subsequent to 1929 has also been considered in certain cases in order to help contextualise representations within the timeframe of this investigation.

The first section of this chapter introduces the existing historiography of English Catholic attitudes and representations of the Jew during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century.\textsuperscript{26} The second section discusses the methodology used during this project. The final section outlines the structure of the rest of this thesis.

**Existing Historiography**

Prior to this project, the only study to address the lacuna in considerations of English Catholic attitudes towards Jews in a significant way was a PhD thesis, Ulrike Ehret’s “Catholics and Antisemitism in Germany and England, 1918-1939” (2006).\textsuperscript{27} Ehret’s study provides a comparative analysis of Catholic “antisemitism” during the interwar period. Ehret adopted a comparative methodology in order to assess how antisemitism developed during the period leading up to the Second World War, taking into account factors such as class, economic stability and nationality. Catholics were selected as convenient subjects of enquiry to satisfy “methodological considerations.”\textsuperscript{28} In her introduction, she explains that one of the advantages of focusing on Catholics rather than Protestants is that the comparison is “more manageable” as a consequence of the smaller size and relative homogeneity of the Catholic communities.\textsuperscript{29} The focus of her project was the “role of the national and social environment in determining anti-Jewish attitudes,” with the shared Catholicity of the subjects enabling one complex behavioural modifier, “the religious factor,” to be “cancelled out.”\textsuperscript{30} However, whilst

\textsuperscript{25} Representations of the Jew in English Catholic discourse did not respect the arbitrary boundaries of periodisation. Many of the myths and stereotypes existed independently of pivotal events.

\textsuperscript{26} Many of the studies examined make little or no distinction between attitudes and representations.


\textsuperscript{28} The comparative approach is discussed in Ehret, “Catholics and Antisemitism,” 10, 17-20, passim.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid, 19-20.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid. Ehret stated that “limiting the study to the Catholic community has a methodological advantage. Differences in antisemitic attitudes are usually explained by a subject’s different religious, national or
Catholics were thus examined in order to satisfy methodological considerations rather than as subjects of intrinsic interest *per se*, her thesis nevertheless provides a very useful and insightful study of English Catholic attitudes.

Despite the partial overlap in timeframe (i.e. the 1920s), the scope and nature of our projects are different in many respects. First, only one of Ehret’s chapters focuses on how the Jew was portrayed in written discourse, with the other chapters being concerned with “more active forms” of antisemitism, sympathies with fascism, and reactions to the persecution of Jews in Germany after 1933. The second, only half of each chapter focuses on English Catholic attitudes. Third, whilst both of our studies make use of Catholic newspapers, there is very little overlap in terms of issues cited. Finally, we tend to examine different types of representation of the Jew. For example, whilst Ehret by no means disregards the religious element of Catholic representations of the Jew, it is not a focal point of her project. Whilst representations of the Christ-Killer and the Antichrist are mentioned in her thesis, there is no detailed consideration of these or other representations of the Jew drawn from traditional religious myths (such as the Pharissee, the Jewish Sorcerer and the Ritual Murderer). Similarly, whilst the Judeo-Masonic conspiracy accusation is mentioned in her study, the extent to which English Catholics obsessed with myths and stereotypes of “the Freemason,” which paralleled and coalesced with myths and stereotypes of “the Jew,” is not brought out in her investigation. These were pervasive aspects of the English Catholic discourse as my thesis will demonstrate. Whilst Ehret only examines these types of representation in passing, her study does conversely provide a detailed examination of

---

31 See ibid, 38-39. Rather than focusing only on the discourse, Ehret’s thesis sets out to determine the influence the discourse had on Catholic organisations and individuals (17, 102).

32 The discourse in English Catholic periodicals is an important aspect of Ehret’s study. These publications are primarily examined in the first section of chapter two in her thesis (pp. 45-72). A number of issues of the Catholic Herald, the Catholic Times and the Month are sampled in her thesis, but only a few issues of the Tablet and the Universe. All of these periodicals are a pivotal part of my investigation. Whilst it has not been possible to include every relevant article found during this investigation, I have examined the Catholic Herald, Catholic Times, Universe, Tablet and Month from 1896 to 1929, and cite approximately 220 articles and editorials from them. To minimise duplication and redundancy, I avoid citing the same issues as Ehret except where they are indispensible to my examination of a particular stereotype, myth or construction. As a consequence, we only cite three of the same issues from the Catholic Times and the Month, two from the Catholic Herald, one from the Universe and none from the Tablet.
Catholic stereotypes of “the Jewish Bolshevik.” The “Jewish Bolshevik,” a politically themed stereotype of the Jew, has conversely only been examined in my investigation in passing as a component of other constructions. Our projects thus complement each other. Together they provide a good foundation for understanding English Catholic attitudes and representations of the Jew from 1896 through to 1939.

Though not concerned with English Catholicism per se, Bryan Cheyette’s Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society: Racial Representations, 1875-1945 (1993), is important to this investigation in a number of ways. Firstly, among the figures that Cheyette examines are two prominent English Catholic authors and journalists: Hilaire Belloc and Gilbert Keith Chesterton. His study of Belloc and Chesterton probably provides the most thorough analysis to date of their constructions of the Jew. In his examination of both authors, Cheyette points to a number of themes which were often present in their fictional and non-fictional works, such as their constructions of a Jewish plutocracy and the queer appearance and

33 Ibid, 59-63, 87-92, passim. According to Ehret, the “Jewish Bolshevik” was the most “frequent” and “powerful” stereotype of the Jew, and it was this stereotype that “drove and at times dominated Catholic hostility towards Jews.” Ibid, 2, 30, 262-263.
34 The Jewish Bolshevik was only one of a number of potent representations of the Jew in the English Catholic discourse. It has not been possible to examine every stereotype in detail, and as Ehret has already examined the stereotype of the “Jewish Bolshevik”, I have not included a section dedicated to it.
35 Though Hilaire Belloc (1870-1953) was born in France, most of his childhood was spent in West Sussex. Belloc’s father was French and his mother was English. After completing his education at John Henry Newman’s Oratory School in Birmingham, Belloc served in the French army before returning to England to study at Balliol College. He naturalised as a British citizen in 1902. Belloc was MP for Salford from 1906 to 1910. He wrote a number of critiques about the English political system, the decline of European civilisation following the Reformation, the Jews, the Freemasons and bolshevism. He also wrote a number of novels in which these themes were often explored.
36 Gilbert Keith Chesterton (1874-1936) was a journalist and prolific author of poems, novels, short stories, travel books and social criticism. He also wrote books exploring philosophical and theological ideas. Caricatures of Jews regularly appeared in his fictional and non-fictional works. Throughout his early life, Chesterton was an Anglo-Catholic (a form of Anglicanism which accepted aspects of Roman Catholic liturgy, theology and practice, without embracing the authority of the Pope). Chesterton may not have been a de jure Roman Catholic before his formal conversion in 1922, but his worldview had long been Roman Catholic. As early as 1911, Chesterton stated that he was inclined to think that “possibly the claims of the Greek and Anglican Churches were less near the truth than the Roman Catholic Church.” Cambridge Daily News, 18 November 1911, 4. When he nearly died in 1915 it was Father O’Connor, a Roman Catholic priest, who he summoned to his deathbed. According to O’Connor, Chesterton had told him in the spring of 1912 that “he had mind up his mind to be received into the Church and was only waiting for Frances [his wife] to come with him.” John O’Connor, Father Brown on Chesterton (London: Frederick Muller, 1937), 85, 95. Some of his angst-ridden letters to Roman Catholic friends in the years leading up to his conversion reveal that it was primarily his fears about the impact his conversion would have on his Anglo-Catholic friends and wife that caused him to delay. See Chesterton to John O’Conner, 24 December 1920, ADD MS 73196, fol. 121 and Chesterton to Maurice Baring, typed copies of three letters, ADD MS 73189, fols. 37, 40, 43, G. K. Chesterton Papers, British Library Manuscripts, London.
lisping speech of many of their Jewish characters. Cheyette concludes that they, like the other authors examined in his study, were engaged in a racialized “semitic discourse.” Belloc and Chesterton did at times develop constructions of the Jew which had a “race” component, but Cheyette seems to overlook the non-racial aspects of their narratives. Some of their constructions were derived not from a modern racialized discourse but from religious and conspiratorial myths (e.g. the ritual murder accusation and the Judeo-Masonic conspiracy). Furthermore, Belloc and Chesterton objected to aspects of the pervasive pseudo-scientific “race” ideas that existed during their lifetime.

At least as important as Cheyette’s close reading of the works of Belloc and Chesterton is his premise about the “race-thinking in the work of virtually everyone published before the Second World War.” Cheyette’s treatment of English literary figures in general, including Belloc and Chesterton, revolves around “a dominant racialized discourse at the heart of what constitutes the received definitions of literary ‘culture.’” Cheyette generalises his findings for the specific authors he examines to arrive at the more general conclusion that “race-thinking” was a pervasive aspect of English literature and society. There is nothing in his study to indicate that English Catholics should be an exception – quite the opposite considering his examination of Belloc and Chesterton – and the implication would seem to be that his premise about a dominant racialized “semitic discourse” at the heart of English literature and society is intended to apply not only to Belloc and Chesterton but equally to the other English Catholics of the time. His key premise seems to be that a racialized English discourse played a significant if not overriding role in shaping the perceptions of those living in English society. This leaves little or no room for external religious and cultural influences, such as the continued presence of pervasive Christian myths which diabolized the Jew, and a spiritual Ultramontanism which explicitly rejected modernism and modernist ideas. Whilst references to “race” were a not uncommon feature of the English Catholic narratives examined in my investigation, “race-thinking” (in the biological and pseudo-scientific sense) has not proven to be a

38 Ibid, xi, 4, passim.
pervasive or necessary feature of them. Many English Catholics engaged in representations of the Jew which contained no overt “race-thinking,” in which the Jews were blamed for rejecting and crucifying Christ, for murdering innocent Christian children in *odium fidei* (hatred of the faith), for being the harbinger and manifestation of Antichrist or for being part of a centuries old Judeo-Masonic conspiracy to dominate or destroy Christian civilisation. In other words, constructions of the Jew which may be thought of as pre-modern or even anti-modern. Cheyette’s conception of a pervasive and dominant discourse at the heart of literature and society, with a Foucauldian emphasis on a single or dominant discourse that shapes and determines the permissible statements and constructions that can appear within it, is tidy and elegant. However, the findings of my investigation suggest that reality, at least for English Catholic representations of the Jew, is simply too untidy to be accounted for by a single discourse or even a prevailing dominant discourse (racialized or otherwise). The evidence suggests that a combination of persistent Christian myths and contemporary stereotypes were embraced, with adaptation, by English Catholics in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. Often the traditional religious myths combined and coalesced with Judeo-Masonic conspiracy myths, contemporary social stereotypes and anti-Zionist narratives, resulting in complex multifaceted discursive constructions. In some instances references to “race” were woven into these representations, though “race” was only a minor theme in the constructions examined. It would thus seem to be more accurate to describe the English Catholic discourse as a combination or superset of multiple overlapping religious, social, cultural, political, intellectual and in some cases racial discourses.

A number of other studies do, albeit obliquely, touch upon the subject of English Catholic attitudes towards Jews during the timeframe of this project. Whilst

---

39 Cheyette acknowledges the influence of Paul Gilroy’s understanding of “race” as “a ‘cultural-biological’ category.” Gilroy refers to the “elasticity and the emptiness of ‘racial’ signifiers” and the simultaneously cultural and biological encoding of “race” in “the new racism.” The one “quibble” that Cheyette has is that Gilroy discusses the “plurality” and “emptiness of racial signifiers” in the context of “new racism,” rather than of racialized discourse in general. Cheyette, *Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society*, 9-10; Paul Gilroy, *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation* (1987; London: Routledge, 2002), 36-38, 42-45. It would seem that with “race” defined in such fluid terms, all representations of the Jew *qua* Jew can be considered racial. As a consequence, in referring to racialized constructions of the Jew, “racialized” becomes a redundant adjective. For the purpose of this project, treating “race” as an “elastic” and “empty” signifier makes precision in the analysis of different types of representation of the Jew impossible. At the very least, if constructions of “race” are to be so defined, then a new term is required to signify the specifically biological and pseudo-scientific manifestations.
there are a number of studies which look at particular intervals, incidents or individuals in more detail, Colin Holmes’ *Anti-Semitism in British Society, 1876-1939* (1979), remains the most wide-ranging, if in some respects problematic examination, of English “anti-Semitism” for the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. It also devotes more pages to a discussion of English Catholic “anti-Semitism” than most other studies, though this still amounts to very little. *Anti-Semitism in British Society* contains a number of short discussions about the “anti-Semitism” of Gilbert Chesterton, his brother and fellow journalistic firebrand, Cecil Chesterton, and Hilaire Belloc. Holmes also mentions the *Catholic News*, *Catholic Gazette*, *Catholic Times* and *Catholic Herald*, but without citing any actual material from them. Holmes instead referred to letters stored in the Board of Deputies archives which expressed concerns about these periodicals. His citations are thus more useful for

---

40 Colin Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society, 1876-1939* (New York, Holmes & Meier, 1979). Bryan Cheyette is critical of Holmes’ study because it advances an “interactionist model” of antisemitism. The interactionist model explains antisemitism through a “balanced” analysis of the behaviours of the “purveyors” and “victims” of hostility (rather than an analysis of “scapegoating,” “the prejudiced personality” or a pervasive “racial discourse”). Cheyette correctly notes that Holmes’ “interactionist” study alleges “an irreducible core of Jewish involvement” in certain ‘Jewish’ financial scandals” (i.e. the Marconi Scandal and the Indian silver affair). This interactionist approach, as Cheyette rightly observes, risks descending into a “theory of ‘well-earned’ anti-Semitism.” See Bryan Cheyette, “Hilaire Belloc and the ‘Marconi Scandal’ 1900-1914: A Reassessment of the Interactionist Model of Racial Hatred,” in Tony Kushner and Kenneth Lunn, eds., *The Politics of Marginality: Race, the Radical Right and Minorities in Twentieth Century Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 1990); Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society*, 81. Tony Kushner also referred to Holmes’ “interactionist approach.” Unlike Cheyette, Kushner did not reject this approach outright. On the one hand he stated that Colin Holmes’ suggestion that “to understand antisemitism, one ‘needs to take account of the interests and activities of both sides in the conflict equation’” is “important advice.” On the other hand he observed, quite rightly, that “there is a danger in going too far in this approach and overemphasising the role of individual Jews in producing the causes of antisemitism.” Kushner, *The Persistence of Prejudice*, 5-6.

41 Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society*, passim. Cecil Chesterton (1879-1918) converted to Roman Catholicism in 1912, ten years prior to his brother. Cecil Chesterton, Gilbert Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc, were all involved in the *New Witness* newspaper and shared similar social and political views. Cecil Chesterton was one of the main agitators during the Marconi Affair. Gilbert Chesterton was badly effected by his brother’s death in 1918 and it has been argued that any hostility he felt towards Jews was somehow provoked by this tragedy. However, Gilbert Chesterton’s caricatures and stereotypes of the Jew began long before his brother passed away.

42 The *Catholic News* was a regional brand of the *Catholic Herald* rather than a distinct newspaper. The regional variants of the *Catholic Herald*, including the *Catholic News*, were nearly identical to the main paper with the exception of a page of local news, and thus have not been treated separately in this thesis (see footnote 92 in this chapter).

43 The *Catholic Gazette* was the monthly periodical of the Catholic Missionary Society, an organisation setup at the beginning of the twentieth century in order to hasten the reconversion of England.

44 The *Catholic Times* and *Catholic Herald* are introduced in the methodology section of this chapter.

45 Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society*, 201, 212-213. There are a dozen or so letters relating to antisemetic articles in the *Catholic Herald* during the 1920s in the files of the Board of Deputies, but most of the letters relating to the *Catholic Herald* were for the 1930s. There are also letters relating to antisemitism in other English Catholic periodicals, but none of these were prior to the 1930s.
pursuing the Anglo-Jewish response to Catholic hostility rather than the Catholic hostility per se. Holmes’ conceptualisation of this Jewish-Catholic encounter was very bilateral: “a battle taking place between certain sections of the Catholic population and representatives of the Jewish community, a battle which ... reflected a longstanding hostility between those who regarded themselves as the guardians of the Christian faith and the Chosen people.” “Out of this clash,” Holmes continued, “a historical tradition of enmity had been created, whose echoes were clearly still present in the 1920s and 1930s.” 46 Holmes’ depiction of an epic clash between two mutually belligerent groups comes perilously close to a portrayal of “well-earned” hostility, which as Cheyette has observed, tends to follow from his “interactionist model” of antisemitism. 47 The interactionist model sometimes obscures the fact that Anglo-Jewish representations of Catholics tended to be reactive rather than bilateral. 48 Holmes devoted more space to Catholics in a short article entitled “The Ritual Murder Accusation in Britain” (1981). 49 In this article, he seemed to abandon the bilateral language of a mutual conflict. He argued that the “Catholic influence, the continuation of an old religious animosity towards Jews, was a powerful force in Britain – and other countries – in the expression of ritual murder charges.” 50 Holmes discussed the blood libel accusations by the Catholic Bulletin in 1916, 51 and the equivocal refutation of ritual murder charges by Herbert Thurston in the Month in 1898 and 1913. 52 Thurston, a British Jesuit, respected scholar and prolific author, wrote about Jews and Freemasons on a number of occasions. Holmes correctly observed that Thurston played down the significance of the beatifications of Andrew of Rinn and Simon of Trent in the Month, observing that Jews were only accused of murder in odium fidei.


46 Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 213.
47 See footnote 40 in this chapter.
50 Ibid, 279.
51 Ibid, 270-271, 279. The Catholic Bulletin is not examined in this thesis as it was an Irish Catholic periodical based in Dublin.
52 Herbert Thurston, “Anti-Semitism and the Charge of Ritual Murder,” Month, XCI (June 1898); Herbert Thurston, “The Ritual Murder Trial at Kieff,” Month, CXXII (November 1913).
rather than ritual murder sanctioned by Judaism.\textsuperscript{53} Thurston in fact discussed the ritual murder accusation in a number of works and he repeatedly suggested that it was probable that Jews had murdered innocent Christian children, in some cases out of spite and hatred (and possibly involving crucifixion in mockery of the Passion), and in other instances as a result of superstitious beliefs in the power of innocent blood when used in sorcery. Thurston’s narratives about the ritual murder accusation in the \textit{Month} in 1898 and 1913, and in his other works, are examined in depth in chapter two. His constructions of the Freemason are examined in chapter four. Other important studies of English antisemitism, such as Anthony Julius’ \textit{Trials of the Diaspora} (2010) and Tony Kushner’s \textit{The Persistence of Prejudice} (1989), also make a number of references, albeit in passing, to Belloc, Chesterton and the \textit{Catholic Herald}.\textsuperscript{54} In this respect they are paradigmatic, in that most considerations of English antisemitism focus on the more prominent Protestant and secular discourses and deal with English Catholic discourse only \textit{en passant}. Whilst these studies of English antisemitism only mention the English Catholic discourse in passing, they have all proven indispensible for comparing and contextualising the representations of the Jew discovered during this project with their counterparts in the general (i.e. not specifically Catholic)\textsuperscript{55} English discourse.

In recent years there has been a flurry of studies examining Roman Catholic antisemitism.\textsuperscript{56} Many of these studies were written after, and in some cases in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{53} Holmes, “The Ritual Murder Accusation in Britain,” 277.
\item \textsuperscript{54} See for example Anthony Julius, \textit{Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 284-285, 355-356, 402-405, 422 and Kushner, \textit{The Persistence of Prejudice}, 56, 79-81, 87, 113, 198, passim. Kushner’s references to the \textit{Catholic Herald} are set in the 1940s when the paper was edited by Michael de la Bedoyere, a very different character to Charles Diamond, the founder, owner and editor of the paper during the timeframe of my project (Diamond is introduced in chapter two). The newspaper changed from a Catholic working class paper with strong Irish sympathies to a middle class paper with sympathies for fascism. Despite the change in editor, the paper held on to its anti-Jewish orientation.
\item \textsuperscript{55} The expression, “general English discourse,” is used in this thesis whenever referring to the English discourse as a whole (i.e. the broader discourse which includes English Catholic and non-Catholic discourses).
\item \textsuperscript{56} The following are just a selection of the recent studies: Susan Zuccotti’s \textit{Under His Very Windows: The Vatican and the Holocaust in Italy} (2000); Michael Phayer’s \textit{The Catholic Church and the Holocaust, 1930-1965} (2000); James Carroll’s \textit{Constantine’s Sword: The Church and the Jews} (2001); David Kertzer’s \textit{The Popes Against the Jews: The Vatican’s Role in the Rise of Modern Anti-Semitism} (2002); José David Lebovitch Dahl’s “The Role of the Roman Catholic Church in the Formation of Modern Anti-Semitism: La Civiltà Cattolica, 1850-1879” (2003); Robert Wistrish’s “The Pope, the Church, and the Jews” (1999) and “The Vatican and the Shoah” (2001).
\end{itemize}
response to, the Vatican document *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah* (1998).\(^{57}\)

One feature which these studies have in common is that they ignore the situation in England. One minor exception is David Kertzer’s *The Popes Against the Jews* (2002). Kertzer’s study provides a comprehensive and well-researched analysis of Roman Catholic attitudes towards Jews in several countries. However, Kertzer’s brief consideration of England is fleeting and a little misleading.\(^{58}\) Kertzer points out, quite correctly, that Roman Catholics in England were, like Jews, a minority who had experienced oppression. His study implies that Jews and Catholics in England therefore shared a bond of fellowship. According to Kertzer, “as members of a despised minority themselves, England’s Catholics were unusually sensitive to the Jews’ plight.”\(^{59}\) Kertzer provides two examples. Firstly, he describes the assistance that Cardinal Henry Manning, the second Archbishop of Westminster (and thus the head of the English Catholic hierarchy), rendered to Rabbi Hermann Adler, the future Chief Rabbi, in 1889 and 1890. Adler had written to Manning in December 1889 with concerns about rumours that Leo XIII had given his formal approval to a French book which repeated Jewish ritual murder accusations. Manning wrote to the Vatican to obtain a denial of the rumour.\(^{60}\) Secondly, Kertzer referred to letters written in November 1899 by three prominent English Catholics, including Cardinal Herbert Vaughan, the third Archbishop of Westminster. These letters lamented a resurgence of the ritual murder claim in the Vatican approved newspaper, *L’Osservatore Romano*, in November 1899.\(^{61}\) Despite these salutary examples, a shared experience of oppression did not always invoke a sense of communal solidarity. Not only did many other English Catholics portray Jews in a less savoury light, there is evidence that Cardinal

---

\(^{57}\) In 1998, the Vatican’s Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews announced the results of its investigation into the Church’s responsibility, if any, for the antisemitism which resulted in the Shoah. The commission’s answer to the question was that the Church itself could not be blamed. The Vatican document, *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*, emphasised a distinction between “long-standing sentiments of mistrust and hostility that we call anti-Judaism” and “anti-Semitism based on theories contrary to the constant teaching of the Church.” Several recent studies (see previous footnote) have been critical of the document’s demarcation between these types of discrimination. For the content of the Vatican document, see “We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah,” in Eugene J. Fisher, ed., *Documents from the Holy See* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1999), 58-72.

\(^{58}\) Kertzer provides a thorough examination of representations of the Jew in Catholic documents and periodicals from France, Austria, Italy and the Vatican, and it is not a major criticism of his study that it only examines English Catholic discourse in passing.


\(^{60}\) Ibid, 214-218.

\(^{61}\) Ibid, 218-220.
Manning and Cardinal Vaughan were themselves more ambivalent about Jews than Kertzer suggests. For example, whilst Cardinal Manning did protest against Russian pogroms and ritual murder accusations, for which he earned the lasting gratitude of many Anglo-Jewish communal leaders, he also repeated the persistent myth of the imminent arrival of the Antichrist who would be born to the Jewish “race” and worshipped by the Jews as their messiah. Cardinal Manning and his Jewish Antichrist narrative are examined in chapter two. Cardinal Vaughan owned the Tablet from 1868 to 1903. He bought the paper as a platform to express his own brand of Ultramontane Catholicism. Not only was the paper’s construction of the Jew during his term of ownership somewhat ambivalent, its protest against the ritual murder charge in November 1899 was marked by equivocation. The paper did refute the charge of ritual murder, but it also suggested that the Jews brought harsh treatment upon themselves as their political and economic conduct provoked hostility. The Tablet furthermore argued that the Jews had occasionally murdered innocent Christian children by crucifixion and bleeding to death, not from ritual necessity, but as a consequence of odium fidei. This is examined in more detail in chapter two.

Another study of Roman Catholic attitudes which is of interest to this investigation is Sergio Minerbi’s The Vatican and Zionism (1990). Minerbi’s study provides a thorough examination of Vatican attitudes towards Jews and Zionism before and after the Balfour Declaration. Whilst English Catholics are not the primary focus of his book, he does discuss the anti-Zionism of Cardinal Bourne, the fourth Archbishop of Westminster. Minerbi points to a number of his letters and speeches which protested against the domination of Jerusalem by the people who, so Bourne claimed, had denied Christ. Bourne certainly did express negative sentiments about Jews and Zionists following the Balfour Declaration, but antipathy towards Zionists and Zionism in English Catholic circles extended far beyond Bourne. With the exception of Sir Mark Sykes, a strong proponent of Zionism, and a minor reference to the Tablet, Minerbi’s study does not consider the wider English Catholic picture.

---

62 For an examination of the Tablet under Vaughan during the 1870s, see Simon Mayers, “Jewish Villains / Jewish Victims: An Examination of the Roles played by Jews in the Tablet’s Response to the fall of Rome (1870-1871) and The Eastern Crisis (1876-1878),” MA dissertation, University of Manchester (2008).

Chapter five of this thesis compliments Minerbi’s study by providing a more complete consideration of English Catholic reactions to Zionism. In addition to examining the speeches of Bourne, the chapter includes constructions of “the Zionist Menace” appearing in the Tablet, Month, Catholic Herald, Catholic Times and the Universe.

A handful of other studies discuss English Catholic attitudes towards Jews. For example, Deborah Yellin Bachrach’s PhD thesis, “The Impact of the Dreyfus Affair on Great Britain” (1978), does contain a chapter on English Catholics around the time of the Dreyfus retrial (circa 1898-1900). It provides a useful if somewhat apologetic survey of articles from the Tablet and the Month during the final years of the crisis. 64 Some general examinations of antisemitism (i.e. those not specifically concerned with English or Roman Catholic antisemitism) also mention English Catholic attitudes, though references to English Catholics other than Belloc and Chesterton are rare, and even the references to Belloc and Chesterton rarely amount to more than a sentence or two. For example, Bernard Lewis’ study, Semites & Anti-Semites (1986), simply mentions that Belloc and Chesterton tried “to import the French clerical variety” of antisemitism, but with “little or no success.” 65 Robert Wistrich’s classic study, Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred (1991), mentions that Belloc and Chesterton “denounced the ‘corrupting’ role of Jews in public life, called for their emigration or demotion to the status of aliens, and encouraged a conspiratorial view of Jewish behaviour in general.” 66 Hyam Maccoby also mentioned Belloc and Chesterton in a footnote, noting that their antisemitism was “openly religious in motivation.” 67

64 Deborah Yellin Bachrach, “The Impact of the Dreyfus Affair on Great Britain,” Ph.D thesis, University of Minnesota (1978), 202-255. Bachrach argued that English Catholics deplored the unjust proceedings against Dreyfus, disassociated themselves from the “journalistic excesses” of French and Italian Catholic periodicals such as La Croix, Civitá Cattolica and Osservatore Romano, expressed opposition to antisemitism and found it necessary to defend the Church against a wave of “anti-Vaticanism” in the English press (153-201, 202-242). Conversely, she also noted that “other English Catholics” took advantage of the “anti-Dreyfus, anti-Semitic propaganda” in France, in order to take the “offensive against Jews.” In some cases these “other English Catholics” were the same publications and individuals whom she earlier cited as defending Jews, for example the Tablet and Father Sydney Smith in the Month (242-253). Whilst Bachrach did not connect these seemingly contradictory findings, they correlate with the ambivalent and equivocal constructions of the Jew often found in the Tablet, the Month and other English Catholic newspapers in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century (an equivocation that Bachrach seems to overlook).


66 Wistrich, Antisemitism, 106.

Most studies of Anglo-Jewish history also mention Catholics and Catholicism, if at all, only in passing. David Feldman’s widely respected study of Anglo-Jewry, *Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture 1840-1914* (1994), makes a few references to English Catholics, but mainly to contextualise Jewish and Catholic emancipation. Feldman did also refer in passing to the “overt Jew baiting” of the *New Witness* newspaper, the paper owned and edited in succession by Hilaire Belloc, Cecil Chesterton and Gilbert Chesterton. Other studies of Anglo-Jewish history make even fewer references to English Catholics. For example, Todd Endelman’s *The Jews of Britain 1656 to 2000* (2002), mentioned Belloc and Chesterton in connection with the Marconi Affair, but only to state that their “hostility to Jews was linked to their opposition to liberalism, their backward-looking Catholicism, and their nostalgia for a medieval Catholic Europe that they imagined was ordered, harmonious, and homogeneous.”

References to Jews and antisemitism in studies of English Catholic history are even more scarce. Most prominent studies of English Catholic history do not mention Jews at all. One exception, Steven Fielding’s study of *Irish Catholics in England, 1880-1939* (1993), mentions Jews on a number of occasions, but mainly to compare and contrast the experiences of Jewish and Irish immigrants. Fielding did however suggest that Jews were often the preferred victims of Irish led gangs looking for street fights, with “Irish Catholic working-class youths … as anti-Semitic as their English peers.” Fielding also observed, albeit in passing, that many Catholics were attracted to the British Union of Fascists, partly because of the party’s “anti-Communism and hostility to Jews, both of which had been endorsed in the pages of the Catholic press.” Jean Maynard’s *A History of St Mary & St Michael’s Parish* (2007), provides some examples of cooperation and solidarity between Jews and Catholics living in the East End of London. According to Maynard (2007), Jewish tailors and Irish dockers in

---

69 Ibid, 267.
72 Ibid, 68.
73 Ibid, 125-126.
the East End of London held joint strike meetings in 1912, and when “the tailors’ strike ended in victory, the Jewish families provided meals for the hungry dockers’ children.”

Another example of cooperation was the Central Labour Party in Stepney. According to Maynard, Oscar Tobin, a Rumanian Jewish chemist, joined his Labour group (the Mile End Labour Party) with the Labour group led by Catholic trade unionist, Matt Aylward (the Limehouse Labour Party). Together they formed the highly successful Stepney Central Labour Party in June 1918. According to Maynard, Catholic dockers of Irish descent, being as unsympathetic to fascism as they often were to communism, protested against the BUF and joined the Jewish and Communist protestors at the battle of Cable Street. Such references to cooperation between Jews and Catholics in the East End of London provide a useful counterbalance to the generally less amiable English Catholic discourse.

Whilst references to Jews are scarce in most examinations of English Catholicism, antisemitism is frequently mentioned in studies of Gilbert Chesterton. In recent years there has been a resurgence in Chesterton’s popularity. This has been marked by a flurry of books examining Chesterton’s life, literature, philosophy, theology, prophetic insight and holiness. Many of these books mention antisemitism, but only to deny it. The movement to rehabilitate Chesterton’s reputation with regard to his antisemitism has at times been very aggressive. For example, in 2008, a special double issue of *Gilbert Magazine*, the periodical of the American Chesterton Society, devoted sixty pages to Chesterton’s attitude towards Jews. The aim of those pages was to “deal in a thorough and forthright manner with the oft-repeated accusation against Chesterton, that he was an anti-Semite.” According to Dale Ahlquist, president of the American Chesterton Society, the accusation is “poisonous” and “a

74 [Jean Maynard], *A History of St Mary & St Michael’s Parish* (London: Terry Marsh, 2007), 209.
75 Ibid, 217.
76 Ibid, 246-250.
78 *Gilbert Magazine*, 12, no. 2&3 (November/December 2008). This double issue is the online sample edition. It can be accessed via the American Chesterton Society web page: http://www.chesterton.org/wordpress/welcome/
mean and wretched lie.”

A conference at Oxford to discuss the holiness of Chesterton went ahead in July 2009. This placed the cause for his beatification on the agenda. A volume of essays based on the papers delivered at the conference examines his “holiness” from various perspectives. The volume concludes with an essay which argues that Chesterton was a “philosemitite.”

Oddie relies heavily on material which dates back to the early 1890s – i.e. when Chesterton was a teenager – to exonerate Chesterton. He cites an entry from Chesterton’s diary dated 5 January 1891 which stated that he felt so strongly about an act of cruelty to a Jewish girl in Russia that he was inclined to “knock some-body down.”

He also quotes passages from letters by Chesterton’s alter ego, Guy Crawford, which were published in the school debating club magazine in 1892. In these letters, Chesterton/Crawford discusses his plans to go to Russia to help “the Hebrews” suffering in pogroms. Oddie also cites “To a Certain Nation,” a poem penned by Chesterton as a reproach to France for the injustice done to Captain Alfred Dreyfus.

These probably provide a fair reflection of his teenage attitudes. Early into the 20th century, his attitude towards Jews becomes less favourable. As subsequent chapters will show, his literary works and newspaper articles frequently contained deprecating representations of the Jews quite different to those found in his school magazine.

---


83 Ibid, 127; the diary entry for 5 January 1891 can be found on page 24 of diary/notebook (1890-1891), ADD MS 73317A, G. K. Chesterton Papers: Notebooks (1890-1891), British Library Manuscripts, London.


85 Oddie, “The Philosemitism of G. K. Chesterton,” 129. The poem can be found in G. K. Chesterton, The Wild Knight (London: Grant Richards, 1900), 94-96. Chesterton added a note to the second edition of The Wild Knight which reveals that by 1906 he was already changing his position about the Dreyfus Affair. The note stated that whilst “there may have been a fog of injustice in the French courts; I know that there was a fog of injustice in the English newspapers.” According to the note, he was unable to reach a final “verdict on the individual” which he largely attributed to the “acrid and irrational unanimity of the English Press.” G. K. Chesterton, The Wild Knight, 2nd ed. (London: Brimley Johnson and Ince, 1906), viii. The second edition is very rare (even the British Library does not have a copy). A copy can be consulted at the London Library (a private members only library). Alternatively, the note can be found in the fourth edition, which is available in a number of university libraries. Chesterton later referred to the Jew “who is a traitor in France” and stated that in “the case of Dreyfus” he was quite certain that “the British public was systematically and despoticly duped by some power.” Gilbert Chesterton to the Editor, Nation: 18 March 1911, 1004 and 8 April 1911, 58.
This examination of the existing historiography demonstrates the significant lacuna that exists in studies which examine English Catholic representations of the Jew. Whilst there are a number of studies which have examined English antisemitism, the focus of these has been Protestant or secular attitudes, with the English Catholic discourse receiving little attention. Studies of English antisemitism and Anglo-Jewish history do tend to mention, though only in passing, the literary duo which George Bernard Shaw famously nicknamed the “Chesterbelloc.” Conversely, several biographical and theological studies of Gilbert Chesterton – some of which border on the hagiographical – argue at length that Chesterton was not an antisemite. Other English Catholics are rarely mentioned in studies of English antisemitism and Anglo-Jewish history. This project attempts to remedy this lacuna by looking at the myths, stereotypes and constructions, authored by a combination of prominent, less well known, obscure and in some cases anonymous English Catholics.

**Methodology**

**Sources**

As very little has been written about English Catholic representations of the Jew during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, the primary goal of this project has been to excavate a layer of discourse which, with the exception of the published works of a few prominent individuals (i.e. Chesterton and Belloc), has hitherto remained largely unexamined. Bryan Cheyette has quite rightly observed that rather than praising or vilifying particular individuals, there is a need for projects that improve our understanding of the cultural context and discourse “in which particular writers and thinkers produced their texts.” In order to increase our understanding of the English Catholic discourse as much as possible, a wide range of sources have been examined, including the published works of a number of prominent, obscure and anonymous authors, the pastoral letters and sermons of cardinals, bishops and priests, articles and editorials in English Catholic newspapers and periodicals, pamphlets,

86 The expression was coined in George Bernard Shaw, “Belloc and Chesterton,” *New Age*, II, no.16, 15 February 1908, 309-11.

personal correspondences, letters to the editors of newspapers, unpublished documents and a small number of oral testimonies. As the main aim of this project has been to bring to light representations of the Jew from a largely unexcavated discourse, the focus of this thesis has been the material unearthed rather than extensive comparisons to other discourses.\textsuperscript{88} Whilst some of the unearthed primary source material has been examined in other contexts (such as Cheyette’s examination of constructions of the Jew by Gilbert Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc\textsuperscript{89}), most of it is here presented for the first time. Comparisons with representations of the Jew in the English non-Catholic discourse have been made, but at a very high level and for the most part utilising information found in secondary sources.

One of the most important types of primary materials used to source English Catholic representations were newspapers and periodicals. These have proven indispensable for a number of reasons. Firstly, the Jew often featured prominently in articles and editorials appearing in English Catholic newspapers, not just in response to key events and episodes, but also in the general course of everyday reporting.\textsuperscript{90} Secondly, several Catholic newspapers and periodicals were published regularly (mostly weekly, some monthly) and thus provide a continuous record of representations of the Jew over the course of the entire timeframe of this project. This has made it possible to spot trends and developments and to correlate representations with events. Thirdly, the English Catholic newspapers were often setup or purchased in order to provide a platform for the owner-editor to broadcast their views and shape opinion. For example, the \textit{Tablet}, the nearest thing to an official English Catholic newspaper, was purchased by Cardinal Herbert Vaughan specifically to articulate an Ultramontane Catholic position.\textsuperscript{91} The \textit{Catholic Herald} was founded and edited by

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{88} i.e. English non-Catholic discourses and Catholic discourses in other countries.
\item \textsuperscript{89} Belloc and Chesterton are considered in this thesis, as whilst they have already been examined in the context of English antisemitism and English discourse, they are also an essential component of the English Catholic discourse. The picture is incomplete without them.
\item \textsuperscript{90} It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between editorials, anonymous articles that were written by the editor and anonymous articles that were written by somebody else. None of the main English Catholic newspapers and periodicals had a section conveniently headed “editorials,” but each of them had a section for the editor to record his general notes and observations about current events of interest (e.g. “Notes of the Week” in the \textit{Catholic Times}; “Notes and Comments” in the \textit{Universe}; “Notes and Comments” in the \textit{Catholic Herald}; “Notes” in the \textit{Tablet}; “Topics of the Month” in the \textit{Month}).
\item \textsuperscript{91} The \textit{Tablet} was bought by Father Hebert Vaughan in 1868. Vaughan (1832-1903) used the paper to defend an Ultramontane Catholic position. According to Michael J. Walsh, \textit{The Tablet : A Commemorative History 1840-1990} ([London]: Tablet, 1990), the \textit{Tablet} was granted a formal commendation by the
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Charles Diamond, a vehement agitator of Irish decent, in order to defend Christian civilisation and communicate an aggressive Roman Catholic triumphalism twinned with Irish nationalism. These papers thus provide an insight into the prominent individuals who owned and edited them. To a lesser extent they also provide some insight into the individuals that read them. Whilst English Catholic newspapers provide an imperfect indication of popular opinion, being shaped primarily by the ideologies of the owner-editors, reader preferences were not an insignificant factor.

Whereas the *Jewish Chronicle* held a near monopoly as the newspaper of choice for the Jewish community in England, the same could not be said for English Catholic periodicals. There were several prominent English Catholic newspapers. If one did not appeal to a reader-audience then there were plenty of others to choose from and it thus seems unlikely that any of them could have survived for long if they continually articulated a message with which their readers did not feel some sympathy. Nevertheless, what they actually say about their readers – the so-called “ordinary” Catholic – does remain largely speculative. Any insights that the newspapers provide into the attitudes of their owners, editors, contributors and readers are necessarily tentative. This is not a major concern as the main focus of this

---

92 The *Catholic Herald* was the most vehemently anti-Jewish of the English Catholic organs in the early twentieth century. It engaged in nearly every type of representation of the Jew examined in this thesis and thus references to it can be found in each chapter. The *Catholic Herald* was founded by Charles Diamond in 1893 and he owned and edited it until his death in 1934 (Diamond is introduced in chapter two). It would be more accurate to describe the *Catholic Herald* as a newspaper empire consisting of a London based newspaper which provided the template for over two dozen regional versions including the *Preston Catholic News*, *Tyneside Catholic News*, *Manchester Catholic Herald*, *Leeds Catholic Herald*, *Glasgow Catholic Herald* and *Irish Catholic Herald*. For the most part these and other variants were identical to the *Catholic Herald* except for a page of local news. For more about the *Catholic Herald*, see Owen Dudley Edwards and Patricia J. Storey, “The Irish Press in Victorian Britain,” in Roger Swift and Sheridan Gilley, eds., *The Irish in the Victorian City* (London: Croom Helm, 1985), 172-176.

93 The use of the term “ordinary” in this study does not indicate the antonym of eccentric, peculiar or special. “Ordinary” is used in a similar way to that employed by Paul Thompson, i.e. as a signifier to indicate the regular individuals whose views have rarely been recorded for posterity. They are the often forgotten actors within myth and history. Paul Thompson, *The Edwardians: The Remaking of British Society* (1975; repr., Chicago: Academy Chicago Publishers, 1985), 14-15, passim.

94 As Ehret has rightly observed, the Catholic newspapers “come closer to the ‘ordinary reader’” than the less affordable journals and periodicals, but even they do not provide a direct reflection of “the elusive popular opinion of the ‘ordinary Catholic.’” Ehret, “Catholics and Antisemitism,” 25, 43.
investigation is structures of discourse (i.e. representations of the Jew) rather than underlying attitudes, thoughts and beliefs. The speculative insights they provide into attitudes and motives are an additional benefit. As sources of the representations of the Jew in the English Catholic discourse, the newspapers and periodicals are indispensable. A final pragmatic consideration is that most issues of the main English Catholic newspapers have been stored at Colindale newspaper library, whereas private documents are sometimes destroyed or rendered inaccessible. The newspapers thus sometimes provide the main available textual record for certain periods and episodes. Five prominent English Catholic newspapers and periodicals (the *Month*, *Tablet*, *Universe*, *Catholic Herald* and *Catholic Times*) have been examined in depth throughout the timeframe of this project.

Another important source has been the published books and pamphlets of authors who were well known, such as Chesterton and Belloc, and less well known authors who did not achieve prominence outside of a specifically English Catholic readership, such as William Barry, Herbert Thurston and a number of other

---

95 Though some issues of the *Universe* and the *Catholic Times* between 1896 and 1899 are badly damaged or unavailable.
96 The *Month* was founded by the British Jesuits and was edited by its members: Sydney Fenn Smith (1897-1901), John Gerard (1901-1912) and Joseph Keating (1912-1939).
97 Prior to 1912, the *Universe* had been edited by George Elliot Anstruther. However, few representations of the Jew were found in the paper until the editorship of William Dunbar McConnell, a convert to Catholicism with sympathies for socialism. McConnell took over the paper in 1912. Editorials and articles about Jews during his editorship were quite sympathetic (his editorship is discussed in chapter three). The paper was acquired by Sir Martin Melvin, a successful Irish Catholic businessman, in 1917. He passed the editorship to Herbert S. Dean, an Oxford convert to Catholicism, who remained as editor until 1938. For a short introduction to the editors of the *Universe*, see J. J. Dwyer, “The Catholic Press, 1850-1950,” in George Andrew Beck, ed., *The English Catholics, 1850-1950* (London, Burns Oates, 1950), 506-507 and Aspden, *Fortress Church*, 48-49.
98 In 1861, Father James Nugent, the founder of many institutions for the poor, including the Liverpool Catholic Children’s Protection Society, purchased the *Northern Press*. This was renamed to the *Catholic Weekly Times* in 1869 and to the *Catholic Times* in 1872. Dwyer states that Father Barry (an important character in this thesis), took over the paper after Nugent passed away. This is not correct. After Father Nugent passed away in 1905, his friend and colleague, Father John Berry (founder and director of a shelter for homeless boys in Liverpool), took over the ownership of the paper. The mistake is understandable. Not only were their names similar, but Father William Barry became a regular contributor to the paper in the late 1910s. Percy Beazley (1859-1923), a Catholic journalist whose father was from Killarney, edited the paper under Nugent, Berry and successive anonymous owners (from 1884 until 1923). The paper was acquired by the Catholic Missionary Society in 1926. For a discussion about the paper under Nugent and Berry, see John Furnival, *Children of the Second Spring: Father James Nugent and the Work of Child Care in Liverpool* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2005), 141-147. See also Dwyer, “The Catholic Press,” 507-508; entry for John Berry in F. C. Burnand, ed., *Catholic Who’s Who & Year Book, 1908* (London: Burns & Oates, 1908), 29; entry for Percy Beazley in *Who Was Who, 1916-1928* (London: A & C Black, 1929), 72.
characters.\(^9\) Whilst these works do not offer a direct map into the minds of the authors, they do provide a solid source of English Catholic stereotypes, myths and constructions of the Jew. Most of the books examined were non-fictional (e.g. social and political criticism, historical studies, examinations of bolshevisim and Freemasonry, biographies and books on religious themes). Novels and short stories can be problematic as it is difficult to determine whether the representations of the Jew expressed by a character are indicative of attitudes held by the author. This is not a significant issue for this project for two reasons. First, as already discussed, the main focus of this project is the representations which existed in the English Catholic discourse, not the attitudes of those who created them. Second, fictional works have not proven to be a major source in this project. The relevant material from novels and short stories in this thesis were by Belloc and Chesterton, and the representations of the Jew expressed by their fictional characters and narrators were the same as the representations of the Jew repeated \textit{ad nauseam} in their ostensibly non-fictional works (e.g. Belloc’s \textit{The Jews}, Chesterton’s \textit{The New Jerusalem} and their numerous articles and columns in the \textit{New Witness} and other newspapers).

Pastorals, sermons and other public addresses have also provided an important source of representations of the Jew. The pastoral letters of the bishops and archbishops were usually published in pamphlet form for distribution. Many of these pastoral letters have been found in diocese and archdiocese archives. Sermons conversely were more difficult to source. Catholic sermons tended to be short and improvised from a few handwritten notes. It was unusual for Catholic priests to preach a sermon from a complete script.\(^{10}\) However, some of the sermons by priests who were noted for their eloquence were published. The \textit{Universe} for example often contained sermons on subjects of topical interest. Ronald Knox, a particularly renowned author and priest, did preach from a complete script and he retained the typewritten texts for subsequent use and in some cases for publication.\(^{11}\) Drafts of sermons were also found in the archives of the Catholic Guild of Israel. Sermons, pastorals and other public addresses by bishops and priests, discussed a wide range of topics, many of which did not relate to Jews or Judaism. Nevertheless, myths and

\(^9\) William Barry and Herbert Thurston are introduced in chapter two.


\(^{11}\) Ibid. Ronald Knox and his sermons are examined in chapter two.
stereotypes of the Jew were not an uncommon feature. Other texts examined for this project include pamphlets, leaflets, letters, diaries and other documents from important institutions (such as the Catholic Guild of Israel and the Catholic Federation). Transcripts and recordings of oral testimony have also been examined.102

**Types of Representation**

Frank Felsenstein’s important study, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes* (1995), explains that stereotypes of the Jew tend to be long-lived and entrenched, and yet are simultaneously bipolar, unstable and adaptive. The protean and mutative nature of stereotypes is something that he repeatedly emphasises. According to Felsenstein, stereotypes of the Jew are crude preconceptions of defining attributes. These preconceptions become stereotypes when they are a part of the “accepted mental vocabulary of a larger group or society.”103 The conception of stereotypes in this project is similar but not identical to that described by Felsenstein. It is similar in as far as stereotypes are interpreted as crude, powerful, resilient and enduring representations which are nevertheless protean and adaptive.104 Where this project differs from Felsenstein’s study is the conception of myths. Citing Sander Gilman, Felsenstein concludes that stereotypes are “often no more than myths that have become ‘powerful enough to substitute for realities.’”105 Felsenstein seems to be suggesting that myths are simply a sort of proto-stereotype. In other words, he sees a myth as a representation of the Jew that is not yet accepted as a reality and a stereotype as a representation that was once a myth but has subsequently been

---

102 John Tosh was right to point out that there can be problems with using oral testimony. Testimony does not represent “a pure distillation of past experience.” The memories of the interviewee, “however precise and vivid, are filtered through subsequent experience.” John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History* (1984; repr., London: Longman, 1989), 178. On the other hand, no text entirely escapes this problem, as no text can provide the means to pierce the veil of discourse to reveal a “pure distillation” of the past. Another crucial problem is that it is difficult to link particular memories to exact dates (and my dating of particular recollections is correspondingly speculative). A small number of audio recordings and transcripts (collected in the 1970s) have been found for English Catholics discussing their memories of Jews during the 1910s and 1920s. These are all from Manchester/Salford, a region where Jews and Catholics lived in close proximity. These have not been a main focus of this investigation, but a few extracts have been used to demonstrate that certain stereotypes and myths were not confined to books, articles and sermons.


104 Other scholars have also noted the bipolar, mutable, constantly shifting nature of stereotypes. See for example, Sander L. Gilman, *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race and Madness* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985).

accepted as a reality. His distinction is thus between the influencing power of the representation rather than its content. This is illustrated by his observation that stereotypes of the Jew are sometimes based on biblical narratives. He suggests that the “imprimatur of the Bible” imbues these myths with a powerful sense of veracity that leads to them being reinforced as enduring stereotypes.\(^{106}\) As a consequence of defining stereotypes by their influencing power rather than the nature of their content, Felsenstein includes “crucifiers,” “anti-Christ,” “desecrators of the ritual Host” and “sorcerers” in his list of anti-Jewish stereotypes.\(^{107}\) However, in my project myths are differentiated from stereotypes not by their influencing power – myths can be powerfully influential – but by their content. Stereotypes of the Jew take vices which are quite human, indeed all too human, such as greed, cowardice and secrecy, all of which can be found in some combination and measure in all but the most saintly of people, and apply and generalise them in exaggerated and distorted form to “the Jew.” In some cases the stereotypes were ostensibly positive, for example, the stereotype of the Smart Jew. These were still exaggerated generalisations and in some cases they were used as damning praise.\(^{108}\) Representations such as the Christ-Killer, the Jewish Antichrist and the Jewish Sorcerer, do not qualify as stereotypes in my project, as they are not human vices that can be exaggerated and distorted.\(^{109}\) There is little or no evidence that they contain even a kernel of truth.\(^{110}\)


\(^{107}\) Ibid, 25.

\(^{108}\) As Sander Gilman has argued, the stereotype of the “Smart Jew” emphasises Jewish distinctiveness no less than other stereotypes, and turns an ostensible virtue into a vice. See Sander L. Gilman, *Smart Jews: The Construction of the Image of Jewish Superior Intelligence* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996). Whilst there is no section dedicated to this particular stereotype in this thesis, it does crop up as a part of other constructions.

\(^{109}\) Allport, like Gavin Langmuir, argued that the Christ-Killer stereotype is based on a “kernel of truth.” “It is,” he suggested, “historically true that certain Jews favoured the crucifixion of Christ.” According to Allport, “the stereotype sharpens this fact until the entire Jewish group in modern times becomes known as ‘Christ killers.’” Allport suggests that certain important “facts” are forgotten – that Pilate permitted the Crucifixion, that the Roman soldiers performed it and that the mob was “only in part composed of Jews”. That Jesus existed, was crucified and that Jews were partly to blame is implicitly accepted by Allport. Considered from Allport’s perspective, the Christ-Killer would be a stereotype rather than a character within a myth, as he believes it has a “kernel of truth.” It is plausible that a historical Jesus did exist, in which case he may have been a Pharisee as Hyam Maccoby and others have argued. The evidence facilitates a multitude of unverifiable suppositions about the identity and fate of the historical Jesus, and narratives about the murder of Christ are thus considered myths rather than stereotypes in this thesis. See Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954; repr., Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958), 185, 192.

\(^{110}\) This project is not concerned with the alleged “kernel of truth” within each stereotype. The purpose of this project is not to prove that the Jews are not greedy, cowardly, secretive (even less so is it concerned with proving that the Jews did not murder Christ and that there will not be a “Jewish Antichrist”). Some individuals (irrespective of whether they are Jewish or non-Jewish) may exhibit
The term myth has been interpreted in a myriad of ways and a great deal of conflicting theory has been developed for how they function and are transmitted. Even high level overviews, such as Robert Segal’s *Myth: A Very Short Introduction* (2004), present dozens of different perspectives and theories on the origins and functions of myths.\(^{111}\) Some scholars insist that myths are foundation stories about a creation event (e.g. of the universe or the world). Other scholars accept a broader definition in which myths do not necessarily deal with a creation event. In this project the term is used to signify an important and persistent story of religious or cultural significance which has been treated as a truthful representation of past events. Myths are resilient but adaptive narratives that serve an important psychological or sociological function, such as justifying the creation and ongoing existence of a religion or culture, or in the case of the traditional myths considered in this study, the usurpation and ongoing suppression of a rival religion and culture.\(^{112}\)

Whilst this definition of “myth” is broader than that found in some studies, it can nevertheless be argued that it is a narrow understanding of the term. It is certainly the case that some other studies have adopted more inclusive definitions of myth. For example, one recent volume coined the neologism “antisémythes” (i.e. antisemitic

---


\(^{112}\) According to Hyam Maccoby, on the surface the Christian foundation myth – i.e. the Christ-Killer myth – is not dissimilar in function to the “dispossession” or “usurpation” myths of other civilisations. Maccoby explains that in the case of the Christian “usurpation myth,” the “very self-image of a community” was the “target of a take-over bid.” Rather than a mere territorial usurpation, the myth has been used to “annex the position of being the true Israel.” Maccoby suggests that the Christian “usurpation myth” is uniquely complex, consisting of a “multiplicity of mythological motifs.” A distinctive feature is that the usurped characters, i.e. the Jews, have been assigned an important “continuing role within the landscape of the Christian myth.” See Maccoby, *A Pariah People*, 63-65, 82-115 and Hyam Maccoby, *The Sacred Executioner: Human Sacrifice and the Legacy of Guilt* ([London]: Thames and Hudson, 1982), 134. For another account of the importance of “mythical thinking” in the internalisation and transmittance of representations of the Jews as Christ-Killers, ritual murderers and demons, see Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer, *Antisemitism: Myth and Hate from Antiquity to the Present* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).
myths) as the umbrella term for the subject of a range of essays examining religious, scientific, racial, political, conspiratorial, cultural, literary and cinematic constructions of the Jew. A more fluid interpretation of “myth” can also be found in Raphael Samuel and Paul Thompson’s *The Myths We Live By* (1990). Samuel and Thompson contrasted the traditional preferences of historians – the so-called “‘hard’ realities” – with a range of “myth” narratives. These include “legends,” “folk narratives,” “nursery rhymes,” “childhood fables,” “ancestor myths,” “family romance,” “proverbs and sayings,” “metaphors,” “magic and shamanism,” “oral memory,” “humour,” “dream-thoughts,” and “fears and fantasies.” They argue that historians have privileged so-called “exact knowledge” over the “symbolic categories through which reality is perceived.” Samuel and Thompson entreat historians to adopt a more sympathetic approach to myth, and point out that a “persistent blindness to myth undeniably robs us of much of our power to understand and interpret the past.” No issue is taken with their plea for historians to treat these types of narrative more sympathetically, or with their objection to “myth” being dismissed as an impediment to truth or its antonym. In general terms there is little to object to in their use of the term “myth,” but for the purposes of this investigation their definition is too broad. According to Samuel and Thompson’s use of the term “myth,” all of the representations of the Jew examined in this project could be considered under the umbrella of the “the myths we live by.” For the purpose of taxonomic precision in the analysis of the English Catholic discourse, it is helpful to adopt a narrower interpretation in which contemporary stereotypes, traditional religious myths, and composite constructions, are defined as similar but distinct types of representation.

Representations drawn from traditional myths and contemporary stereotypes are distinct in two important respects. Firstly, stereotypes exaggerate and distort traits (such as greed, cowardice, disloyalty, cunning and secrecy) which exist in some measure and form in most people. It is thus always possible for the determined author to find some “evidence” to prove the veracity of a stereotype. Conversely, Christ-

---


Killer, Antichrist and Ritual Murderer are not traits that are exaggerated and distorted. They are, to use Langmuir’s phrase, “false fantasises unsupported by evidence.”115 Secondly, contemporary stereotypes of the Jew always by intention caricature contemporary Jews. However, sermons and pastoral letters often replicated the myths about the Jew in such a way that their main focus was biblical Jews.116 The sermons and pastorals in these cases helped to preserve and perpetuate the image of the diabolical biblical Jew in the popular imagination, and no doubt they often encouraged prejudice towards contemporary Jews, but in many cases it does not seem that they were deliberately intended to diabolise contemporary Jews. For these two reasons, the mythologized Jew is quite different to the stereotyped Jew. However, the two types of representation were by no means completely different. In some cases myths were used in sermons, lectures, articles and books in order to deprecate and vilify contemporary Jews. In some instances they were incorporated into composite constructions of the Jew. For example, articles in English Catholic newspapers about Jewish greed, secrecy and disloyalty were given a kind of biblical authority by suggesting that the Jews had killed Christ and are now repeating this persecution by plundering the Church and invading the Holy Land. By drawing upon myth, the Jew could be rendered a truly diabolic bogeyman or Antichrist figure, rather than, comparatively speaking, a mundane human villain.

Bryan Cheyette is critical of studies which explain literary representations of the Jew in terms of “fixed ‘stereotypes’, ‘myths’ or ‘images’ that have remained essentially the same across the centuries.”117 As a result he tends to eschew terms like myth and stereotype, preferring instead “construction,” as myth and stereotype misleadingly suggest that representations of the Jew are eternal, fixed and ordered.118

115 Langmuir, Toward a Definition of Antisemitism, 61.
116 More specifically, biblical Jews from the New Testament; Jews from the Old Testament were sometimes treated with respect and admiration (i.e. as proto-Christians).
117 Cheyette, Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society, 3 and Cheyette, “Neither Excuse nor Accuse,” 432.
118 See Cheyette, Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society, 3, 8-9, 268. Hannah Arendt observed that the “doctrine of an ‘eternal antisemitism’” treats “outbursts” as “natural consequences of an eternal problem.” Cheyette approvingly refers to Arendt’s observation in Constructions of “the Jew” (3). However, Arendt’s understanding of anti-Jewish prejudice was quite opposed to Cheyette’s. Cheyette eschews explanations based on the “interactionist model” of antisemitism (see footnote 40 in this chapter). Arendt conversely seemed to advocate the interactionist approach. She suggested that “the thesis of eternal antisemitism” and “the scapegoat theory” are both “escapist” as they “deny all specific Jewish responsibility and refuse to discuss matters in specific
Cheyette identifies Edgar Rosenberg’s *Jewish Stereotypes in English Fiction* (1961) as an example of “influential ‘mythic’ accounts of the eternal ‘Jewish stereotype.’”¹¹⁹ Cheyette is justified in being suspicious of studies like Rosenberg’s which see myths and stereotypes as a timeless and unchanging phenomenon.¹²⁰ This does not mean that myths and stereotypes, conceived in more protean terms, should be disregarded. One corollary of Cheyette’s “dominant racialised discourse” model and his strong rejection of explanations which rely on myths and stereotypes, seems to be that traditional Christian myths are necessarily a secondary or even non-determining factor in his framework. However, representations which had their roots in persistent but adaptive myths, such as the Christ-Killer, Ritual Murderer and Jewish Antichrist legends, were a pervasive component of English Catholic discourse during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. These myths should not be dismissed as eternal and fixed, but rather considered as resilient and yet protean. To survive into the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, they had to evolve and adapt.

Even defined in such protean terms, the concepts of myth and stereotype do not fit comfortably within Cheyette’s discursive framework.¹²¹ This can be seen in Cheyette’s identification of Frank Felsenstein’s *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes* as another study that reinforces “‘eternal’ images of Jews.”¹²² Felsenstein, unlike Rosenberg, does repeatedly emphasise the protean, adaptive and evolving nature of stereotypes.¹²³ He even criticises Rosenberg for treating stereotypes as “enduring archaeological fossil[s].”¹²⁴ Cheyette nevertheless seems to conclude that any study that treats pre-modern myths and stereotypes of the Jew as persistent, must be focused “primarily on a free-floating discourse (outside of time and space) which is, by definition,

---

¹¹⁹ Cheyette, *Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society*, 3n5.
¹²⁰ One of the central arguments of Edgar Rosenberg, *Jewish Stereotypes in English Fiction: From Shylock to Svengali* (London: Peter Owen, 1961), is that stereotypes are massively durable, unpliable and insensitive to historical changes.
¹²¹ Cheyette’s rejection of the terms “myth” and “stereotype” seems to have begun in 1993 with *Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society*. He employed both terms in an essay published in 1989. See Bryan Cheyette, “Jewish stereotyping and English literature, 1875-1920: Towards a political analysis,” in Tony Kushner and Kenneth Lunn, eds., *Traditions of Intolerance: Historical Perspectives on Fascism and Race Discourse in Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989).
¹²⁴ Ibid, 256.
decontextualized.” His concern seems to be that such studies, which he associates with the so-called “conventional historiography of anti-Semitism,” are decontextualized from the discourses of the modern period. According to Cheyette, “the danger is that the conventional historiography continues to essentialize Jews as uniquely timeless, unchanging victims and therefore positions the history of anti-Semitism outside of the social, political, and cultural processes which gave rise to this history in the first place.”

Cheyette is quite right to highlight the dangers of considering constructions of the Jew independent of the contemporary social, political and cultural discourses which gave rise to them. Nevertheless, by treating studies that look at the continued but adapted presence of earlier representations of the Jew as somehow divorced from reality – i.e. focused on a “free-floating” atemporal discourse – he has disconnected modern discourses from their historical antecedents. The influence of Foucault would seem be at work here.

Foucault employed a number of different approaches to the analysis of discourse. A reoccurring approach, which he sometimes referred to as “archaeology,” was a predominantly synchronic form of analysis which focused on the structures of discourse. Traditional historiographical concepts, such as narrative continuity, coherence, temporal succession, and the gradual evolution of ideas over time, were foreign to this approach. As Foucault stated, “archaeology does not seek to rediscover the continuous insensible transition that relates discourses, on a gentle slope, to what precedes them, surrounds them, or follows them. ... On the contrary, its problem is to define discourses in their specificity.” Foucault did introduce a form of diachronic analysis to his approach, but this replaced the idea of historical continuity and gradual development with a series of discontinuities, intrinsic contradictions, ruptures and radical shifts. Cheyette’s framework seems to embody a similar discursive discontinuity. Ironically, in treating modern “semitic discourse” as if

---

126 Cheyette refers approvingly to Foucault’s influence on Edward Said, pointing out that Said’s work identifies “racial discourse” as “a series of ‘representations’, not ‘natural’ depictions of the Orient.” According to Cheyette, Said emphasizes “the determining power of these representations to create the ‘Orient’ in the consciousness and institutions of the west.” Cheyette concludes that it is this “dimension of power between minority and majority groups in a ‘conflict situation’” that is missing from other approaches. See Cheyette, “A Reassessment of the Interactionist Model of Racial Hatred,” 134.
128 Ibid, 155.
129 See ibid, 183-195.
it was disconnected from the past, in effect encapsulating it within a self-contained épistèmé, he has decontextualized it from history as a whole.\textsuperscript{130}

Another reason why the concepts of myth and stereotype are rejected by Cheyette, is that he focuses not on structures of discourse, but rather their complete absence. He argues that constructions of the Jew were “radically unstable,” “indeterminate,” “ambivalent,” “contradictory,” “over-determined” and “fluid.”\textsuperscript{131}

There is a close resemblance between the “slipperiness” that Cheyette observes in constructions of the Jew, and the dynamic and unstable relationship that Post-Modernists and New Historicists detect between all signifiers and signifieds.\textsuperscript{132} In particular, the influence of Zygmunt Bauman’s post-modern rendering of the Jew as “ambivalence incarnate” can be found in Cheyette’s analysis.\textsuperscript{133} In a short essay published in 2001, Cheyette identified Bauman as one of the theorists that he finds “most useful.”\textsuperscript{134} According to Cheyette and Laura Marcus, Bauman argued that

\textsuperscript{130} Readers may observe that this thesis also focuses primarily on a synchronic rather than a diachronic analysis of representations of the Jew, and that as a consequence it does little to show the evolving nature of myths and stereotypes over time. However, this thesis neither argues that conventional approaches to historiography are problematic nor locates discourse in a self-contained épistèmé (the epistemic framework in which the collective discourses of a culture for a particular period are set). Evolution tends to be a slow gradual affair, with radical shifts and mutations being rare exceptions. Had the timeframe of this project been wider, it is probable that an evolution of the myths and stereotypes would have presented itself, and a more diachronic analysis would thus have been appropriate. Despite the focus on structures of discourse rather than developments over time, this thesis does acknowledge the historical antecedents of the Christ-Killer, Ritual Murderer and Antichrist representations (see introduction to chapter two), and the stereotype of the Greedy Jew (introduction to chapter three).

\textsuperscript{131} See Cheyette, \textit{Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society}, 8-9, 268-269; Cheyette, “Neither Excuse nor Accuse,” 433.

\textsuperscript{132} New Historicism is a (loose) school of thought in literary criticism. Whilst it is often claimed that New Historicism promotes a more complete and mutual understanding of history and literature, closely following Foucault it ends up emphasising historical discontinuity, the unusual and the anecdotal. For good introductions to New Historicism (and examples of it), see Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, \textit{Practicing New Historicism} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); H. Aram Veeser, ed., \textit{The New Historicism} (New York: Routledge, 1989); H. Aram Veeser, ed., \textit{The New Historicism Reader} (New York: Routledge, 1994). Cheyette does not mention New Historicism directly in his examination of \textit{Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society}, though the back cover does state that “new historicism” is part of the approach that he adopts. Cheyette also cites with approval (albeit in passing) essays by Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, two of the original founders of New Historicism. See Cheyette, \textit{Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society}, 2, 43, 49, 52, 53, 97.


“given the ordering, classifying nature of modernity – signified, above all, by the rise of the nation-state – the ambivalence of ‘the Jew’ was particularly threatening because he or she made light of all modern ‘social, political and cultural distinctions.’” Cheyette similarly concludes that there was a “bewildering variety” of constructions of the Jew in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, and that this was “particularly threatening to those who would wish to exert a sense of control and order over an increasingly unmanageable ‘reality.’”

This project reaches a quite different conclusion to Cheyette. Constructions of the Jew could be relatively stable in at least some contexts. More specifically, after a wide-ranging examination of the English Catholic discourse, this project concludes that English Catholic constructions of the Jew in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century were protean and yet reasonably stable structures. The term “construction” is thus used in this thesis to signify a distinct composite creation which drew upon a combination of contemporary stereotypes and traditional myths. For example, William Barry, a frequent commentator on Jews and Freemasons, drew upon stereotypes of Jewish greed, foreignness and secrecy, and myths about a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy and the Jewish Antichrist, to produce his own distinctive construction of the Jew. Gilbert Chesterton drew upon the ritual murder myth and most of the contemporary stereotypes (including greed, cowardice, pacifism, a lack of patriotism and secrecy), to produce a number of complex constructions of the Jew. Whilst the core stereotypes and myths were relatively stable and few in number, the potential permutations of composite constructions based upon them were extremely large. However, in reality, the constructions of one English Catholic author were never radically different to those of another; they were varied and distinct, but there were always points of similarity, and they were by no means protean to the point of being radically fluid.

135 Cheyette and Marcus, “Some Methodological Anxieties,” 10. This line of argument can be seen in Bauman’s analogy of “modern culture [as] a garden culture.” See Bauman, Modernity and the Holocaust, 91-93, passim.
136 Cheyette, Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society, 268.
Thesis Structure

The next five chapters of this thesis examine the various myths, stereotypes and constructions of “the Jew” that were discovered in English Catholic discourse during this investigation. Chapter two introduces some of the roles assigned to the Jews in a number of traditional Christian myths. These persistent mythological roles were first developed during the first four centuries of the Christian era (in the case of “the Pharisee,” “the Christ-Killer” and “the Jewish Antichrist”) and during the Middle Ages (in the case of “the Ritual Murderer” and “the Jewish Sorcerer”). The chapter examines how these myths continued to function and were incorporated into complex constructions of the Jew in English Catholic discourse during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. Chapter three serves a similar function to chapter two, but introducing and examining some of the popular contemporary stereotypes rather than traditional myths. These stereotypes, “the Greedy Jew,” “the Jewish Coward,” “the Unpatriotic Jew” and “the Secretive Jew,” tended to render the Jew an alien parasite and untrustworthy villain within the body politic. Chapter four examines myths and stereotypes of “the Freemason,” the main counterpart to “the Jew” in English Catholic discourse, and how representations of the Jew and the Freemason combined and coalesced to form a construction of “the Masonic-Jewish Camarilla.” Chapter five examines English Catholic constructions of “the Zionist Menace.” These constructions became popular after the Balfour Declaration. It was by far the most prominent type of representation of the Jew in English Catholic discourse during 1922 when the British Mandate passed through its ratification process. Chapter five focuses on this intense period of anti-Zionism (i.e. 1917 to 1922), examining the constructions of the Zionist Menace in each of the main English Catholic periodicals, as well as by prominent individuals, such as Cardinal Bourne and Sir Mark Sykes. Chapter six examines the “solutions” proposed by English Catholics to the so-called “Jewish problem.” One solution which received positive reviews in most English Catholic periodicals was Belloc’s proposal of “recognition” and “privilege”. These were euphemisms for segregation. Other proposals included conversion (proposed by the Catholic Guild of Israel) and Zionism (proposed by Gilbert Chesterton).

The final chapter of this thesis presents the conclusions drawn during the course of this investigation. In summary, the material discovered seems to reveal that
representations of the Jew in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century were not always modern in character. In the case of the English Catholic discourse, they were often pre-modern or anti-modern. Many existing studies of English antisemitism argue that by the late nineteenth century, constructions of the Jew based on traditional Christian myths had largely, though not entirely, been replaced by modern socio-political and racial forms of antisemitism. This study however demonstrates that traditional religious myths about the Jews continued to thrive and function in the English Catholic discourse. Their continued existence was not confined to a handful of narrative artefacts from a bygone era. English Catholic constructions of the Jew combined these persistent Christian myths with other more contemporary social stereotypes, though surprisingly, the one element that was usually absent from these constructions was “race.” Jews were rarely denigrated as racially inferior in the English Catholic discourse and there were few references to biology or pseudo-scientific “race” theories. They were however portrayed as usurious, cowardly, disloyal and secretive villains and diabolized as Pharisees, Christ-Killers, fanatical murderers, sorcerers and Antichrists. They were often portrayed in conjunction with Freemasons, who were vilified as secretive anti-Christian revolutionaries and diabolized as servants of Satan. In some cases the language used to describe the Jew, the Zionist and the Freemason, drew upon a vocabulary which suggested an apocalyptic war between the forces of good and evil.
2. The Jew in Traditional Myths

At the dawn of the Christian era, the foundation was established for a complex and protean myth: the long awaited Jewish messiah whose coming was foretold in the Hebrew Scriptures was rejected and killed by the Jews. Two key roles, sometimes rendered distinct but often conjoined, were assigned to the Jews in this myth. The first role, “the Pharisee,” was depicted as blind, arrogant, stubborn, mean, manipulative, hypocritical and legalistic. According to the foundation myth, the Pharisee would not embrace the truth of God’s new covenant.\(^1\) The second role, “the Christ-Killer,” was the paramount villain of all time, who rejected, hounded and called for the death of the messiah. According to the myth, by rejecting the messiah and the new covenant, the Jews rejected God. God in turn rejected them, and replaced them with the Church as the “new Israel.”

The foundation myth, being protean, evolved over time, as did the role of the Jews within it. Paul’s second epistle to the community at Thessalonica warned that the second coming of Christ will be preceded by the appearance of “the man of sin” who will work false miracles and exalt himself over God, setting himself up in God’s Temple, all in accordance with the plans of Satan (2 Thess 2:1-17). The “man of sin” was subsequently linked to the Antichrist mentioned in John’s first and second Epistle (1 John 2:18-22, 4:3, 2 John 1:7). Various diabolic figures from the Book of Daniel and the Book of Revelation have also been interpreted as relating to the Antichrist. These allusions to a diabolic character were fleshed out over time. It was perhaps inevitable that the Jews, already key villains in Christian myths, and the Antichrist, would coalesce into a new mythological role, “the Jewish Antichrist,” whose arrival would mark the beginning of an apocalyptic conflict. The early Church Fathers increasingly linked the prophesied Antichrist with the Jews.\(^2\) The Antichrist, they

---

1 Trachtenberg points out that it was believed by some Christians that the Jews were wilful rather than ignorant in their rejection. For example, some early Church Fathers, such as Jerome and Justinian, complained that the Rabbis “deliberately perverted the meaning of the original text.” Medieval scholars even accused Jews of “tampering with the text of the Bible in an effort to destroy its Christological meaning.” Joshua Trachtenberg, *The Devil and the Jews: The Medieval Conception of the Jew and its Relation to Modern Antisemitism* (1943; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1983), 15, 153.

2 The earliest explicit reference to a Jewish Antichrist in the texts of the Church Fathers seems to have been by St. Irenaeus in the 2nd century. In *Adversus Haereses* (Against Heresies), Irenaeus concluded that the Antichrist will one day come and he will be from the tribe of Dan. See Irenaeus, *Five Books of*
declared, would be a Jew and would be worshipped by the Jews as their messiah.\textsuperscript{3} According to Perry and Schweitzer, a “composite symbol of the Jew” developed during the first five centuries of the Church. This composite symbol “combined the image of the Wandering or Eternal Jew with that of the agent of Satan and the Antichrist.”\textsuperscript{4} According to Norman Cohn, these constructions of the Jew were “revived and integrated into a whole new demonology” during the Middle Ages. Cohn stated that “from the time of the first crusade onwards Jews were presented as children of the Devil, agents employed by Satan for the express purpose of combating Christianity.”\textsuperscript{5} Robert Wistrich similarly observed that the medieval millenarian myth, “the apocalyptic fantasy of the Antichrist, a man who would lead the armies of the Devil against those of Christ, provided a popular, millenarian underpinning to the association of Jews with satanic forces.”\textsuperscript{6}

During the Middle Ages, the Jews were assigned a number of additional roles in Christian myths. The Jews were accused of spreading the Black Death by poison or magic and attacking the host wafers. According to Medieval Christian theology, the host wafers are literally the body of Christ. The Jews were thus portrayed as being guilty of repeating their crime of murdering Jesus. The Jews were also accused of torturing and murdering innocent Christian children, either for rituals commanded by Judaism, or to use their blood for magical and medicinal purposes, or simply because of \textit{odium fidei} (hatred of the faith). The Jews were thus assigned new roles in Christian myths as “the Ritual Murderer” and “the Jewish Sorcerer.” According to many of the ritual murder accusations, these crimes sometimes involved crucifixion and were thus another form of reenactment, or mockery, of the original murder of Christ.\textsuperscript{7}


\textsuperscript{4} Perry and Schweitzer, \textit{Antisemitism: Myth and Hate}, 18.

\textsuperscript{5} Cohn, \textit{Warrant for Genocide}, 26.

\textsuperscript{6} Wistrich, \textit{Antisemitism}, 30. For a good introduction to the Jewish Antichrist myth, see Trachtenberg, \textit{The Devil and the Jews}, 32-43. For an introduction to millenarian expectations of a battle between the forces of Christ and the Antichrist, see Norman Cohn, \textit{The Pursuit of the Millennium} (1957; repr., London: Pimlico, 1993). See also Maccoby, \textit{The Sacred Executioner}, 171-175.

\textsuperscript{7} Maccoby observed that the “sufferings and bloodshed of Jesus are continually renewed” in Christian myths, with the role of “Sacred Executioners” being repeatedly assigned to the Jews. Maccoby, \textit{The Sacred Executioner}, 147. Felsenstein also observes that the “deicidal image of the Jew” was reinforced by the accusation that “during Passover Jews were possessed by the fiendish desire to reenact the
Conventional wisdom in studies of antisemitism and Jewish history tends to suggest that by the nineteenth century religious prejudice had largely been replaced by modern forms of hostility. For example, Robert Wistrich observed that “with the decline of religious faith in post-medieval European society the traditional theological hostility towards the ‘deicide’ people became less relevant.”\(^8\) According to Todd Endelman, by the eighteenth century, “anti-Jewish sentiment” in England had largely been transformed into “secular rather than religious language.” Hostility still existed, but it was often independent of “any theological framework, even if religious animosity was its initial inspiration.” The main accusation was no longer that Jews had rejected Christ but that they were the “embodiment of unrestrained, morally unfettered, economic individualism.”\(^9\) Frank Felsenstein and Anthony Julius both supported Endelman’s assessment that the prejudices rooted in narratives about the murder of Christ, ritual murder, the Antichrist and the Devil, decreased significantly during the late eighteenth century.\(^10\) Even studies which have stressed the resilience of myths about diabolic Jews tend to suggest that the myths have been reformulated into modern stereotypes. For example, Joshua Trachtenberg’s classic treatise, *The Devil and the Jews* (1943), argues that the medieval rendering of the Jews as demonic figures was no mere metaphor for worldly vilification. Jews were literally regarded as agents of a metaphysical evil, “deliberately guilty of unspeakable crimes against the founder of the Christian faith and the Christian Church, and against its adherents as individuals.” Their most heinous desire was “to destroy Christianity and

---

8 Wistrich, *Antisemitism*, 43. Conversely, Wistrich did highlight the coalescence of racial, socio-political and theological myths in Nazi ideology in *Hitler’s Apocalypse: Jews and the Nazi Legacy* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1985). For example, he observed that “it was from Christian theology that the Nazis had ultimately inherited their demonological view of Jews and Judaism as a satanic force and the embodiment of universal evil.” (137).

9 Endelman, *The Jews of Britain*, 67-71. See also Todd M. Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714-1830* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979), 86-117. According to *The Jews of Georgian England*, there were “more than a few otherwise sensible men” in the eighteenth century who accused Jews of blaspheming Jesus, murdering Christian children, being the synagogue of Satan, the children of the Devil and the incarnation of Antichrist. These accusations were mainly by “adherents of the High Church party” (87). The turning point appears to have been 1753. These accusations can be found in 1753 (i.e. when the Jewish Naturalization Act was being debated), but according to Endelman, “it becomes increasingly difficult to trace after 1753 the presence and influence of traditional Christian beliefs about the Jews” (91). However, as my study will show, these myths continued to play a significant role in the English Catholic discourse in the early twentieth century.

Christendom.” According to Trachtenberg, the Jew was regarded as “the inveterate enemy of mankind” and “no sin was too foul to be adduced against him.” The Jew was believed to be evil personified, in league with the Devil, the harbinger of the Antichrist, and the Ritual Murderer of Christian children. The Jew was also portrayed as the Satanic “magician par excellence,” whose sorcery was often linked to the murder of innocent children in order to obtain their blood. The Jew was thus the ideal scapegoat to explain everything bad that befell society. Trachtenberg concluded that this diabolisation of the Jew has prevailed into the modern era, but that “the contemporaneous lexicon of Jewish crime” has been updated with modern terms. He suggested that outmoded crimes, such as “satanism and sorcery,” have for the most part (though not entirely) been transmuted into “international communist” and “international banker.” This conventional wisdom probably reflects the general English discourse during the timeframe of this project. Nevertheless, whilst there was also a measure of this transmutation in the English Catholic discourse, traditional myths, with their cast of Jewish diabolists, continued to be a pervasive aspect of it. This chapter examines the continued presence of representations of the Jew from traditional Christian myths – i.e. the Pharisee, the Christ-killer, the Ritual Murderer, the Jewish Sorcerer and the Jewish Antichrist – in English Catholic discourse during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century.

The Pharisee and the Christ-Killer

The most common source within the English Catholic discourse for the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer were the sermons and pastoral letters of priests and bishops. Selective elements from traditional myths were drawn upon to make salutary points about Christian virtues and non-Christian vices. One of the masters of this form of sermon was a prominent convert from the Anglican to the Catholic Church, Ronald Knox, a

14 Some studies have suggested that these myths not only prevailed into the twentieth century, they also played a pivotal role in modern antisemitism. See for example Hyam Maccoby, “The Origins of Anti-Semitism,” in Randolph Braham, ed., The Origins of the Holocaust: Christian Anti-Semitism (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 1986); Cohn, Warrant for Genocide.
celebrated priest, theologian and novelist.\textsuperscript{15} Many of his sermons have been collected into volumes and published. His sermons were often peppered with references to Jews and Pharisees, especially those dealing with the parables of Jesus. According to Knox, “the Pharisee” in Jesus’ parables represents “the Jews, and especially the strict Jews.”\textsuperscript{16} He argued that the Pharisees were full of “pride and blindness,”\textsuperscript{17} trusted in their “own righteousness”\textsuperscript{18} and “misinterpreted the meaning of the old dispensation.”\textsuperscript{19} “The Pharisees,” Knox concluded, “could not accept Christ” because of “their hatred of everything Gentile” and their “blind traditional interpretations of the law.” “The Jews had rejected their God” and so “God rejects his people.” Knox explained that “the Jews have so long been accustomed to being the sole beneficiaries of God’s covenant with man that it seems incredible to them now that God should be able to do without them.”\textsuperscript{20} According to Knox, as the Pharisees listened to the parables of Jesus, they were sure there was something blasphemous about them, something that could only “be expiated by a cross.” When they realised that Jesus was “speaking of them,” the only thing that prevented them seizing Him there and then was their fear of “the multitude.” This was, he suggested, the “prelude to Gethsemane and to Calvary.”\textsuperscript{21} “God’s patience,” he stated, “lasts very long,” and thus he did not reject “the Jews” until they “crowned their apostasy with the murder of his own Son.”\textsuperscript{22} Knox repeated these narratives in articles published in \textit{The Cross}, the

\textsuperscript{15} Ronald Knox (1888-1957) was a close friend of Hilaire Belloc and Gilbert Chesterton. Knox was born into a wealthy Anglican family. His father, Edmund Knox, was the Anglican Bishop of Manchester. Knox was ordained an Anglican priest in 1912, converted to Roman Catholicism in 1917 and was ordained a Roman Catholic priest in 1919. His sermons were crafted with meticulous care, highly articulate and in demand. According to Kevin Morris and Ulrike Ehret, Knox developed sympathies for fascism, though he subsequently opposed Nazism (as it infringed upon the rights of the Church). Kevin L. Morris, “Fascism and British Catholic Writers 1924-1939,” \textit{Chesterton Review}, XXV, no.1&2 (February 1999), 31, 38; Ehret, “Catholics and Antisemitism,” 177. A number of works have been written about Knox. See for example Evelyn Waugh, \textit{Ronald Knox} (London: Cassell, 1959) and Robert Speaight, \textit{Ronald Knox the Writer} (London: Sheed and Ward, 1966). See also \textit{Who Was Who}, 1951-1960 (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1961), 628.

\textsuperscript{16} Ronald Knox, “Grace and Good Works,” in \textit{The Mystery of the Kingdom} (London: Sheed & Ward, 1928), 98-99. This sermon and all the other Knox sermons cited in this chapter from \textit{The Mystery of the Kingdom} were delivered at the Carmelites’ Church in Kensington and published in 1928.

\textsuperscript{17} Ronald Knox, “The Incarnation” (1928), in \textit{Mystery of the Kingdom}, 13-14.

\textsuperscript{18} Ronald Knox, “Equality of Reward” (1928), in \textit{Mystery of the Kingdom}, 120.

\textsuperscript{19} Ronald Knox, “Parable” (1928), in \textit{Mystery of the Kingdom}, 8.

\textsuperscript{20} Ronald Knox, “Reprobation” (1928), in \textit{Mystery of the Kingdom}, 80-83.

\textsuperscript{21} Ronald Knox, “Parable” (1928), in \textit{Mystery of the Kingdom}, 3-4.

\textsuperscript{22} Ronald Knox, “Equality of Reward” (1928), in \textit{Mystery of the Kingdom}, 119.
periodical of the Passionists based in Dublin. He suggested that the Pharisees were obsessed with fulfilling “the old law.” Christians should, he argued, go beyond “the Scribes and Pharisees,” not by adding “a series of codicils, as lifeless, as uninspiring as the rest.” They should not add even more rules, but carry out God’s commandments “in the spirit” rather than “in the letter.” His point was that unlike the Pharisees, “Christians ought to have a law, written not on tables of stone, but on our inmost hearts; a principle of active charity which ought to supersede the necessity for commandments.”

Since the early centuries of the Christian era, a variety of Jews have been held accountable for crucifying Christ, and often this multiplicity would be found in a single narrative. This was also the case in the modern English Catholic discourse. For example, Knox explained that it was not just the “Pharisees” who “rejected and crucified our Lord.” The Jewish “Zealots” expected a military leader. They were ready to support Jesus until “they discovered that his kingdom was not of this world” and that his warfare would not be “against the Roman oppressor.” The “Sadducees” considered Jesus “a political menace.” According to Knox, whichever type of Jew they were, fanatical Zealot, obscurantist Pharisee or worldly Sadducee, “they all crucify Christ.”

Father Bernard Vaughan, brother of Cardinal Archbishop Vaughan, was a popular clergyman in his own right, and like Knox, his sermons were in demand all over the country. Also like Knox, he explained that all varieties of Jews were responsible for the murder of Christ. In an address delivered at the Church of the Immaculate Conception in 1907, he stated that “Priests and Levites, Pharisees and Scribes, Sadducees and Herodians, servants and soldiers, young men and women, and children innumerable, all came forth to see the end, the crucifixion and death of Jesus Christ.” Invoking the moment for his audience, he asked them to “picture for one moment the wild and mad Eastern mob, tossing to and fro, screaming and gesticulating in their flowing garments of every shade.” He observed that “they are,

23 The Passionists are members of a Catholic order (the Congregation of Discalced Clerks of the Most Holy Cross and Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ), founded in the eighteenth century. The Cross often contained articles by prominent English Catholics, including Knox, Belloc and Gilbert Chesterton.
25 Ronald Knox, “Reprobation” (1928), in Mystery of the Kingdom, 80-81.
most of them at any rate, discussing the situation, and congratulating one another on the verdict which rids their nation of another arch imposter.”

Sermons by other priests also referred to the rejection of Christ. For example, Father Bede Jarrett, the head of the English Dominicans and the founder and president of the Catholic Guild of Israel, combined the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer in a sermon delivered in 1915. According to a report of this sermon in the Catholic Times, Jarrett pointed out that Christ was “done to death” as a result of a “political accusation.” According to Jarrett, the noteworthy thing was that Christ was “accused by the Pharisees because He adopted their political ideas.” His teachings were too pure and sincere for the Pharisees and so, in their “sheer hypocrisy,” they denied their own politics in order to denounce Him. A sermon in 1915 by the auxiliary Bishop of Salford, John Stephen Vaughan (another brother of the Cardinal Archbishop), stated that when the world goes astray and “is in danger of forgetting Him, God does not abandon it, but He rises up and visits it with the most unmistakable signs of His displeasure.” As an example he cited the fate of the Jews: God summoned up “the Romans with their armies,” and used them to wrought destruction upon Jerusalem, “in punishment of the sins and crimes of the perfidious Jews.”

In addition to these sermons, the follies of Jewish “legalism” and the rejection of Christ also featured in the carefully constructed pastoral letters of the bishops and

---

27 Bernard Vaughan, Society, Sin and the Saviour (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1908), 183-184. Bernard Vaughan also drew upon ostensibly positive stereotypes of Jewish character. For example, in a lecture to the West Central Jewish Men’s Club, he stated that “heredity, a great engraver of character, had marked the Jewish race off from the religions of the world.” He observed that Jewish family life was excellent and that there is “nothing finer than the filial affection and domestic happiness that prevailed among the Jewish community.” See “Father Vaughan on Jewish Character,” Universe, 22 May 1914, 10. He made similar remarks about Jews being “good husbands and wives,” “kind and careful parents” and “excellent citizens, sober, patient, industrious and thrifty,” at a meeting about the Beilis trial. See “Fr. Vaughan and the Jews,” Catholic Herald, 15 November 1913, 2.

28 “Christ or Caesar: Sermon by Father Bede Jarrett, O.P.,” Catholic Times (London edition only), 29 October 1915, 7. The sermon was delivered at St James’ Roman Catholic Church, Spanish Place, London. Bede Jarrett (1881-1934) was the head of the English Dominicans from 1916 onwards. He founded the Catholic Guild of Israel in 1917 in order to improve efforts to convert the Jews in England. The Catholic Guild of Israel is discussed in chapter six. For more information about Jarrett, see Gervase Mathew and Kenneth Wykeham-George, Bede Jarrett of the Order of Preachers (London: Blackfriars Publications, 1952).

29 John Stephen Vaughan, “The Scourge of War,” The Catholic Pulpit, Universe, 13 August 1915, 6. This sermon was delivered at Salford Cathedral on 5 August 1915. John Stephen Vaughan (1853-1925) was the youngest brother of Cardinal Archbishop Vaughan. He was the auxiliary Bishop of Salford.
archbishops of the English hierarchy. Edward Ilsley, the first Archbishop of Birmingham, one of the largest and most important Roman Catholic divisions in England, referred to the Jews in a number of his pastoral letters. In his mid-Lent pastoral for 1916, he stated that the Jewish sacrifices could have but little efficacy for the “remission of sins.” “At the best they came from a tainted source,” he stated, and “possessed no worth which could make them pleasing to God.” The sacrifices of “the Old Law,” he maintained, “availed only to give the Jews an external, ceremonial purification, but were powerless to cleanse the soul from sin.”

In a pastoral for Quinquagesima Sunday in 1916, Ilsley stated that God repeatedly visited “the infidelities of the Jewish people with the scourge of war and of pestilence, and finally of national ruin and rejection.” This was because they “repeatedly rejected Him.” Ilsley referred back to this pastoral letter in the following year, pointing out again that “the history of the human race, and especially of the Jewish nation, brings home to us the truth that Almighty God punishes sin not only in the next life, but also in this.” “Time after time the infidelities of the Jewish people,” Ilsley stated, “were visited by the death of thousands.”

In another pastoral letter, Ilsley declared that “the revealed truth of the Divinity of Christ was denied and called in question from its first affirmation.” He stated that “the Jews, of course, refused to believe it.” Archbishop John McIntyre, Ilsley’s friend and assistant for many years and his successor at

---

30 For a nuanced discussion of “legalism,” see Bernard Jackson, “Legalism,” Journal of Jewish Studies, XXX, no.1, Spring 1979, 1-22. Jackson observes that the notion of “legalism” is a Christian concept and one that ideally neither Jews nor lawyers world have to deal with.

31 Edward Ilsley (1838-1926) was Bishop (1888-1911) and Archbishop of Birmingham (1911-1921). After the reintroduction of the Catholic hierarchy in 1850, England consisted of one ecclesiastical province (the Archdiocese of Westminster and several suffragan dioceses). Due to rapid growth, the Catholic Church in England was reorganised in 1911 into three ecclesiastical provinces (Westminster, Birmingham and Liverpool). Francis Bourne, the Archbishop of Westminster, was made a Cardinal at the same time. Ironically, Bourne had less power as Cardinal-Archbishop than he did previously. The Archbishop of Westminster continued to enjoy certain privileges, but he was now in effect the first amongst three equals. Bourne sought permission to use the title, “Primate of England and Wales,” in order to solidify his position. Archbishop Ilsley, one of two new archbishops, was one of the leading voices of objection. Bourne was not granted the title of Primate and over the following years a heated rivalry developed between Bourne and Ilsley over the boundaries of the dioceses. See Mary McInally, Edward Ilsley: Archbishop of Birmingham (London: Burns & Oates, 2002), 309-329, 342-344.

32 Edward Ilsley, pastoral letter, Mid-Lent Sunday 1916, pp.6-7, Birmingham Archdiocesan Archives.

33 Edward Ilsley, pastoral letter, Quinquagesima Sunday 1916, p.5, Birmingham Archdiocesan Archives. Quinquagesima Sunday was the Sunday before Ash Wednesday (fifty days before Easter Day). The term has largely fallen out of use since Vatican II.

34 Edward Ilsley, pastoral letter, Quinquagesima Sunday 1917, pp.3-4, Birmingham Archdiocesan Archives.

Birmingham, similarly stated that, “God turned to the Gentiles and called them to inherit His ancient promises which the Jews had fallen away from by reason of their infidelity.”

Pastorals by many other bishops referred or alluded to the murder of Christ and the emptiness of Jewish legalism. William Gordon, the Bishop of Leeds, did not explicitly link the “awful death of Calvary” to the Jews, but he did state that on the night before his death, he closed “the Jewish dispensation” and instituted “the New Covenant with His Christian people.”

George Ambrose Burton, the Bishop of Clifton, alluding to a passage in Luke 18:32, stated that: “He shall be delivered to the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and scourged, and spit upon; and after they have scourged Him, they will put him to death.” Burton went on to state that the Passion of Christ continues to hold an “abiding significance” even though it has been “some two thousand years since the wild shouts of the Jewish people filled Pilate’s praetorium.”

William Cotter, the Bishop of Portsmouth, stated in 1916, that “it would be a great mistake to suppose that by the mere exterior act of fasting, we should fulfil all our obligations to Almighty God.” “The Jews,” Cotter continued, “fasted even according to the letter of the precept; but God answered them with a reproach.” The important point is not, he suggested, to observe every rigour of the law with proud passion, but rather to fulfil the spirit of the law with humility and “deep sorrow for our sins.”

In 1924, Cotter informed his flock, that “in the story of the passion of Our Lord there is an incident which causes us a special horror.” According to Cotter, “when the Jews were offered by Pontius Pilate the choice between Jesus and Barabbas,” they shouted out, “take away Jesus: let him be crucified.” This incident should, he suggested, cause us to “shudder with horror.” This sermon provides an example of the representation of


39 William Timothy Cotter, pastoral letter, Quinquagesima Sunday 1916, pp.7-8, Acta Episcoporum Angliae, Salford Diocesan Archives. Cotter (1866-1940) was born and trained as a priest in Ireland, ordained in 1892, appointed Canon of Portsmouth in 1900, and Bishop of the same diocese in 1910. See Who Was Who, 1929-1940, 291.
the Jew as Christ-Killer being used to instruct Christians about the dangers of sin. Cotter suggested that Christians should not be complacent, as they too are guilty of rejecting God and turning away from Jesus every time they place their “sinful whims” over the love of God. This was, Cotter suggested, even worse than the crime of “the Jews,” since they at least “knew not what they were doing.”

These sermons and pastoral letters, for the most part repeated key aspects of traditional myths about the Jews, mainly taken or adapted from the New Testament. The main function of the mythological villains in these addresses, would seem to have been to provide a foil against which Christian virtues could be favourably contrasted. It seems unlikely that these sermons and pastoral letters were intended by their authors as templates for the deliberate stereotyping of contemporary Jews, but it is likely that these and countless sermons and pastorals just like them fulfilled an important function in preserving and replicating the myth of the Jew as a diabolic villain. In this respect they were similar in function, if milder in tone, than corresponding sermons from the early centuries of the Christian era and the Middle Ages. They helped to ensure that myths about the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer survived into the next generation.

These sermons and pastoral letters may have been ostensibly innocent, at least by intention, but the myth of the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer was sometimes formulated in such a way that the contemporary Jew became a part of the narrative. For example, Ronald Knox suggested that the character of the Jewish “race” has been shaped by their rejection of Jesus. According to a sermon by Knox, “with each fresh rejection of God’s messengers the habit of rebellion has grown deeper into the Jewish heart.” “Their character,” he stated, has been moulded by “act after act of apostasy.”

Another example is provided by a sermon preached at a meeting of the Catholic Guild of Israel by the Rev. Dr. Arendzen, a respected scholar, author and member of the Catholic Missionary Society. Arendzen argued that “the history of the world is the

---

40 William Timothy Cotter, pastoral letter, Quinquagesima Sunday 1924, pp.5-6.
41 Ronald Knox, “The Patience of God” (1928), in Mystery of the Kingdom, 62.
42 Rev Dr John Arendzen (1873-1954) held a PhD from Bonn University, a Doctor of Divinity from Munich and a BA and MA from Cambridge. He was an expert in philosophy, theology and Arabic, and the author of many books and articles on religion. He was a member of the Catholic Missionary Society
history of a school.” “Israel,” the first pupils of “God’s school,” had “a contempt and disdain for all the world.” They would not accept the teachings of Jesus and instead “crucified him on the hill of Calvary.” “The Jews” were thus replaced by “the gentiles,” who “became the good school of God.” Bringing the story forward to the present day, Arendzen argued that Israel “have gone their own way for these two thousand years. They still have their old school books, the old testament, and the Jews know their old testament very well in the old Hebrew language. The Jews are a proud people and they despise all others.”

The Guild minutes described his address as “a beautiful sermon on behalf of the people of Israel.” Arendzen’s sermon was clearly focused not only on the mythologized Jews from the traditional foundation myth, but also on contemporary Jews, who, he alleged, continue to despise all non-Jews. These sermons no longer merely replicated myths. They incorporated mythological roles (i.e. the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer) and stereotypes (i.e. prideful, disdainful, spiteful, powerful, rebellious Jews), into contemporary constructions of the Jew.

Whereas sermons and pastoral letters tended to replicate and preserve the myth of the diabolic Jewish villain, and in some exceptional cases were formulated in such a way as to generalise the villainy to contemporary Jews, the Catholic Herald conversely had a much more overt role in combining the myths with modern stereotypes in order to create a complex construction. As the next chapter will demonstrate, the Catholic Herald drew upon a number of modern stereotypes as part of its complex but unequivocally hostile construction of the Jew. Charles Diamond, the owner-editor of the Catholic Herald and a political firebrand and maverick, was not particularly concerned about the deep theological significance of the Jew in Christian myths. Diamond saw himself as a champion of Catholicism, Christian civilisation and Irish nationalism. It seems that he disliked Jews and Freemasons, not

and the Catholic Evidence Guild. He attended a number of meetings of the Catholic Guild of Israel, though it is not clear if he attended as a guest or as a member.

43 John Arendzen, sermon, 28 November 1921, Catholic Guild of Israel Archives, Sion Centre for Dialogue and Encounter, London (hereafter cited as CGI Archives).
44 Guild Minute Book, entry for 28 November 1921, taped into minute book at page 50, CGI Archives.
45 Charles Diamond (1858-1934) was born in Ireland in 1858. He was M.P. for North Monaghan from 1892-1895. He also contested districts of London for the Labour Party in 1918, 1922 and 1924. Diamond was a maverick who frequently got into trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities. He was repeatedly criticised by the English bishops, not for his hostile articles about Jews, but because he tended to disrespect and undermine their ecclesiastical authority. A resolution was passed by the bishops in 1910, expressing their distaste with the Catholic Herald, which tended to “lessen the respect
as a consequence of theological concerns, but because he saw them as a foreign and threatening presence within Christian civilisation. He felt that the European nations should have the right to expel the Jews. “His civilisation is not Christian,” the newspaper warned, and “his ethics, his morality, are not Christian. He has a deadly hatred of Christianity.” Whilst he was not concerned with theology per se, Diamond was happy to draw upon aspects of the Christian foundation myth in order to make his constructions of the Jew more powerful. The main function of the foundation myth for Diamond seems to have been to give the newspaper’s construction of the villainous Jew the added weight of scriptural authority. If the original function of the Christ-Killer myth was to justify the usurpation of the Jewish claim to be the true Israel, it was now used to justify the continued suppression of the Jews living in Christian society. An editorial in 1914 provides a useful example. This editorial was written in response to a report that a rabbi-chaplain had been killed whilst attending a dying Catholic soldier on the battlefield with a crucifix to ease his passing. The editorial stated that this story was improbable. It went on to suggest that there is “ample evidence” to show that most Jews are more than willing to “trample upon the Christian name” and to treat the crucifix with anything but respect. The editorial argued that the Jews had pillaged the Church in France and that their houses are filled with the plunder. The editorial made its construction of the Jew more diabolic by drawing upon the foundation myth. The newspaper thus combined myths about the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer with stereotypes about Jewish greed. It stated that “the First Christian of all and the Founder of Christianity [was] put to death, the supreme tragedy of history, by the Jewish people.” The editorial concluded with the following question: “If our Jewish brethren still live under the Old Law, the old dispensation, which permitted ‘an

due from all Catholics to ecclesiastical authority.” Acta of the Bishops’ Low Week and Autumn Meetings, 5 April 1910, file EP/A/1, Birmingham Archdiocesan Archives. Diamond also got into trouble with the British authorities when one of his articles suggested that a failed attempt to assassinate Lord French, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, should not be considered an attempted murder. He argued that the action was justified since “English government in Ireland is not government. It is simply usurpation, brutality, and oppression.” As a result he spent several months in Pentonville Prison (January – August 1920). For the article that got him into trouble, see “Killing no Murder,” Notes and Comments, Catholic Herald, 27 December 1919, 6-7. For an article that described his experiences in prison, see “Mr Diamond’s Release: Story of His Experiences in Pentonville,” Catholic Herald, 14 August 1920. 3. Diamond articulated a mixture of left-wing politics, energetic Catholicism and Irish nationalism in the Catholic Herald, which attracted a large working class Catholic readership despite his fragile relationship with the bishops. For more on Charles Diamond, see Edwards and Storey, “The Irish Press in Victorian Britain,” 172-176; Aspden, Fortress Church, 33-34, 88, 96; Who Was Who, 1929-1940, 363.

eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth’ and which made it lawful to ‘spoil the Egyptians’ and all others who were not Jews, and if they have in certain specific and proved cases shown themselves ready and willing to act on these principles, are we to take it that the mere mention of the fact is evidence of a bigoted and persecuting spirit?”47 The paper’s implicit answer was no.

Charles Diamond reinforced his construction of the Jew with scriptural myth in several other issues of the Catholic Herald. In “The Jew and the World Ferment” (1919) and “Jewry” (1920), in addition to depicting the Jews as gamblers, usurers, parasites, tyrannical bullies, pathetic sycophants and vulgar materialists, Diamond also stated that

the Scribes and Pharisees, the wealthy Israelites, and most of the selfish and hard hearted multitude, sought only power, and glory and pre-eminence for their nation, and led by their rulers, the high priests and the body of the priesthood, they committed the paramount crime of all time.

The “paramount crime of all time” was, of course, the murder of Christ. Diamond suggested that whilst it is “beyond our province even to speculate” as to “how much of what Christians and non-Christians despise in them and denounce is due to what they have endured during the two thousand years of expiation of their unparalleled crime,” it was apparent that “their sufferings have not improved them.”48 Other articles and editorials in the Catholic Herald also combined references to “pharisaically dishonest action,” “haters of the Christian name” and “a denial of the Divinity of Christ,” with stereotypes of Jewish greed, cowardice, cunning, secrecy, treachery and the myth of a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy.49 The paper later complained that Jews had used their influence to have a movie, The Kings of Kings (1927), modified so that responsibility for the murder of Christ was confined to the Roman authorities and Caiaphas the High

---

48 “The Jew and the World Ferment,” Catholic Herald, 14 June 1919, 6 and “Jewry,” Catholic Herald, 26 June 1920, 11. The paper later argued that even if their “worst characteristics” can be traced back to their sufferings, “it may be said that they were not persecuted without reason.” “An Israelite without Guile,” Catholic Herald, 17 August 1929, 4. Even the bars of a prison cell did not prevent Charles Diamond making such claims. “Jewry,” signed “C.D.,” was published whilst Diamond was serving time in Pentonville.
Priest, rather than “the Jewish race as a whole.” This was, the Catholic Herald suggested, a gross falsification of the “historical record.”

The Tablet also contained articles which referred to the Pharisees and Christ-Killers, though less frequently and with a measure of ambivalence which was absent from the Catholic Herald. For example, an article in 1920 about pogroms in Poland deplored the violence that had been perpetrated against the Jews, but suggested that the problem was partly the result of a “Jewish population which has not assimilated with the Polish people, but perpetuates in itself an archaic polity, curious customs, and as meticulous an observance of its religious ordinances as that of the Pharisees 2,000 years ago. It is a foreign body in the very heart of the State, an Oriental civilization hitherto racially insoluble.”

A review in the Tablet of Herford’s What the World Owes to the Pharisees (1919), deprecated the Pharisees in traditional terms – their rejection of Christ and “unworthy conception of God” – suggesting that the “fundamental lie of Pharisaism” was that the “oral tradition” had “Divine authority.” This lie, the reviewer continued, separated the Pharisees from the “earlier Old Testament religion.” The reviewer concluded by linking the Pharisees with Zionism. He stated that “at the present time, when Zionism is so much in the air, one cannot but feel anxious as to what this Pharisaism, still so dominant among the Jews, is likely to produce, should they acquire political ascendancy in Palestine.”

Articles in other English Catholic periodicals linked critiques of Zionism to the construction of the Christ-Killer. For example, according to an article in the Month, it would be intolerable for the Jews to be “encouraged to overrun” the Holy Land. Donald Attwater, an author and journalist, listed a number of reasons, but foremost was the religious. He stated that the Jews were once “the Chosen people,” but as a result of their role in his “shameful death,” they have become “the accursed people.” It is, he suggested, one thing to forgive the Jews (though he pointed out that “neither the Jews as a people, nor their religious leaders, have ever made manifestation of any

50 “Jewish Culpability for the Crucifixion,” Notes and Comments, Catholic Herald, 14 January 1928, 8 and “To Please the Jews,” Catholic Herald, 21 January 1928, 8.


repentance for their crime”), but forgiveness does not entail a remission of their sentence. The “punishment of this race,” Attwater concluded, was “exile from the Promised Land.” The myth of the Christ-Killers once again justified their reduction in status from a chosen people to a wandering witness people. As chapter five will demonstrate, Attwater’s narrative about the rejection of Christ was far from atypical of English Catholic constrictions of the Zionist Menace.

Baron Friedrich von Hügel, a Roman Catholic reformer who wished to bring the Church in line with modernist principles, also embraced myths about the Pharisees. In a letter to his niece in January 1922, von Hügel stated that “Our Lord’s vehemence” was against “the Pharisees” because “claiming to be the religious teachers of the people at large, they made religion unbearably heavy and complicated for the poor.” He informed his niece a few months later, that at a meeting of the London School for the Study of Religion, he had “tried to show that Our Lord’s vehemence against the Pharisees was indeed sincere, and must be taken by us as indicating grave error in the Pharisees.” Despite his reputation for ecumenical thinking and his close friendship with Claude Montefiore, one of the founders of British Liberal Judaism, he generalised his criticisms of the Pharisees to include contemporary Jews and the contemporary synagogue. In March 1922, von Hügel suggested in a letter to one of his modernist friends, Maude Petre, that the Jewish Temple was closely akin to the Church. It was, he believed, “the Church for those ages.” It seems from his letter that von Hügel admired the priestly Judaism of the Temple periods and lamented its disappearance. He went on to state that “the Synagogue has practically entirely

53 Donald Attwater, “Religious Conditions in Palestine,” *Month*, CXLVIII (October 1926), 354. Attwater was an author and journalist. He worked with Herbert Thurston on the revised edition of Alban Butler’s *Lives of the Saints* (see footnote 89 in this chapter).
54 Baron Friedrich von Hügel (1852-1925) was born in Austria. He moved to England with his family when he was fifteen and adopted England as his home. He was friends with a number of prominent Catholic Modernists including Maude Petre, Alfred Loisy and George Tyrrell. For more on Friedrich von Hügel, see Maude D. Petre, *Von Hügel and Tyrrell: The Story of a Friendship* (London: J.M. Dent, 1937) and Michael de la Bedoyere, *The Life of Baron von Hügel* (London: J.M. Dent, 1951).
56 Friedrich von Hügel to Gwendolen Greene, 23 May 1922, in von Hügel, *Letters to a Niece*, 166.
57 The London School for the Study of Religion (LSSR) was set up in 1904 as an informal forum to discuss various aspects of religion. Montefiore and von Hügel were founding members. Baron von Hügel’s friendship with Montefiore and his involvement in this ecumenical forum were not however indicative of an unequivocally friendly attitude towards Jews qua Jews. For more about Claude Montefiore, his relationship with von Hügel and the LSSR, see Daniel R. Langton, *Claude Montefiore: His Life and Thought* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002).
supplanted the Temple in the temper and outlook of at least the average Jew, and the Synagogue is, I am convinced, curiously unlike the Church.” Friedrich von Hügel did not welcome this change. He stated that, “the more I have to do even with strictly religious Jews, the more I am struck, in spite of their legalisms, with their curious, distinctly bald individualism.” In June of the same year, von Hügel wrote to Petre in response to an article she published criticising Belloc’s The Jews. He suggested to Petre that it is not merely religion that marks the Jews as distinct, as their religion as practiced by “97 out of every 100 practising Jews,” places “an immense stress upon blood, upon race, upon their blood, upon their race.” He concluded that “they are, in this respect, like some National Church gone bad.”

There is only scant evidence upon which to speculate about the effect that these myths about the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer, repeated in sermons and pastoral letters, and incorporated into constructions of the Jew in English Catholic newspapers, had on the “ordinary” lay Catholic. Though anecdotal, oral testimony has been found that reinforces the suggestion that these myths did have at least some impact on “ordinary” Catholics during the 1910s and 1920s. For example, Mary Brady, a Catholic from Salford, admitted in her recollections that she used to shove and shout at Jews. She stated that “we always thought they killed our Lord you know. Who killed Christ we used to shout.” David Freedman, a correspondent for the Jewish Chronicle whose parents immigrated from Lithuania and Poland, remembered encountering “antisemitism” as a boy. He recalled that this was often from boys his own age, “mostly from Catholic schools,” such as St. Chad’s. They would shout taunts such as: “dirty Jew, who killed Christ? You killed Christ.”

---
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61 David Freeman, birth date: 1901, audio tape (recorded 1977), MJM: J85, Manchester Jewish Museum. As his recollection was of taunts from schoolboys of his own age (probably aged 9-14), the
Catholic from Manchester and former pupil of St. Chad’s, stated that he remembered Jewish lads blaspheming Christ and taking His name in vain. According to Jenner,

in those days, the feeling between the Christians and Jews were still present underneath, religious feelings, because if we had an argument, they’d start blaspheming at Christ. Some of them would. And we resented this, the Christian lads.

Jenner also expressed a profound fear of being set upon and killed when entering a Jew’s house. He stated that he was “frightened actually, as a child, was always frightened to go in the Jew’s house, because I used to hear these tales about Christian children being, you know, you’ve heard about them, about them being garrotted.”

The continued presence in English Catholic discourse of the myths about Jews murdering innocent Christian child is examined in the following section.

The Ritual Murderer and the Jewish Sorcerer

The ritual murder accusation was a medieval development of the Christ-Killer myth. Usually the accusation involved the murder of a Christian child, an innocent martyr and symbolic stand in for Jesus. In some cases it was even suggested that the child was nailed to a cross in mockery or reenactment of the original crime. The ritual murder myth did not disappear with the conclusion of the Middle Ages. In 1899, as the primary events of the Dreyfus Affair were drawing to a close, another drama was just beginning. In April 1899, in the Czech town of Polna, a young woman, Anežka Hrůzová, was murdered and dumped in a section of the town inhabited by poor Jews. A destitute Jew, Leopold Hilsner, was accused of having murdered Anežka. According to the indictment, the body “had been completely bled” and “the traces of blood found

likely date range for these memories was the years leading up to the First World War and possibly into the early years of the war (circa 1910-1915).

62 Harold Jenner, birth date: circa 1910, audio tape (recorded 1976), MJM: J131, Manchester Jewish Museum. It is difficult to exactly date these recollections. Based on dates mentioned in his testimony and the fact that they seem to include his adolescent childhood fears of entering a Jewish house and his memories as a lad of fighting Jews over their alleged blaspheming of Christ, they probably relate to an interval stretching from circa 1916 to the mid-1920s.

63 The victim was not always a child. In the case of the Hilsner Affair, the victim was a young woman (aged 19).
under the body did not correspond to the amount of blood one would expect to find.”

The implication was that Anežka was murdered in order to obtain as much of her blood as possible. Scientists and so-called experts in Jewish ritual murder were called in to examine the evidence and express their opinion on whether the murder was committed for religious ritual purposes. The trial of Hilsner became a concern for Jewry as a whole as it was not just Hilsner but Jews in general who were once again accused de facto of practising ritual murder.

In 1898, Herbert Thurston, a well respected Jesuit scholar and prolific author, outlined his views about the likely development of the ritual murder accusation in two works. He published an article on ritual murder in the *Month* and discussed the accusation in a book he edited on Saint Hugh, the Bishop of Lincoln. The article and book were written a year before the Hilsner Affair. According to Thurston, the article was prompted by the publication of two works which accused the Jews of ritual murder: *Les Juifs devant l’Eglise et l’Histoire* (1897) by Father Constant and the peculiarly named book by Richard Francis Burton, *The Jew, the Gipsy, and El Islam* (1898). Thurston refuted, at length, the charge that the Jews were required by rituals in their religion to murder Christian children and to use their blood for religious
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purposes. However, he suggested that Jews had, on occasion, murdered innocent Christian children in “odium fidei” and that it would have been “a matter of comparatively little moment” if Father Constant had “regarded these alleged murders as isolated and unauthorised outbreaks of fanaticism, reprobated with horror by the higher and better feeling of educated Israelites.” In his appendix to The Life of Saint Hugh of Lincoln, Thurston referred to an account in the Hebrew chronicles of Rabbi Joseph Ben Joshua Ben Meir, as evidence that “in some cases murders were undoubtedly committed by Jews.” The account in the chronicles does refer to the murder of a Christian child by an insane Jew. According to the account, on the 7th day of Adar in the year 4957 (1197 CE), “a Hebrew, a foolish man, met a Gentile girl and slaughtered her and cast her into the midst of a well, before the face of the sun, for he raved with madness.” This was presumably intended by Thurston as evidence that Jews could murder in oodium fidei, but the chronicles seem only to depict a spontaneous and motiveless murder by a crazed individual who happened to be Jewish. There is no indication that the girl had been murdered because she was Christian let alone as a consequence of oodium fidei. But for a turn of fate the victim may well have been Jewish.

Murder in oodium fidei was not the only explanation Thurston provided for the murder of Christian children. The other possible explanation was that the blood was required for Jewish sorcery. In his notes to The Life of Saint Hugh of Lincoln, Thurston stated that he was “inclined ... to adopt a suggestion,” made in a review in the Academy, that “the use of human blood taken from some innocent victim, really did enter into the magic spells of the professors of the black art.” He found this explanation to be compatible with what St. John Chrysostom had said about
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72 Thurston, The Life of Saint Hugh, 286-287; a review in the Academy did suggest that the blood of a murdered innocent was sometimes used in sorcery and that “the charge of ritual murder” may have sprung from the reputation that Jews had for “magic arts” rather than from a hatred of Judaism. “St. William of Norwich,” review of The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich, by A. Jessopp and M. R. James, eds., Academy, 27 February 1897, 251.
“magicians who are said to decoy children to their houses and cut their throats.”

“Sorcery,” Thurston continued, “was practiced amongst the Jews as it was practiced among Christians, and if Christian writers can be trusted, a great deal more so. It is quite possible that some individual Jewish sorcerers may at all periods have combined this very evil magic with their religious beliefs.” According to Thurston, “Judaism as a system [emphasis mine] can certainly not be held responsible for these outrages. None the less, it is very difficult to waive away the evidence of some Jewish complicity in such murders by declaring them all to be the fabrication of popular prejudice.”

Each issue of the Tablet contained a section, Topics of the Day, which consisted of an article on a subject of topical interest. On 25 November 1899, the topic of interest was the “ritual murder” charge. The article, written in response to the Hilsner affair, did denounce “the sort of blind and fanatical hatred which demands the persecution of the Jew as though that were part of the duty of a Christian.” Nevertheless, whilst ostensibly defending Jews from the ritual murder accusation, the same piece had no problem with what it called “a political and economical conflict” against the Jews, which “in particular countries or districts may be justifiable enough.” It suggested that no one is likely to complain if “in this or that country Jewish attempts to squeeze Christians out of a particular industry are met by organized resistance, or if strenuous opposition is offered to an attempt in whatever country, to obtain exclusive control of the Press or the money market. If in parts of France or Austria or Russia the Jews so conduct themselves as to invite economic or political reprisals they have only themselves to blame.” The Tablet thus seemed to reject a particularly unsavoury form of medieval hostility, the ritual murder accusation, whilst endorsing social-economic stereotypes about Jewish greed. More importantly, the article’s ostensible rejection of the ritual murder accusation was far from unequivocal. Closely following Herbert Thurston’s narrative, the article stated that “an entire disbelief in the ritual-murder calumny is quite consistent with the admission that in a few individual cases Christian children may have been murdered by Jews, and even murdered in odium fidei, i.e.,
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because they were Christians.” The Tablet reasoned that it was likely that some Jews had murdered innocent Christian children as a result of being “stung to madness” by the “tyrannous oppression under which they laboured.” The Tablet cited as an example the same account from the chronicles of Rabbi Joseph Ben Joshua Ben Meir that Thurston had cited the previous year. The Tablet stated that “there are certain forms of homicidal mania in which the very knowledge that Jews were suspected of such deeds would supply just the determining cause for an act of blood if the lunatic chanced to find himself alone with his opportunity.” “In such a case,” the paper continued, “we could quite believe that this same knowledge might produce the enactment of the very horrors – crucifixion, bleeding to death or what not – which were impressed so vividly upon the maniac’s brain.” The fact that the chronicles by Rabbi Joseph did not specify or imply that the girl was killed because she was a Christian, only that she was a Christian, and nothing suggested the crime was premeditated, involved crucifixion or bleeding to death, seems to have been dismissed as irrelevant detail. The paper concluded that “in any case it is quite easy to conceive how innocent children may sometimes have suffered outrage from the Jews precisely on account of their Christianity, and in such instances they may have been honoured locally as martyrs.”

Another ritual murder accusation began in 1911. Mendel Beilis, a Ukrainian Jew, was accused of murdering a thirteen year old Christian child for ritual purposes in a cave just outside Kiev. He was incarcerated, tortured and interrogated and finally brought to trial in September 1913. Though Eastern Orthodox Christianity was generally hostile to Roman Catholicism, the accusation received the backing of a Roman Catholic priest, Father Pranaitis, and much of the European Catholic press. A number of articles in the Catholic press informed readers in gruesome detail of numerous supposed ritual murders of Christian children by Jews. La Civiltà Cattolica, a Catholic periodical constitutionally connected to the Vatican, published two articles which set out to present “medical opinion” to the effect that “death was brought about in three stages: the boy was stabbed in such a manner that all his blood could be collected, he was tortured, and finally his heart was pierced.” This alleged evidence was held to indicate “ritual murder, which only Jews could perpetrate, since it required

long experience.” As a supposed “expert on Judaism,” Father Pranaitis was present during the trial to support the accusation that the Jews murdered Christians in order to obtain their blood for rituals commanded by Jewish law.

The Tablet published an article in its Topics of the Day in response to the Beilis trial. The article vehemently denounced the ritual murder accusation. This time, unlike during the Hilsner Affair, the Tablet did not blame Jews for provoking the incident through attempts to dominate the press or money markets. It did however once again suggest that in the past some Jews had been responsible for the murder of innocent Christian children, not for religious ritual reasons, but as a result of odium fidei. According to the article, even if “little Simon of Trent, Andrew of Rinn, Hugh of Lincoln, and other such child martyrs were canonized, this approval of solemn cultus does not in the least touch the question of ritual murder.” The article clarified that “the Church might recognize that these children were put to death by Jews in odium fidei, and therefore truly martyred, without in any way pronouncing that such a practice had its foundation in the ritual of the Jewish religion.” A distinction was thus again maintained between ritual murder sanctioned by Judaism and murder by Jews in odium fidei. The article then went on to clarify that in any case none of these child martyrs had received “any proper canonization,” though it acknowledged that two of them had “been beatified by Papal decrees.”

A similar point was made back in 1898 by Herbert Thurston. According to Thurston, in at least two cases – Simon of Trent and William of Rinn – the child-martyrs were granted “an equipollent beatification,” which fell short of “a formal beatification,” being only a “conditional approval” rather than an approval based on “the infallible authority of the Church.” The theological distinction between “equipollent” and “formal” beatification is not entirely clear, and perhaps more importantly, it is unlikely that the distinction would have been widely understood or appreciated by many “ordinary” Jews and “ordinary” Catholics. Despite the “equipollent” nature of the beatification, Simon of Trent was nevertheless recorded

---
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in the official Roman Catholic Martyrology, where he remained until after the Second Vatican Council.

Herbert Thurston also wrote an article about ritual murder in response to the Beilis trial.\(^{80}\) Thurston and the *Tablet* were once again largely in agreement in terms of the distinction made between religious ritual murder and murder in *odium fidei*. Whilst Thurston stated that “the immolation of Christian children is in no way sanctioned by the Jewish religion as a system [emphasis mine],” he nevertheless reasoned that “considering the incredible and brutal oppression to which the Jews were commonly subjected from the tenth century onwards, it seems extremely likely that in a few isolated instances some half-crazy Israelite may have welcomed the opportunity of venting his spite upon a defenceless Christian child or girl.” In other words, murder in *odium fidei* rather than murder for religious purposes. Thurston again referred to the Hebrew chronicles of Rabbi Joseph Ben Joshua Ben Meir as evidence that at least one such case “did actually happen.” As he had in 1898, Thurston also argued that another possible explanation for the emergence of the accusation that Jews murdered Christian children was Jewish Sorcery. He pointed out that during Pesach:

> one of the practices which stood almost first in importance in the mind of the less educated Hebrews was the preparation of the *Mazzoth* or cakes of unleavened bread. These were often preserved with veneration and used medically and, it is probable, magically. Further, we know that magic was much employed among the Jews, and on the other hand the use of blood was so frequent in all magical rites that it is difficult to suppose that the Jews can have escaped the infection.\(^{81}\)

Thurston concluded, “not that the Jews really made use of Christian blood for *liturgical* [emphasis mine] purposes, but that the idea of its employment was sufficiently familiar to lead to the belief that in these cakes, which the Jews were known to treat with superstitious reverence, there must be some latent magical power, such as blood might be supposed to impart.” Thurston implied that this was how the ritual murder accusation established itself. In an ostensibly balanced but fallacious argument – of the kind that suggests that in any conflict there are faults on both sides – Thurston stated that:

\(^{80}\) Herbert Thurston, “The Ritual Murder Trial at Kieff,” *Month*, CXXII (November 1913).

\(^{81}\) Ibid, 511-513.
once a belief that the Jews sacrificed Christian children in order to use their blood in the mazzoth, was established and propagated abroad, it would be impossible to eradicate it from the popular mind. Nay, it seems even probable that such beliefs exercised a sort of hypnotic effect upon the victims themselves, in such sort that they also came to think and possibly even to do, in a few isolated cases, the very things of which they were suspected.  

In other words, because they were suspected of using Christian blood in sorcery, some of “the victims” of the accusation – i.e. the Jews – started to do so. Referring to the Spanish inquisition trial for the murder of *el santo Niño de la Guardia*, Thurston concluded that the records indicate that the accusation was not concerned with “ritual sacrifice” (i.e. an accusation against Judaism), but “with the procuring of blood for Jewish magical purposes by taking the life of a Christian child” (i.e. an accusation against “superstitious Jews” who believed in the efficacy of magic). Thurston acknowledged that scholars have argued that “the confessions elicited from the accused were worthless” because of the “diabolical ingenuity of their torturers.” Thurston however concluded that this was not the case. He stated that “after a careful study of the records, we have come round to the opinion of Mr. Rafael Sabatini in his recently-published volume on Torquemada. We believe that in this particular trial the admissions made in the examinations before the Inquisition were faithfully reported, and in substance, accurate as to the facts.”

A similar equivocation can be detected in a speech by Father Joseph Bampton, a Jesuit colleague and friend of Herbert Thurston, at a meeting about the ritual murder accusation organised by the English Zionist Federation in October 1913. Bampton’s speech was quoted in the *Jewish Chronicle* and the *Tablet*. Bampton stated that before
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82 Ibid, 512.
83 Ibid, 512-513. Rafael Sabatini (1875-1950) argued that the child was murdered, not as “an instance of Jewish ritual murder,” but for the purpose of extracting his heart to use in a Jewish enchantment. The crucifixion was unnecessary to the enchantment, but was nevertheless done, Sabatini suggested, merely “in derision and vituperation of the Passion of Jesus Christ.” Sabatini therefore argued that the child was murdered both in *odium fidei* and for magical purposes. Rafael Sabatini, *Torquemada and the Spanish Inquisition* (1913; repr., Thirsk, North Yorkshire: House of Stratus, 2001), 254. Sabatini was a prolific author of novels, short stories and non-fiction. His mother was English, his father Italian, and he spent most of his life in England.
84 Joseph Bampton (1854-1933?) was the rector of Farm Street Church (the home of the British Jesuits) and Beaumont College. See Catholic Who’s Who & Year Book, 1933 (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1933), 16.
coming to the meeting he had consulted with “an expert in these matters, my friend Father Thurston,” and that he thus felt “fortified by his authority.” Bampton expressed “complete incredulity” at the “ritual murder charge,” but like Thurston, he seemed to narrowly define it as the accusation that Jews murder Christians in compliance with their religious rites. Whilst Bampton acknowledged that “no such rite exists,” he nevertheless stated that “there can be no question that at different times and in different places throughout the Christian era Christian children have been put to death by members of the Jewish race out of hatred for Christianity, and that such children are venerated as child martyrs, and that veneration is approved by the Catholic Church.” Bampton implied that these children were murdered not by orthodox Jews, but by “a parcel of fanatics” that happened to be Jewish. This should not, he suggested, be taken as “evidence of any precept of the Jewish law or any accordance with any Jewish rite.” He stated, presumably in mitigation, that “I suppose Jews have murdered Christians and Christians have murdered Jews at different times, but because Christians have murdered Jews, we have never heard of any charges of ritual murder brought against Christians.” According to the account in the Tablet, Bampton clarified that

we must remember that the accusation we are concerned with and the one we are here to protest against is a charge of ritual murder, i.e., of murder of Christians by Jews, committed in compliance with some precept or ritual observance of the Jewish law [emphasis mine]. We are not here to declare that no Christians, whether children or adults, have ever been murdered by Jews out of hatred to the Christian faith, any more than we are here to declare that no Jews have ever been murdered by Christians out of hatred to the Jewish faith.

Bampton’s equivocal defence, as reported in both newspapers, sounds balanced on the surface. However, it is problematic for at least three reasons. Firstly, he suggested that Jews had murdered Christian children and Christians had murdered Jews, but he never suggested that Jewish children had been murdered, let alone in the diabolic manner traditionally associated with accusations of murder in odium fidei (i.e. with

87 Bampton’s formulation was of a type summed up by Anthony Julius (whilst discussing passages by Gilbert Chesterton): “a nicely balanced formulation, one that appeals to a kind of fair-to-both-sides, ‘six of one, half a dozen of the other’, sentiment.” Julius, Trials of the Diaspora, 422.
crucifixion or blood draining). Secondly, the Christian children, allegedly murdered out of “hatred for Christianity,” became the subject of veneration as Bampton acknowledged, and thus acquired theological significance. These were therefore not murders, or accusations of murders, in a mundane or conventional sense. The medieval narratives which arose about these “murders” helped to reinforce the resilient image of the diabolic Jew in traditional Christian myths. Thirdly, Bampton made the relationship between Jews and Christians sound very bilateral, with Jews oppressing Christians as much as Christians oppressed Jews, but this does not correspond to the power dynamic that existed in Christian Europe.

Whereas the Rome based Catholic newspaper, *La Civiltà Cattolica*, produced unequivocal articles cataloguing cases of ritual murder, arguing that the Jews not only killed innocent Christian children out of *odium fidei* but also because they needed to consume their blood to satisfy religious commandments, it seems plausible that the equivocation of Thurston and Bampton reflected a genuine desire to defend Judaism (rather than all Jews) from the charge of ritual murder. No doubt they felt they had to develop a defence which on the one hand demonstrated religious tolerance and on the other hand did not challenge already existing child-martyr cults. It is possible that they would have been less equivocal if the cults and shrines of the child martyr saints had not existed. On the other hand, Thurston felt little compunction about using the ritual murder accusation to balance out certain Protestant anti-Catholic myths in a way that suggests he did believe the accusation had supporting evidence. He stated in an article published in 1894 (and republished in 1902), that “the evidence for the Jewish murder of Christian children is simply overwhelming beside any evidence which ever has been adduced or is ever likely to be adduced for the walling-up of nuns. In the former case we have at least full details of names, place, and time, we have judicial inquiries, we have the record of contemporary documents, we have the testimony of witnesses on oath.”

88 See Klein, “Civiltà Cattolica on Ritual Murder.”
Significantly, the *Jewish Chronicle* expressed its appreciation for many of these equivocal refutations of the ritual murder charge. The *Jewish Chronicle* lavished praise on Father Thurston’s June 1898 article for its “enlightened effort to nail the abominable falsehoods that pass current amongst anti-Jews to the counter.” It neglected to mention that Thurston had suggested that some Jews had murdered innocent Christian children in *odium fidei*. The *Jewish Chronicle* also applauded — and very selectively quoted from — the article which appeared in the *Tablet* in November 1899. It similarly praised the speech by Father Bampton in October 1913. Chief Rabbi Hermann Adler wrote a letter to Thurston on 10 June 1898 to thank him for his article. He also recommended Thurston’s “scholarly article” in a letter to the *Tablet*. Israel Abrahams seems to have been the only English Jew who noticed that Thurston only “half-heartedly” defended Jews from the charge of ritual murder. Despite the thanks that the equivocal defences by Thurston, Bampton and the *Tablet* elicited from the *Jewish Chronicle* and the Chief Rabbi, only a thin line separated them from the more overtly polemical uses of the ritual murder myth by other English Catholics, such as Montague Summers and the Chesterton brothers.

Cecil Chesterton, like his close friend Hilaire Belloc and his brother Gilbert Chesterton, frequently discussed the Jew in his newspaper articles. Cecil drew upon the myth of the ritual murder as part of his wider construction of Jewish villainy and
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92 According to the correspondent for the *Jewish Chronicle*, Father Bampton “held the audience spell-bound while he explained the consistent attitude of denunciation of his church of the foul and monstrous charge which had from time to time been brought against the Jewish people” (26). The correspondent did not mention the equivocation in Bampton’s speech. However, whilst Bampton’s speech implied that Jewish “fanatics” had murdered Christian children, the speeches by the president of the English Zionist Federation, Sir Francis Montefiore, and the Chief Rabbi, Joseph Hertz, both denied the charge that “obscure sects” of uncivilised Jews engaged in such murders (28, 30). Francis Montefiore pointed out that this charge was in some ways more insidious, as whilst the ritual murder charge was “bound to fail” when levelled against “the Jews generally,” it may sound believable when levelled against an “obscure sect” (28). “Beilis: Great Protest Meeting in London,” *Jewish Chronicle*, 31 October 1913, 26, 28, 30.
93 Hermann Adler to Herbert Thurston, 10 June 1898, in Crehan, *Father Thurston*, 102.
94 Hermann Adler, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 24 February 1900, 295.
foreignness. In 1914, in the *New Witness*, in response to the Beilis Affair, he characterised Russian pogroms as something horrible, but also something to be understood as part of an ongoing “bitter historic quarrel between [Israel Zangwill’s] own people and the people of Russia.” The evidence, he argued, points to a “savage religious and racial quarrel.” He suggested that it was sometimes the “naturally kindly” Russians who were “led to perpetrate the atrocities,” and sometimes it was the “equally embittered” Jews, who, “when they got a chance of retaliating, would be equally savage.” Referring to the Beilis affair, he stated that:

An impartial observer, unconnected with either nation, may reasonably inquire why, if we are asked to believe Russians do abominable things to Jewish children, we should at the same time be asked to regard it as incredible … that Jews do abominable things to Russian children – at Kieff, for instance.

Cecil Chesterton also revived the host desecration myth. He stated that “the Jews may or may not have insulted the Host, as was alleged. I do not know.” “But,” he continued, “I do know that they wanted to; because I know what a religion means, and therefore what a religious quarrel means.” This insight into what he considered expected conduct in a “religious quarrel” – and his belief that Jews would care about the destruction of host wafers, which have a place in Christian myths but hold no significance in Judaism – is revealing of his polemical mind set. Israel Zangwill, a prominent Anglo-Jewish author and playwright, countered Cecil Chesterton’s accusation by stating that following his logic we should have to accept that if hooligans throttle Quakers then Quakers must also be throttling hooligans. Furthermore, he argued, it is incredible that Jews would murder a Christian child for ritual purposes when no such rite has ever been found in Jewish texts. In response Cecil Chesterton stated that “as to ‘ritual murder’, Mr. Zangwill, of course, knows that no sane man has ever suggested that [ritual murder] was a ‘rite’ of the Jewish Church any more than pogroms are rites of the Greek Orthodox Church.” He then proceeded to clarify that what he and others had suggested, is that “there may be ferocious secret societies among the Russian Jews,” and that “such societies may sanctify very horrible
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97 Israel Zangwill to the editor of the *New Witness* (Cecil Chesterton), in Cecil Chesterton, “A Letter from Mr. Zangwill,” 593.
revenge with a religious ritual.\textsuperscript{98} Cecil’s brother, Gilbert Chesterton, also incorporated the ritual murder myth into his construction of the Jew. He argued that members of the “Hebrew race” had engaged in the murder of children. In the \textit{Everlasting Man} (1925), he stated that:

The Hebrew prophets were perpetually protesting against the Hebrew race relapsing into idolatry that involved such a war upon children; and it is probable enough that this abominable apostasy from the God of Israel has occasionally appeared in Israel since, in the form of what is called ritual murder; not of course of any representative of the religion of Judaism, but by individual and irresponsible diabolists who did happen to be Jews.\textsuperscript{99}

Herbert Thurston was not alone in suggesting that one explanation for the ritual murder accusation was Jewish sorcery. Montague Summers, an idiosyncratic Catholic clergyman and once a popular author with interests in witchcraft and demonology, provides another example, though unlike Herbert Thurston, Summers made no pretence of even equivocally defending Jews.\textsuperscript{100} He claimed in \textit{The History of Witchcraft and Demonology} (1926) that the Jews were persecuted during the Middle

\textsuperscript{98} Cecil Chesterton, “A Letter from Mr. Zangwill,” 594.
\textsuperscript{99} G. K. Chesterton, \textit{The Everlasting Man} (London: Hodder and Stoughton, [1925]), 136. Whilst this seems to have been the only occasion that Chesterton claimed that “diabolist” Jews engaged in ritual murder, constructions of the diabolic Jew did also appear in his fiction. For example, in “The Duel of Dr. Hirsch” (1914), the Jew, Dr. Hirsch/Colonel Dubosc, is modelled on a diabolic composite of Judas Iscariot, Captain Dreyfus, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Hirsch sets up a second Dreyfus affair, playing simultaneously the role of the accused villain and the accusing hero. Hirsch succeeds in his complex scheme to be vilified, vindicated and heralded as a hero. At the conclusion of the story, he is seen by Father Brown’s assistant, half way through his metamorphosis from Colonel Dubosc to Dr. Hirsch. His face with its “framework of rank red hair” looked like “Judas laughing horribly and surrounded by capering flames of hell.” G. K. Chesterton, “The Duel of Dr. Hirsch,” in G. K. Chesterton, \textit{The Complete Father Brown Stories} (1914; repr., London: Wordsworth Classics, 2006), 224. This short story is examined in Cheyette, \textit{Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society}, 192-193. The final image of Hirsch/Dubosc is reminiscent of a “devil-worshipper” that Chesterton claimed he once knew, with “long, ironical face ... and red hair,” and when seen in the light of the bonfire, “his long chin and high cheek-bones were lit up infernally from underneath; so that he looked like a fiend staring down into the flaming pit.” G. K. Chesterton, “The Diabolist,” \textit{Daily News}, 9 November 1907, 6.

\textsuperscript{100} Montague Summers (1880-1948) was an ordained deacon in the Church of England who converted to Catholicism in July 1909. He was granted the clerical tonsure in December 1910. He deliberately cultivated a reputation as an eccentric and he was a familiar sight in London and Oxford, wearing a soutane, buckled shoes and shovel hat. He had a particular interest in the occult and witchcraft. Robertson Davies, “Montague Summers,” in Matthew and Harrison, \textit{Oxford Dictionary of National Biography}, vol. 53, 320-321. Summers is mentioned as a factor in the resurgence of the ritual murder accusation by Julius, \textit{Trials of the Diaspora}, 439; Holmes, “The Ritual Murder Accusation in Britain,” 275; Trachtenberg, \textit{The Devil and the Jews}, 155; and Norman Cohn, \textit{Europe’s Inner Demons: The Demonisation of Christians in Medieval Christendom} (1975; repr., London, Pimlico, 2005), 160. Cohn observed that Summers was “a Roman Catholic of a kind now almost extinct – obsessed by thoughts of the Devil, perpetually ferreting out Satan’s servants whether in past epochs or in the contemporary world.” (160).
Ages not because of their religion, but as a result of their “practice of the dark and hideous traditions of Hebrew magic.” According to Summers, “closely connected with these ancient sorceries” were a whole series of “ritual murders” committed by “certain rabbis.” “In many cases,” he concluded, “the evidence is quite conclusive that the body, and especially the blood of the victim, was used for magical purposes.” Cohn stated in 1975 that some of the basic contentions in *The History of Witchcraft* “continue to be taken seriously by some historians down to the present day.” One might hope that the assertions in *The History of Witchcraft* are no longer taken too seriously, but what can be said with some confidence is that there is still a market for the volume. It has been republished many times since 1926 and was recently reissued by Routledge in November 2009.

Though beyond the timeframe of this investigation, one of Thurston’s Jesuit colleagues at Farm Street, Father Arthur Day, the vice president of the Catholic Guild of Israel from 1923 onwards, presented a similar explanation to Thurston. Father Day stated that it would be “definitely anti-Jewish” to revive the “thoroughly demolished” accusation of “human sacrifice being perpetrated by the Jews.” However, also like Thurston, he stated that: “but it would not be so to suggest that there may have been a few isolated cases of such child-murder committed in the Middle Ages by Jews addicted to Black Magic.” He also stated that “it is not inconceivable that superstitious Jews ... may have violated consecrated Hosts.”

**The Jewish Antichrist**

The accusation that the Antichrist, a servant of Satan, will be born to Jews, arose in the early centuries of the Christian era and gained popularity during the Middle Ages. From the time of the early Church Fathers through to the Middle Ages, Satan and a host of demons were pivotal to explanations of important world events, and according
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to Norman Cohn, over time it “came to seem that the world was in the grip of demons and that their human allies were everywhere, even in the heart of Christendom itself.”

The Antichrist was regarded as an authentic manifestation of evil, who would lead Satan’s forces in a war against the followers of Christ shortly before the Second Coming. The Antichrist was thus intertwined with millenarian expectations of the establishment of the Kingdom of God on Earth. As Trachtenberg observes, in the modern era the Antichrist myth may be “easily dismissed as pure fantasy, merely another of the fabulous motifs that entertained the Middle Ages, without exerting any momentous influence upon the thought and action of the common people.” Trachtenberg concludes however that the Antichrist was considered “a terrifying reality.” The arrival of the Antichrist, as Cohn observed, was considered no mere “phantasy about some remote and indefinite future but a prophecy which was infallible and which at almost any given moment was felt to be on the point of fulfilment.”

Momentous events, such as “the Turks” advancing into the heart of Europe, the Crusades and the Black Death, were interpreted as signs that the Antichrist or Lawless One was in the world.

For some English Catholics in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, Satan and the Antichrist were more than just narrative artefacts from the Middle Ages. Satan and a host of malign spirits were often described as very real agents responsible for a number of the world’s woes and fighting the Church for the souls of men. The Antichrist was invoked by English Catholic newspapers to explain modern developments, such as the collapse of the Papal States, the massacre of Catholics in Mexico and the rise of bolshevism. The Antichrist was a resilient theme which was by no means dependent on the presence of the Jew. For example, the Universe contained two articles in 1914, one in June and the other in November, which revolved around the Antichrist. According to the June article, the arrival of the Lawless One was part of
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“the history of the everlasting unseen war of spiritual forces, repeating itself with cyclic fury.” The paper suggested that “the forces of evil have ranged themselves in most furious onslaught on humanity.” Every degenerate anti-Christian and anti-Church impulse of modern society, such as the vulgarisation of speech and deterioration of manners, “unbridled sensuous indulgence” and “resurgent women, who renounce the sacredness of home” and the eruption of hatred and the anti-Christian revolution, can be traced, the article suggested, to the spirit of “lawlessness” and the “dethronement of Christ in the hearts of men, and the erection of the throne of Satan.” The article reasoned that the “cultus of evil spirits” and an increasing interest in “fortune-telling,” “crystal-gazing,” “necromancy,” “astrology” and “overt devil-worship” were “portents of evil,” “symptoms of minds diseased” and evidence that the “Lawless One is abroad.”

Referring to anti-Catholic atrocities occurring in Mexico, the destruction of Catholic property, the desecration of alters and sacred vestments and the massacring of the sick and wounded, the November article argued that the “spirit of Antichrist is, indeed, ranging the earth.” According to the article, the malice in Mexico and elsewhere reveals a hatred of God “beyond the power and limits of mere human malice.” The article stated that “those who believe in the presence of unseen forces that surround us and enter the currents of human action, are compelled to see in all these revelations the manifestation of the ‘the mystery of iniquity.’” “The ‘Man of Sin’ openly proclaims himself,” the article reasoned, and “the spirit of Antichrist in its hideous malignity unMASKS itself in Mexico, as it did in Portugal and in France.”

This piece prompted a number of letters to the Universe which debated the nature of the Antichrist. The Tablet was also not immune to this millenarian vocabulary. An editorial in the paper observed that whilst “Modernists will smile at us as hopelessly old-fashioned, we do not hesitate to say that the prevailing evils are not wholly to be explained as by-products of the Great War. There is something Satanic about it all.” The paper concluded that the “present struggle between Christ and Anti-Christ” had been accurately prophesised by Cardinal Newman and that Catholics should pray that the “Prince of the Heavenly Host will be with us in this day of battle.”

111 “The Lawless One,” Universe, 19 June 1914, 8.
113 “Antichrist,” Letters to the Editor, Universe: 4 December 1914, 4; 11 December 1914, 4; 18 December 1914, 4; 24 December 1914, 4.
114 News and Notes, Tablet, 28 September 1929, 397.
Whilst English Catholic narratives about the Antichrist did not necessitate the presence of the Jew, the two did on occasion firmly coalesce. Canon William Barry, a senior cleric within the English Catholic hierarchy and a prolific author, developed a complex construction of the Jew which drew upon stereotypes of Jewish usury, capitalism, bolshevism and secrecy and myths about a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy. Barry also incorporated the myth of the Jewish Antichrist into this construction as a core component. The Jewish Antichrist myth served much the same function as the Christ-Killer narrative. It was used as a justification for treating Jews as a menace to Christian civilisation that needed to be kept under control.

Barry’s incorporation of the Jewish Antichrist into his construction of the Jew was influenced by Henry Manning’s formulation of this traditional narrative. Manning also had a profound influence on other English Catholics such as Hilaire Belloc and Cardinal Vaughan. It is thus instructive to first examine Manning’s representation of the Jewish Antichrist even though it falls before the timeframe of this project. Manning discussed the arrival of the Antichrist in a series of lectures delivered in 1861. These were published in 1862, a time when most of the Papal States had been seized by the Risorgimento. The collapse of the Papal States was often blamed on Jews and Freemasons. At this time Father Manning, who had converted to Catholicism in 1850 and was advancing rapidly within the Church, was it seems quite willing to accept the Jew as a scapegoat for this catastrophe. Whilst he later adopted more positive stereotypes of the Jews, he nevertheless republished these lectures verbatim with a new preface in 1880. By this time he was Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and thus the official head of the English Catholic hierarchy. Manning

Dr William Barry (1849-1930), Canon of Birmingham archdioese, was a well connected figure within the Church. He was a scholar, theologian, prolific writer and a supporter of Ultramontanism. His parents were Irish. Barry wrote numerous articles for the Catholic Times and was described by the paper as “a soldier of Christ.” He was the recipient of the “Holy Father’s congratulations and blessings on his efforts as a priest and public writer” and honoured as a Protonary Apostolic of the Roman Court. See Catholic Who’s Who & Year Book, 1928 (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1928), 21-22 and “Mgr. Canon Barry’s Retirement,” Catholic Times, 3 August 1928, 2. According to Ehret, he was respected by senior ecclesiastics including Cardinal Bourne and Archbishop McIntyre, both of whom encouraged his work. Ehret, “Catholics and Antisemitism,” 154. For more on William Barry, see Sheridan Gilley, “Father William Barry: Priest and Novelist,” Recusant History, 24, no.4 (October 1999).


The Judeo-Masonic conspiracy myth is examined in chapter four.

After graduating from Oxford with first class honours, Manning (1808-1892) first turned to the Colonial Office for employment before deciding that his vocation lay within the Anglican Church. At
explained in these lectures that whilst it may “run counter to the popular spirit of these times,” for someone who believes in revelation, it is inconsistent to try to explain contemporary history without taking prophecy and the Divine will into consideration. Manning argued, “is an illusion and a snare.” Manning stated that it is a “master-stroke of deceit” to attempt to allay fears by dismissing the Antichrist as a mere “spirit or system” of the times rather than “a person.” The “prophecies of Revelation,” he explained, describe the Antichrist with “the attributes of a person” and “to deny the personality of Antichrist, is therefore to deny the plain testimony of Holy Scripture.” Manning informed his audience that the “[Church] Fathers believed that Antichrist will be of the Jewish race.” He stated that such was the belief of “St. Irenaeus,” “St. Jerome,” “St. Hippolytus,” “St. Ambrose” and “many others.” He concluded that they were probably correct considering that “the Antichrist will come to deceive the Jews, according to the prophecy of our Lord.” Manning explained that whilst the Antichrist will at first pretend to believe in the Jewish laws, he will only do this “in dissimulation.” Afterwards he will “reject the law of Moses, and will deny the true God who gave it.” The Antichrist will be received by the Jews because they are still awaiting the coming of their messiah and “they have prepared themselves for delusion by crucifying the true Messias.” It is not “difficult to understand how those who have lost the true and divine idea of the Messias may accept a false,” Manning stated, and that “being dazzled by the greatness of political and military successes,” they will pay that honour to the Antichrist that “Christians pay to the true Messias.” The Antichrist, Manning argued, will be “a temporal deliverer, the restorer of their temporal power; or, in other words, a political and military prince.” Manning explained that the only thing that will hinder the arrival of the Antichrist is

first he was a committed Anglican, believing that the Church of England was a branch of the Catholic Church. He later decided that this was not the case and converted to Roman Catholicism in 1851. He rose rapidly through the ranks and was elected Archbishop in 1865 and Cardinal in 1875. Manning was a fervent advocate of Ultramontanism and one of the strongest supporters of papal infallibility during the First Vatican Council.

119 Manning, The Temporal Power, 81.
120 Ibid, 102-103.
121 Ibid, 103-104.
122 Ibid, 105-106.
“Christendom and its head,” as “the lawless one” has no “antagonist on earth more direct than the Vicar of Jesus Christ.”

Cardinal Manning later expressed admiration for the communal solidarity and organisation of the Jews and raised his voice in defence of Jews on a number of occasions. In an address delivered at a meeting organised by the Lord Mayor of London in 1882, Manning condemned the persecution of Jews in Russia and praised the virtues of Jews in England, France and Germany. Manning asked, “for uprightness, for refinement, for generosity, for charity, for all the graces and virtues that adorn humanity where will be found examples brighter or more true of human excellence than in this Hebrew race”? Manning lamented the ritual murder accusations, on which subject he corresponded with Chief Rabbi Herman Adler. He was presented with an illuminated address of thanks by the Chief Rabbi and frequently praised by the Jewish Chronicle. Considering the support that Manning provided the Jewish community in the late nineteenth century, it seems strange that he embraced the Jewish Antichrist myth. In this, Manning followed a not uncommon precedent of excoriating the Jew theologically whilst defending Jews socially. After addressing the question of papal infallibility at the First Vatican Council (1868-1870), Manning became less concerned with theological problems and more focused on the social needs of English Catholics. This change in focus may explain why his acceptance of the Jewish Antichrist myth was subsequently accompanied by an admiration for Jewish communal organisation and character. For example, he argued that Jews were doing more for their poor in the East End than Catholics. He also stated, in a letter written to Sir John Simon in 1890, that the Jews are:

a race with a sacred history of nearly four thousand years; at present without a parallel, dispersed in all lands, with an imperishable personal identity, isolated and changeless, greatly afflicted, without home or fatherland; visibly reserved for a future of signal mercy. ... any man who
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126 See J. Derek Holmes, More Roman than Rome, 158.
does not believe in their future must be a careless reader, not only of the old Jewish Scriptures, but even of our own.\textsuperscript{128}

Though this portrayal was not overtly negative like constructions of the Jewish Antichrist, it was still an essentialistic and patronising image of a “changeless” mythologized people.

In a four part article published in the \textit{Catholic Times} in 1920,\textsuperscript{129} William Barry, like Manning before him, expressed his fears that “the end of an age is upon us, and we are not ready.”\textsuperscript{130} Like Manning, Barry had a “highly coloured vision of history as the unfolding of the will of God.”\textsuperscript{131} Barry argued that the “long-drawn anti-Christian movement, centuries old,” was poised to defeat Christendom having been “quickened by victory after victory.” Barry cited Manning at length and blended his own impressions of the arrival of the Jewish Antichrist with those found in Manning’s lectures. Closely following Manning’s lectures, Barry also asserted that the Antichrist would be Jewish, an arch-medium, a protector of the Jews who would be worshipped by them as their messiah. Barry stated that it is clear from “St. Paul’s doctrine” and what “St. John and the Fathers have left us concerning the Antichrist,” that the question of the Jew’s role in the fate of Europe will be, as Manning argued, the “most vital and most decisive of all.”\textsuperscript{132} Manning was concerned that it might “appear strange to attach much importance to any event the sphere of which seems to be the Jewish race.”\textsuperscript{133} The state of affairs in the present day, Barry suggested, should overcome any such temptation to dismiss Manning’s prophetic warning. The years, he argued, are “bringing Antichrist nearer,” and many voices other than Manning’s now announce his approach “to the City of God.” “All the portents,” Barry concluded, “have been fulfilled in Russia, not to say elsewhere.”\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{128} Cardinal Manning to Sir John Simon, 8 December 1890, cited by Leslie, \textit{Henry Edward Manning}, 485-486.
\textsuperscript{131} Gilley, “Father William Barry,” 525.
\textsuperscript{133} Manning, \textit{The Temporal Power}, 115.
\textsuperscript{134} Barry, “Sign of the Times I.”
According to Barry and Manning, there are only two agencies in the history of the modern world that are independent of and more powerful than any of the nations, and these are mutually antagonistic: “the Jewish people” and “the universal Church.” Drawing upon the stereotype of the Smart Jew, Barry stated that “the Catholic spirit and the Hebrew genius” have been locked in conflict as a result of “Israel’s rejection of the Gospel.” The oppression of Paul and his fellow Christians was just the beginning. “Israel,” he informed his readers, “did surely fulfil the prophets when it gave birth to Christ.” It is doing so yet again, Barry concluded, but this time it is paving the way not for Christ but for the Antichrist. Following Manning, he suggested that only the “remnant of the Christian society” can hold back the “antichristian power.” Barry did not however hold much hope for the coming battle, for he believed that the Christian remnant had been torn apart by the Reformation and that the Protestants had deserted the battlefield. Manning’s so-called prophetic warning was not the only one that Barry listened to. He also detected “prophecies” and “forecasts” about the Jews in the works of Benjamin Disraeli, Édouard Drumont, Peter Kropotkin and Friedrich Nietzsche. According to Nietzsche, one of Barry’s supposed prophets, “that the Jews could, if they wanted ... quite literally rule over Europe, is certain; that they are not planning and working towards that is equally certain.” Alluding to this passage, Barry stated that “according to Nietzsche, the Jews, thirty-five years ago, could have seized the supremacy over Europe. They did not want it then, he believed. They surely want it now.”

Barry returned to the Antichrist a few years later. Again referring to scriptural teaching about “the ‘Man of Sin’” and Manning’s interpretation of prophecy, he

---

135 William Barry, “Sign of the Times II,” Catholic Times, 6 November 1920, 7 and Manning, The Temporal Power, 146. Considering the influence that Manning had on Belloc (see the section on “Recognition” in chapter six), it is perhaps unsurprising that Belloc makes a similar point. Belloc stated that “there are two, and only two, organized international forces in Europe to-day with a soul and identity in them. One is the Catholic Church, and the other is Jewry.” Hilaire Belloc, The Jews (London: Constable, 1922), 172.

136 Barry, “Sign of the Times II.”

137 According to Barry, Disraeli was a commendable Jew, who recognised the significance of race and secret societies. Barry nevertheless stressed that “English he never could altogether be; he looked, thought, and felt as an Israelite, moving about in a foreign world.” William Barry, “Disraeli the Jew,” Catholic Times, 24 July 1920, 7.


concluded that the events in Russia, the triumph of atheism over Christianity, demonstrate that the Antichrist is “now in the world.” Barry observed that the Church Fathers predicted “the persistence of Israel though scattered among all peoples” and “their enmity to the Church, their certain rise to power in Christendom, and their strange alliance with the ‘Man of Sin,’ who will, however, be himself a Jew, though most likely a renegade from his faith and tribe.” According to Barry, this was an amazing “stroke of divination,” which has been “accomplished in Russia to the letter.” Karl Marx, Barry suggested, was “the false prophet of the Apocalypse;” and Lenin, “a monster of blood and impiety.” “Lenin,” Barry suggested, “is an unspeakable murderer, a usurper of all public rights, God’s enemy, man’s oppressor.” In other words, Lenin was the Antichrist and Marx was his evangelist. According to Barry, Cardinal Manning regarded “the Revolution,” “the evil elements in emancipated Judaism” and “the assailants of Papal Rome,” to be “associated in a common Unholy Alliance.” Barry concluded that “history justifies the forecast which he made of a coming Antichrist, now looming large upon our Christian inheritance.”

The Jewish Antichrist was a less prominent theme in the English Catholic discourse than the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer. References to the Antichrist, the Lawless One, the Man of Sin, princes of darkness, Satan, servants of the Devil and other malign spirits, were quite common in English Catholic newspapers, but in most cases these were discussed without mentioning Jews. Manning and Barry’s formulation of the Jewish Antichrist myth was however endorsed and adopted by the Month. An editorial in the Month approved of Barry’s “notable article.” According to the Month, “in Soviet Russia Manning’s prophecy has actually been realised.” The editorial stated that “Antichrist, in the person of those apostate Jews, is already in power” and “Marx, another apostate Jew, is his evangelist, and Christianity, especially the Catholicism of Rome, is the object of his bitterest hatred.” The Antichrist was also a common theme in English Catholic constructions of the Freemason and the Masonic-Jewish Camarilla.

142 “Antichrist in Russia,” Topics of the Month, Month, CXL1 (June 1923), 552-553. See also “Antichrist in Russia at Home,” Topics of the Month, CL (July 1927), 65-67 and “Anti-Christ in Russia and Mexico,” Topics of the Month, CL (November 1927), 443.  
143 Discussed in chapter four.
Conclusion

The scriptural authority of the New Testament has given the myths about the Pharisee, the Christ-Killer and the Jewish Antichrist a highly resilient quality. The most prominent source of these myths in English Catholic discourse during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century were the sermons, pastoral letters and public addresses of priests, bishops and archbishops. Hostility towards contemporary Jews was probably not intended by most of the authors of these public addresses. The Christ-Killer and the Pharisee often served as caricatures to represent everything reprobate, obsolete, non-Christian or anti-Christian. They were thus convenient symbols which could be drawn upon to contrast with Christian virtues and illustrate non-Christian vices. However, whilst many of the authors of the sermons and pastoral letters probably had biblical figures in mind rather than contemporary Jews, there was an essentialistic quality to these representations and it seems likely that in many cases little consideration was given to any such distinction. In some cases the sermons were framed in such a way as to generalise Jewish villainy to the “Jewish race”, past and present. Furthermore, certain authors, such as the Chesterton brothers, William Barry and Charles Diamond, were happy to combine the Jewish diabolist from traditional Christian myths with modern stereotypes of Jewish villains in order to create their own distinctive constructions of the Jew.

Many of the authors of the narratives that replicated the myths about Jews were members of the clergy, from junior priests through to senior members of the hierarchy. Many of the priests in English Catholic society were also novelists, newspaper editors and established scholars. It can be argued that as priests they were not necessarily representative of the English Catholic community as a whole – though the same observation can be made about any individual who was published, such as Belloc and Chesterton. In any project it is difficult to determine the attitudes of the “ordinary” members of a community. Most members of the English Catholic community did not publish articles or books; the very act of publishing made an author, even if they did not achieve the prominence of Belloc or Chesterton, somewhat unrepresentative of the “ordinary” Catholic. There are nevertheless indications that the mythologized Jewish

villains that appeared in the sermons and pastoral letters had an impact beyond the pews. Recollections from shortly before, during and after the First World War, collected in oral testimony, seem to show that the myths about Jews murdering Christ and Christian children were part of the discourse embraced by “ordinary” members of the English Catholic community.

One of the more troublesome myths that survived into the twentieth century, albeit often with some adaptation, was the ritual murder accusation. This accusation resulted in trials, convictions and massacres. Some prominent Catholic periodicals in Italy and France, most notably Civiltà Cattolica, but also L’Unita Cattolica, L’Univers, Osservatore Romano and Osservatore Cattolico, embraced the myth of the Jewish ritual murder. As far as the editors of Civiltà Cattolica were concerned, the Jews murdered innocent Christian children to satisfy religious commandments. Conversely, English Catholic reformulations of the accusation were usually divorced from criticisms of Judaism as a religion. Though sometimes presented using polemical language and sometimes ostensibly as a defence of Jews, it was common in either case to argue that the Jews had murdered innocent Christian children, with all the paraphernalia of crucifixion and blood draining, but that this was neither sanctioned by Judaism nor necessitated by Jewish rituals. It was usually argued that such murders were the result of the odium fidei of fanatical Jews or that they had been committed by superstitious Jews who believed in the efficacy of innocent Christian blood for magical purposes. The myth of Jewish ritual murder did not cease to exist, but it survived by adapting itself (thus demonstrating the resilient but protean nature of the myth). The Ritual Murderer thus underwent a partial metamorphosis into alternative representations, such as the Fanatical Murderer and the Jewish Sorcerer. Despite a willingness to exonerate Judaism “as a system” from the charge of sanctioning the murder of Christians, it was, it seems, impossible to abandon the myth that the Jews had murdered innocent Christian children in various diabolic ways, in some cases in reenactment or mockery of the Passion.

146 Kertzer, The Popes Against the Jews, 232-233
147 Ibid, 233-234.
148 Ibid, 162-163, 217-218
149 Ibid, 163-165.
A similar metamorphosis of the Ritual Murderer can be found in the English non-Catholic discourse. For example, M. R. James, the mediaevalist, biblical scholar, renowned novelis of the macabre and subsequently the provost of King’s College, Cambridge, argued that it was unlikely that William of Norwich had been killed as a “genuine case of ritual murder.” He stated that it was also “unlikely that the educated Jews of Norwich in their corporate capacity [James’ emphasis] would perpetrate this crime as an act of anti-Christian spite.” The implication would seem to be that the crime may have been committed in odium fidei by a fanatical Jew not acting in a “corporate capacity.” James did suggest that the “simpler” hypothesis was that “the whole story was a fabrication,” but he also concluded that we should entertain the possibility that William may have been killed by a Jew who had reverted to “half-forgotten practices of a darker age.” In other words, the Jew as Fanatical Murderer or Sorcerer. Rafael Sabatini, an English-Italian author of novels and non-fiction, argued that the Jews have been known to murder Christian children, not for ritual purposes, but to use their hearts in magical enchantments and perhaps also out of spite.

Perhaps as puzzling as the continued presence of this sinister medieval myth in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century is the fact that the equivocal defences were interpreted as defences at all. The argument that such child murders were not sanctioned by Judaism but were committed in odium fidei by Jewish fanatics or for magical purposes by Jewish sorcerers does not seem to be much of a defence. Colin Holmes concluded that Thurston’s distinction between murder provoked by odium fidei and murder for ritual purposes was not one that was “easily grasped by all Catholics.” Holmes was right. The moral distinction is not easily grasped at all.

150 M. R. James, “The Legend,” in M. R. James and Augustus Jessop (trans. and eds.), The Life and Miracles of St William of Norwich by Thomas of Monmouth (Cambridge: The University Press, 1896), lxxvii-lxxix. It might be that James allowed his macabre imagination to influence his scholarship. For example, in 1895, he published a short story in which two children are murdered by a man obsessed with the occult. The diabolist in the story recorded that by “enacting certain processes, which to us moderns have something of a barbaric complexion, a very remarkable enlightenment of the spiritual faculties in man may be attained.” According to the diabolist, “the best means of effecting the required absorption is to remove the heart from the living subject, to reduce it to ashes, and to mingle them with about a pint of some red wine, preferably port.” (646). M. R. James, “Lost Hearts,” Pall Mall Magazine, VII, no. 32 (December 1895), 639-647.

151 Discussed in footnote 83 in this chapter.

Nevertheless, the *Jewish Chronicle* and the Chief Rabbi both expressed their gratitude for these equivocal defences.
3. The Jew in Contemporary Stereotypes

Conventional wisdom suggests that by the nineteenth century religious prejudices about Jews had largely been secularised or replaced by modern socio-political and racial stereotypes. However, the material examined in the previous chapter reveals that traditional Christian myths continued to play an important role in English Catholic discourse during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. Myths about the Pharisee, the Christ-killer, the Fanatical Murderer, the Jewish Sorcerer and the Jewish Antichrist were repeated in sermons, pastoral letters, lectures, periodicals and books. They also featured as components of complex composite constructions of the Jew. The findings of the previous chapter therefore problematize the conventional wisdom, at least as applied to English Catholic discourse. Whilst these traditional myths persisted into the twentieth century, they did have to share a space with a number of contemporary stereotypes of the Jew.

One of the most persistent stereotypes was “the Greedy Jew.” Its durability can be attributed to two main factors. First, the stereotype is highly protean and adaptive, and it has thus survived in a myriad of forms. The usurer, coin-clipper, stock-market speculator, monopolist, banker, gambler, merchant, fence, thief, peddler and corrupt politician are just some of the manifestations of the Greedy Jew. The Jew, it was alleged, controls the banks, creates trade monopolies and fills his houses with plunder looted from the Church. Second, the Greedy Jew has well established roots, sharing a place with the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer in the Christian foundation myth narratives. The stereotype of Jewish greed has thus been replicated and transmitted from generation to generation as part and parcel of the Christian foundation myth. According to this myth, the crucifixion of Jesus was preceded by Judas Iscariot’s betrayal. For a mere thirty pieces of silver, Judas was willing to sell out the messiah to the Roman authorities (Matthew 26:15). Judas has subsequently been portrayed as “the quintessential Jewish bloodsucker, he who sells his soul for ‘blood money.’”1 Judas was thus an early prototype of the Greedy Jew. Another prototype of the Greedy Jew is encountered in the biblical story of the Jewish money lenders who turned the Temple into a “den of thieves” (Mark 11:15-19, 27-33; Matthew 21:12-17, 23-27; 1 Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer. Antisemitic Myths: A Historical and Contemporary Anthology (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), 75.
Luke 19:45-48, 20:1-8; John 2:13-16). According to Mervin Perry and Frederick Schweitzer, “without this theological condemnation, the Jew would have been a merchant, banker, or property owner, normal and respectable, rather than wicked money-grubber, usurer, and leech, as Christians came to perceive them. Condemnation of the Jews as economic exploiters followed from their theological condemnation as a criminal people.”

The image of the Greedy Jew was reinforced in the Middle Ages. As Langmuir noted, “by the middle of the twelfth century in northern Europe, Jews were becoming stereotyped as usurers in addition to the older stereotype of Christ-killers.” Prohibited from landowning, excluded from the guilds and under various occupational and trade restrictions, Jews were often reliant on money lending to survive. Jews had little choice but to fill the “financial vacuum” created by the Church’s prohibitions on Christian money lending. As money lenders and tax collectors for the royal court, they were granted certain so-called privileges and protections. These were retracted at a moment’s whim by the king, either to squeeze money from Jews or to appease an angry mob. Nevertheless, these “privileges” led to popular and ecclesiastical resentment. Jews, “already stigmatised as infidels and deicides, soon found themselves depicted as alien ‘bloodsuckers.’”

Jewish usury was even regarded as “the work of the devil.”

The other stereotypes examined in this chapter do not share the mythological heritage of the Greedy Jew, though certain Christian myths may have been a factor in their development. For example, the wandering Jew, ritual murder and Judeo-Masonic conspiracy myths do share themes with the contemporary stereotypes of “the Jewish Coward,” “the Unpatriotic Jew” and “the Secretive Jew.” However, by the end of the nineteenth century, all of these stereotypes had been largely divorced from traditional Christian discourse. Whereas the myths considered in the previous chapter make little sense and lose most of their potency outside of a specifically Christian discourse, all of these stereotypes can function just as well as part of a non-Christian discourse. The roles assigned to the Jews in the myths considered in the previous chapter could be truly demonic: the murderers of Christ, torturers and murderers of innocent Christian

---

2 Ibid.
3 Langmuir, Toward a Definition of Antisemitism, 60.
4 Wistrich, antisemitism, 26-27. See also Maccoby, The Sacred Executioner, 164.
5 Felsenstein, Anti-Semitic Stereotypes, 33.
children, servants of Satan who practise foul magic and the Antichrist incarnate. In other words, inhuman bogeymen. Conversely, the vices that characterised the stereotypical Jew – greed, cowardice, disloyalty and secrecy – were if anything all too human. This is not to say that contemporary stereotypes were harmless. They were far from it. These stereotypes took typical vices that one would expect to see in some combination and measure in most people – only a saint or tzadik could be utterly free of them – and then magnified and distorted them. The result was then projected over the Jews as a collective.

According to the stereotype of the Secretive Jew, the Jew is a deceiver. The Secretive Jew adopts a non-Jewish name in order to hide his Jewish identity and infiltrates English society by pretending to be English (or French or German or Russian, anything as long as it is not Jewish). In some cases it was claimed that Jewish thieves and money lenders hid their Jewishness to avoid their parasitic greed being used to cast aspersion upon their race. It was conceded that the Jew also changed his name in order to avoid oppression and persecution, but this only served to reinforce the stereotype of the Jewish Coward. According to the stereotype of the Jewish Coward, the Jew refuses to fight for their host nation, or indeed any cause, since they lack an understanding of bravery and chivalry. According to this stereotype, the Jew spread pessimism during the First World War, cringed in the tubes during air-raids and elevated cowardice to an ideal by calling it pacifism. The Jewish Coward does not even defend himself, relying on others to fight his battles for him. A related stereotype was the Unpatriotic Jew. According to this stereotype, the Jew is an Asiatic, a Hebrew, a Turk, an alien, and he refuses to fight for his host country since his loyalties lie elsewhere. Either he is a member of a landless Jewish nation for whom his loyalty is reserved, or he is cosmopolitan and thus incapable of any sense of national loyalty. Alternatively, he was disloyal to England since by natural affinity he was pro-German.

6 The accusation that Jews refuse to defend even themselves was at times adopted by Leopold Greenberg (1861-1931), the editor of the Jewish Chronicle and Jewish World. Greenberg believed that Jews needed to learn to defend themselves rather hiding behind the shields of gentiles. He argued that “Christians cannot always be expected to guard Jewish interests. The time must inevitably come, ... when they will ask why Jews do not look after their own concerns. And if the question has to be asked too often, we shall not be listened to when we do pluck up courage to speak, for we shall be regarded merely as a body of poltroons, of whom no serious notice need be taken.” “Dumb Dogs,” Week by Week, Jewish Chronicle, 11 July 1913, 11-12.
This chapter examines the presence of the Greedy Jew, the Jewish Coward, the Unpatriotic Jew and the Secretive Jew stereotypes in English Catholic discourse during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. These stereotypes tended not to operate in isolation. Some of the most prominent English Catholic authors and newspaper editors, such as the Chesterton brothers, Hilaire Belloc, William Barry and Charles Diamond, combined these stereotypes to produce their own distinct constructions of the Jew.

The Greedy Jew

English Catholic periodicals embraced the stereotype of Jewish greed and usury in order to explain or justify a number of major incidents during the timeframe of this project. For example, in March 1897, the Tablet celebrated the restoration of Vienna to the position of “a Christian democratic city, the capital of a Catholic State.” The paper explained that hitherto it had been the “fief of the great Hebrew banking interest.” According to the paper, through the efforts of Karl Lueger, the city had finally “thrown off the yoke of that mighty plutocracy.”\(^7\) In this example, the stereotype of the Greedy Jew seems to have served a similar function to some of the myths examined in the previous chapter. Like the Christian foundation myth, it served to justify the dispossession and subjugation of the Jews living in Christian society.

The Dreyfus Affair became a major focal point for Catholic fears that the Jews were attempting to dominate and destroy Christian civilisation. The Tablet developed a construction of the Jews and the Dreyfusards that combined the stereotype of Jewish financial power with the accusation that Jews and Freemasons were conspiring to destroy the French Church and nation.\(^8\) The paper reported that “the sudden clamour for the revision of the Dreyfus trial ... is a subsidized movement, financed by the

---

\(^7\) “Anti-Semitism in the Austrian Elections,” Tablet, 27 March 1897, 482. Lueger was a Roman Catholic, the leader of the Christian Social Party in Austria and a supporter of anti-Jewish policies. According to Wistrich, he was “the first political role-model for the young Adolf Hitler.” In 1897 he was elected mayor of Vienna. He denounced Jewish influence in “Austrian banking, industry and commerce, in the Viennese Press, in medicine and the liberal professions.” Wistrich, Antisemitism, 63-65.

\(^8\) The more pervasive dimension of the Dreyfus Affair in the English Catholic discourse was the myth of an anti-Christian Jewish-Masonic alliance or camarilla (examined in chapter four).
moneyed interest which has made the cause of the Jewish Captain its own.” “It looks,” the paper reported, “almost as if the intangibility of the Hebrew were to be elevated to the place of a new dogma of public right, as the final article of the Jacobin creed of the Revolution.” The paper argued that the Dreyfus case has become the battleground for two opposing factions. On the one side stands “the elements that represent and constitute French nationality – the old aristocracy, the army with its Catholic traditions, and the bulk of the Catholic population.” On the other side stands the “cosmopolitan forces of international journalism, Semitic finance, and infidel letters which seek to move the world by the leverage of two great powers, intellect and money.” Zola was seen as the leader of the anti-Christian cosmopolitan “crusade.” According to the Tablet, Zola “stands forth with a broadside of hysterical philippics, the apostle of decadent realism, who has poisoned the literature not only of France, but of the world, with the fetid breath of his tainted imagination.”

In February 1899, Father Sydney Smith, a Jesuit converted from Anglicanism and the editor of the Month, defended the French Jesuits from the accusation of being responsible for any “anti-Semitic campaign” during the Dreyfus Affair. He argued that the violent agitations and riots in France were not aimed at Jews per se; they were financial protests, targeting the usurers of France. Smith stated that “members of that race engage in these nefarious practices” and “contrive, step by step, to enrich themselves by pauperizing others.” “In Russia, Poland and Austria,” he continued, “this class of usurers is known to have been still more widely mischievous than in England; and anti-Semite movements have been the consequence.” Smith stated that whilst it is impossible to know “the extent to which the Jewish usurer has sucked out of the small proprietor his slender means,” there is certainly a deep-rooted feeling in France that “this kind of devastation has been very general.” He surmised that if the Jews were targeted then it was because their behaviour had provoked the “wrath” of their victims, which had boiled over into “indignant agitations.” Smith repeated his defence of the French Jesuits in an interview with the Catholic Herald in September of the same year. He gave his impression that there was no “natural antagonism between

9 “Captain Dreyfus and His Champions,” Topics of the Day, Tablet. 12 February 1898, 238.
10 Sydney F. Smith, “The Jesuits and the Dreyfus Case,” Month, XCIII (February 1899).
11 Ibid, 121-122. Father Sydney Smith (1843-1921) converted from Anglicanism in 1864, became a member of the Jesuits in 1866 and was the editor of the Month from 1897-1901. See Who was Who, 1916-1928, 977.
Jews and Catholics,” and that the prejudice against Jews in France was a consequence of Jewish usury rather than religion.  

The Catholic Times also depicted the Jew as corrupt and greedy during the Dreyfus Affair. Representations of the Jew in the Catholic Times around this time were ambivalent. On the one hand the paper acknowledged that anti-Jewish sentiment was running high in France and that Captain Dreyfus was being refused “fair play” with regard to his “honour and reputation,” but conversely it also stated that “the typical Jew in France is corrupt and sordid.” The paper made a distinction between “the typical Jew” and “converted Jews.” The converted Jew, unlike the corrupt Jew, was a beacon of light to be admired by Catholics. In October 1899, when the Dreyfus Affair was still in the press, a report in the Catholic Times blamed the troubles in South Africa on Jews. Combining the stereotype of Jewish greed and cowardice, the paper suggested that the Jews were manipulating the situation so that others will do their fighting for them. “The Jews,” the paper observed, “take little active part in the Outlander agitation; they let others do that sort of work. But since half the land and nine-tenths of the wealth of the Transvaal claimed for the Outlander are chiefly theirs, they will reap whatever advantage may be gained by war.” The paper concluded that “we wish the Jews well and the enjoyment of every legitimate liberty, but we do object to murdering the Boers for their benefit.”

The stereotype of Jewish usury was also invoked by the Catholic Times in order to rationalise and mitigate the agitation – a “pogrom” according to some witnesses – that occurred in Limerick in 1904. During this episode, a number of Jews

---

14 “The Jews and South Africa,” Notes of the Week, Catholic Times, 6 October 1899, 7.
15 For a detailed description of the Limerick Affair, see Dermot Keogh, Jews in Twentieth-Century Ireland (Cork: Cork University Press, 1998), 26-53. See also Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 97-99. The episode all but destroyed the Jewish community in Limerick. Keogh concluded that the use of the term “pogrom” was “justified” (26). The episode was certainly anti-Jewish, but the usefulness of the term “pogrom” in this context is, I would suggest, questionable. It’s not the only time i’ve used the term, but it’s not the only time i’ve used the term “pogrom.” More significant than the actual violence was the terrorising of Jews and the boycotting of Jewish businesses which made life impossible. Keogh points out that the terror was such
living in Limerick were assaulted and their businesses boycotted and destroyed. The Limerick Affair was instigated by sermons led by Father Creagh, a priest of the Redemptorist arch-confraternity. Father Creagh accused Jews of ritual murder, usury and of plundering the Church in France. The Catholic Times did not support Father Creagh’s agitating, but it did accept that disturbances in Limerick sometimes followed legal proceedings against the Jews for “usurious practices.” The newspaper trivialised the severity of the agitations and used them as an opportunity to caricature the Jews as weak in contrast to the manlier bearing of Irish Catholics. Catholic boys and women were, the paper implied, manlier than Jewish men. The paper stated that the affair consisted of little more than a “petty persecution” by some “women and young folk.” The paper acknowledged that some Jews had been “subjected to rather rough usage for a few hours by women and boys,” but its language suggested that this was just the antics of “lovers of manliness.” The Catholic Herald also rejected Father Creagh’s ritual murder accusation, but it argued that the agitations were the result of strong feelings “directed (perhaps unfairly) against the whole Hebrew race, on account of the reckless and ruffianly conduct of itinerant Jewish traders.” Furthermore, whilst the paper did not develop an argument about murders by fanatical or superstitious Jews, its rejection of the libel was somewhat equivocal. The paper stated that, “so far as the imputation of child murder goes, ... no such imputation can be fairly levelled at the Jewish people, whatever may have been the lapses of individual Jews [emphasis mine].” The Catholic Herald dismissed the persecutions of Jews in Limerick during this episode as “rather trifling in their nature” and a “wicked exaggeration of trivial events.”

Another significant episode in which the Greedy Jew stereotype was invoked was the Marconi Affair. Cecil Chesterton, recently converted to Roman Catholicism, did not merely repeat the stereotype of Jewish greed, he used it as a core aspect of his multifaceted construction of the alien, Asiatic, nomadic, queer, secretive and that “based on their experiences in Lithuania, the word pogrom came immediately to the lips of Limerick’s Jews when they found themselves under attack” (26).

16 “Libelling Limerick,” Notes of the Week, Catholic Times, 8 April 1904, 7.
politically corrupt Jew. Cecil Chesterton seized the Marconi scandal as a paradigm example of the foreignness of the Jew, which was, he suggested, marked by the Jew’s inability to understand Christian conceptions of morality. The events of the Marconi Scandal began in March 1912 and revolved around allegations that members of the Liberal government had profited through improper use of information about the Government’s intentions with respect to the Marconi Company. The details of the Marconi Affair and its financial, legal, political and anti-Jewish ramifications are complex and have already been the focus of significant studies. The evidence does suggest that some procedurally questionable and politically unwise, though not strictly illegal share trading had occurred. The key actors in this drama included Rufus Isaacs (Attorney-General in the British Government), Godfrey Isaacs (director of the English and American Marconi companies), David Lloyd George (Chancellor of the Exchequer) and Alexander Murray (Liberal Chief Whip). The involvement of Rufus and Godfrey Isaacs made it no more a Jewish affair than the involvement of David Lloyd George and Alexander Murray made it a Christian affair. Nevertheless, according to Cecil Chesterton, the Marconi scandal was not a simple case of greed or bad judgement on the part of a number of individuals, two of whom just happened to be Jewish. It was, he implied, a quintessentially Jewish affair.


21 As part of an arrangement to raise capital to acquire the United Wireless Company, the English Marconi company had to guarantee a large issue of American Marconi shares. Godfrey Isaacs was required to take on a large number of these shares personally. On 9 April 1912, he offered to sell to his brothers, Rufus and Harry Isaacs, some of these shares in the American Marconi company. The government had recently agreed a contract with the English Marconi company. Rufus wisely declined his brother’s offer as he was worried that it might appear that he was taking advantage of privileged information. The extent of the legal dilemma is fuzzy. The government’s contract was with the English Marconi company rather than the American Marconi company. The English Marconi company held shares in the American company but the American company did not have shares in the English company, and thus, according to Godfrey Isaacs, it could not benefit from the contract. Technically this was probably correct, but confidence in the American Marconi company was linked to the fortunes of the English company. Harry, unlike Rufus, bought 56,000 shares. On 17 April, Rufus purchased 10,000 shares, but from Harry to avoid taking advantage of Godfrey’s position. Rufus then sold David Lloyd George and Alexander Murray some of his shares. When shares became available to the public on 19 April, it was difficult for buyers to obtain them and the price was artificially high. Rufus sold half of his shares at a profit. Rufus subsequently denied, correctly, that he ever purchased English Marconi shares, but he carefully phrased his denial to avoid mentioning his transactions in the American Marconi shares. See Lunn, “The Marconi Scandal,” 7-13 and Donaldson, The Marconi Scandal, 49-54.

22 Though Colin Holmes, as Bryan Cheyette noted, stated that “there was an irreducible core of Jewish involvement” at the centre of the Marconi scandal. Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 81. This was discussed in chapter one, footnote 40.
In a satirical legal defence in the *Eye Witness*, Cecil Chesterton “defended” Rufus Isaacs specifically as a Jew. He claimed that Rufus hid his Jewishness because he shared the shyness and secrecy which was “hereditary” in his race, but that it was this very Jewishness that constituted the core of his defence. According to Cecil, Rufus Isaacs should not be tried in “an English court” as he is “not an Englishman” but a Jew. “He is an alien,” Cecil surmised, “a nomad, an Asiatic, the heir of a religious and racial tradition wholly alien from ours. He is amongst us: he is not of us.” He could not, Cecil stated, be fairly “expected to understand the subtle workings of that queer thing the Christian conscience.”

Cecil continued to attack Godfrey and Rufus Isaacs in a series of articles in the *New Witness* (the successor to the *Eye Witness*). According to Cecil, one can locate the roots of the prosperity and political power of the Isaacs, along with other Jewish families, such as the Samuels and Rothschilds, in “usury,” “gambling” and the “systematic bribery of politicians.” Cecil repeatedly accused Rufus Isaacs of political corruption and Godfrey Isaacs of commercial ineptitude. He organised teams of men with sandwich-boards emblazoned with the message, “Godfrey Isaacs’ Ghastly Record,” to patrol outside the House of Commons and the Marconi offices. This was the final straw as far as Godfrey was concerned. He took legal action and successfully prosecuted Cecil for libel in June 1913. Cecil was fined £100. The relatively small fine was interpreted by Cecil as a moral vindication of his position and the proceedings were described by Ada Chesterton, his wife, as a jovial family excursion. According to Ada, when the verdict was read out, the people cheered, much to the agitation of the Isaacs family. Ada concluded that Cecil had faced the “Marconi Goliath of wealth and power” and “held his own” and that his nominal fine was “regarded as a victory for clean government.”

The *Catholic Herald* was willing to accept that Lloyd George and Rufus Isaacs were both innocent of the “charge of dishonourable conduct.” The paper concluded that “terms such as ‘want of thought’, ‘want of judgement’, ‘indiscretion’, but nothing

---

of a more serious nature may be applied.” The paper blamed Rufus Isaacs for his indiscretion and for having involved others, but it concluded that any “charge of corruption or of dishonesty must fall to the ground.”

Despite its relatively restrained position during the Marconi Affair, the Catholic Herald increasingly developed a more malevolent construction of the Jew during and subsequent to the First World War. Charles Diamond, the acerbic editor of the newspaper, combined religious myths and modern stereotypes to produce a complex and virulent construction. He claimed that the Jews had looted the Church in France and that “the most sacred Christian objects [are] being bought up by the Jews for a mere song.” This, he suggested, was the result of their belief that they still lived under an old dispensation that entitles them to despoil all non-Jewish nations.

The claim that Jews feel it is their right to spoil the nations in which they reside and the accusation that they plundered the Church became regular leitmotifs of the Catholic Herald from 1914 onwards. The paper even argued that the First World War was arranged by Jews specifically so they could have another opportunity to pillage. According to the Catholic Herald, “this Hun war was largely the work of the Jews around the Kaiser. It was a huge plan of plunder and pillage, in which the Jew was to get his chance.”

The paper continued with this stereotype of Jewish greed and exploitation after the war. In 1919 and 1920, the Catholic Herald acknowledged that Jews have a reputation for being “great philanthropists,” but observed that they nevertheless continue to be despised. The paper concluded that the reason they continue to be hated is that “as a people, taken as a whole, they are given to the worst of vices.” The articles stated that the Jews are “gamblers, fond of vulgar display; cruel and domineering when they have power, sycophants and cringers when they are weak or have an end to serve.” According to the paper, the “orthodox Jew” and the

28 Notes and Comments, Catholic Herald, 14 November 1914, 2.
“creedless materialistic Jew” were nearly as bad as each other, as the orthodox Jew has a religious creed which encourages “spoiling the stranger” whilst the secular Jew hovers “like a vampire over the nations.”32 In the late 1920s the accusation that Jews plundered the Church in France was transformed into the accusation that they plundered the Christians in Russia. According to the paper, the Jews were pursuing the identical policy in Russia that they had once pursued in France.33

As the previous chapter discussed, Canon William Barry embraced and built upon the myth of the Jewish Antichrist. Barry believed that the signs of the times indicated that the Jewish Antichrist was already in the world and that Karl Marx had been his “false prophet.” He also accepted stereotypes about Jewish finance and greed which he incorporated into his construction of the Jew. In 1919, in response to suggestions made by some newspapers that Catholics and Jews should be excluded from the League of Nations on the grounds that they are “international,” Barry argued that “on no grounds of race or religion can the League boycott any man, forbidding him to hold office under it, whether Jew, Catholic or Japanese.” However, whilst arguing that Jews and Catholics should both be at liberty to serve in the League of Nations, Barry went on to inform his readers “that there is a tremendous power concentrated in Hebrew international finance.” The power of this fantasy was such that even when confronting a bigotry that was as prejudicial to Catholics as it was to Jews, Barry could not prevent himself from inserting a criticism about Jewish finance, even though it would have made his argument simpler if he had focused on the prejudice that both communities suffered.34 Barry developed this theme in subsequent articles. In an article in 1922 which blended his own ideas with those of Hilaire Belloc, Barry argued that “the Hebrew domination over Europe and America has set in” and that the social revolution has a “double aspect” with the Jews as leaders of both. In the West, “the Rothschilds may stand for its triumph without violence in finance, industry, [and] ‘bourgeois’ legislation,” whilst in the East “the Bolsheviks, tyrants and exploiters of a Russia reduced to chaos, who claim Karl Marx for their

prophet, are Israelites almost to a man.” Barry repeated his construction of Jewish power and greed in subsequent years. He argued in 1925 that the domination of Europe by Jewish Ministers, financiers and diplomats in France, Bohemia and elsewhere, and in particular a Russia “prostrate under the Bolshevik sons of Israel, furnishes the shameful, the appalling proof which cries aloud that Europe is declining from its sovereign rank.” “How,” he asked, “does the Hebrew contrive to get world-power into his hands?” He stated in 1929 that the peasant-farmers in Bavaria were being exploited with no hope of redemption by the “Semitic money-lenders.”

Gilbert Chesterton also raised the spectre of “Hebrew usury” as part of his complex construction of the Jew. Chesterton traced many of the problems of modernity back to the Reformation, which he suggested tore Europe apart faster than the Catholic Church could hold it together. He was romantically attracted to the Middle Ages, which he imagined to be a relatively well-ordered period in history, with happy peasants, Christianity as a healthy part of every-day life and the trades managed equitably by the Church and the guild system. The medieval guilds, he suggested, prevented usury from disrupting the balance of society and destroying the livelihood of the peasantry. In his A Short History of England, published in 1917, Chesterton implied that the Jews were not as badly treated in the Middle Ages as often portrayed, though they were sometimes handed over to “the fury of the poor,” whom they had supposedly ruined with their usury. The idea that Jews were compelled to hand over money to King John or have their teeth pulled was, he implied, a fabrication: “a story against King John” rather than about him. He suggested that the story was “doubtful” and the measure, if it was enacted, was “exceptional.” The Christian and the Jew, he claimed, had “at least equal reason” to view each other as the ruthless oppressor. “The Jews in the Middle Ages,” he asserted, were “powerful,” “unpopular,” “the capitalists

38 G. K. Chesterton, What’s Wrong with the World (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1910), 42.
39 See for example, G. K. Chesterton, Our Notebook, Illustrated London News, 26 April 1919, 590.
40 G. K. Chesterton, A Short History of England (London: Chatto & Windus, 1917), 108-109. According to Anthony Julius, in order to obtain the vast sums demanded by King John, Jews were arrested, property seized, some Jews were hanged, and one Jew had several teeth removed to persuade him to pay the sums demanded. Even poor Jews had to pay a tax or leave the kingdom. Julius, Trials of the Diaspora, 118-119, 643n82-84.
of the age” and “the men with wealth banked ready for use.” In *The New Jerusalem* (1920), he again argued that Jews were inclined to usurious practices. He stated that “there may be good Gipseys [sic]” and “good qualities which specially belong to them as Gipseys,” but a “respect for private property” was not among those qualities. He concluded that “the whole argument about Gipsey theft can be roughly repeated about Hebrew usury.”

Chesterton’s best friend, Hilaire Belloc, was also obsessed by so-called Jewish greed. His development of a complex construction of the Jew can be traced at least as far back as the Boer War. Belloc, like many others, blamed the South African war (1899-1902) on Jewish financiers and *Uitlanders*. Belloc argued that the *Uitlanders* were German Jews exploiting the country. Belloc explored this accusation in his novel, *Emmanuel Burden* (1904). The main antagonist, I.Z. Barnett, was depicted as a greedy, manipulative and fraudulent German Jew. Barnett formulated a project, the African M’Korio scheme, which involved the manipulation of the stock market and the destruction of Emmanuel Burden, a naïve but honest British merchant. The M’Korio scheme, a project to exploit the gold in a region of Africa for the benefits of a small financial syndicate, was a clear allusion to South Africa. It was not just in his fiction that he constructed this image of the *Uitlanders* as exploitive Jews. In a letter to Gilbert Chesterton, written shortly after being elected Liberal MP for Salford, Belloc stated that: “I am now out against all Vermin: notably South African Jews.”

---

42 The peculiar spelling of gypsy is Chesterton’s.
44 For example, Gilbert Chesterton denounced the Jewish “tyrant” in England who commands “the blood of Spion Kop” (Spion Kop was a battle during the Boer War). Gilbert Chesterton to the Editor, *Nation*, 18 March 1911, 1004. It was by no means primarily English Catholics who blamed the Boer War on Jews. According to Wistrich, Endelman, Kushner and Holmes, the belief that a secret cabal of powerful Jewish financiers were behind the war in South Africa had a wide range of supporters in England. See Wistrich, *Antisemitism*, 105-106; Endelman, *The Jews of Britain*, 153; Kushner, *The Persistence of Prejudice*, 11-12; Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society*, 12-13, 66-70.
claimed in 1911 that the role of Jewish finance in influencing the South African war, the Dreyfus Affair, the revolutionary movement in Russia, and a host of other international episodes, was “manifest and glaring.” Belloc returned to this accusation after the First World War. Jewish finance, he argued, has forced England to fight over Egypt, to get excited over the Dreyfus case in France and to make war in South Africa. According to Belloc, a small number of Jews, including the Rothschilds, the Sassoons and the Samuels, have set up a cabal to monopolise the important trades, commodities and financial markets. “You could get the Jewish bankers who control international finance round one large dinner table” he observed, and indeed, he continued, “I know dinner tables which have seen nearly all of them at one time or another.”

Even ostensibly friendly English Catholics were not immune from accepting the stereotype of Jewish greed. Members of the Catholic Guild of Israel alluded to the Jewish propensity for money. For example, in 1921, Bede Jarrett, the president of the Guild, argued that “English public life has also come under the influence, the steadily-increasing influence, of political Judaism.” Jarrett stated that “in our own day, wealth has ceased to lie in land or even industry; it is largely a question of money, and in money the Jew has always specialised.” “There is then no reason,” Jarrett continued, “for wondering at the power the Jews wield to-day. The Jew finds himself in a civilisation which is based on capitalism, that is, on a system in which money counts most – and money is his flair.” Maude Petre, a liberal Catholic nun and author who

50 Ibid, 84-96. Belloc also discussed Jewish finance in the Eye Witness. “The whole tone of international finance is still marked with the Jewish mark,” he observed, such as “its secrecy, its mystification, its utterly international and its certainly un-Christian ethics.” Hilaire Belloc, “The Jewish Question: III. The Present Position,” The Eye Witness, 21 September 1911, 427.
51 The Catholic Guild of Israel is examined in chapter six.
52 Bede Jarrett, “The Catholic Guild of Israel,” Month, CXXXVIII (September 1921), 194. This article was republished in Harvest, XXXIV (November 1921), 297-299. A large extract from this article can also be found in Ehret, “Catholics and Antisemitism,” 56. Citing this article as an example, Ehret concluded that “the theological meaning of Jewish conversion, namely the fulfilment of god’s revelations, appeared almost as an afterthought” (56). She also points out that the image of the Jew in Guild publications reflected popular contemporary stereotypes, such as the Jewish financier and the Jewish socialist (55). It was certainly the case that Jarrett, like others in the Catholic Guild of Israel, were influenced by contemporary stereotypes of capitalist and socialist Jews. However, Jarrett was also very keen to bring Israel into the Church for religious reasons. He believed that Catholicism was the fulfilment of Judaism and that the Church would benefit from the passionate zeal of the Jews (discussed in chapter six).
was forced out of her religious order, the Daughters of the Heart of Mary, as a consequence of her modernist views, wrote an article in 1922 which was staunchly critical of Belloc’s *The Jews*. Petre criticised Belloc’s condemnation of the Jews as usurers and Bolsheviks. However, she did not argue that Christians had not fallen under the power of the Jewish financiers. This she seemed to conclude was true enough. She instead argued that Christian greed was to blame and that Christians “have fallen subject to the Jew financier not because he wanted us, but because we wanted him.” She suggested that the “remedy is to be sought in criticism of self and not in blame of others” and “our recovery must be wrought by honest rivalry.” In other words, she suggested that Christians should stop scapegoating Jews.53

The Unpatriotic Jew and the Jewish Coward

Stereotypes of Jews lacking in courage and patriotism were prevalent during the First World War. These stereotypes were a significant theme in Gilbert Chesterton’s construction of the Jew. He argued on a number of occasions that bravery and patriotism were foreign to the Jewish makeup. For Chesterton, the virtues of bravery, chivalry and patriotism were intertwined. That the Jews did not share these Christian qualities was, he contended, a fact that should be recognised and understood rather than condemned. He claimed that unlike journalists, who copied “the Jewish hysteria” and panicked without excuse, the “wretched ‘alien’” can at least claim “that if he is scared he is also puzzled; that if he is physically frightened he is really morally mystified.” Chesterton stated that:

Moving in a crowd of his own kindred from country to country, and even from continent to continent, all equally remote and unreal to his own mind, he may well feel the events of European war as meaningl ess energies of evil. He must find it as unintelligible as we find Chinese tortures.

Chesterton claimed that he was inclined to “the side of mercy in judging the Jews,” at least in comparison to non-Jewish journalists. He argued that “a Jew with a gold watch-chain grovelling on the floor of the tube” was not as ugly a spectacle as the newspaper millionaires who multiply their “individual timidity in the souls of men as if in millions of mirrors.”

When later quizzed by Leopold Greenberg, the editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* and the *Jewish World*, as to whether he himself had witnessed Jews cowering in tube stations, Chesterton admitted that he had not personally witnessed this, but he argued that it was a matter of common knowledge: “the problem of aliens in air-raids is a thing that everybody knows.” He could hardly be expected, he implied, to go looking “for Jews in the Tubes, instead of going about my business above ground.” He concluded that if his affairs had led him into the Tubes during an air raid, he would probably have seen what others have reported, and the editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* would no doubt have “refused my testimony as he refused theirs.”

Gilbert Chesterton was willing to accept that there were rare and exceptional Jews who won medals for bravery. Such Jews, he argued, were so rare that they should be honoured not merely as “exceptionally heroic among the Jews,” but also as “exceptionally heroic even among the heroes.” Chesterton explained that it “must have been by sheer individual imagination and virtue that they pierced through the pacifist materialism of their tradition, and perceived both the mystery and the meaning of chivalry.” But he believed that the Jew in general could not understand sentiments of bravery or patriotism, as they were alien to him. He satirically “defended” the Jew, comparing his bafflement about Christian bravery to “a Red Indian who might possibly be afraid of fireworks, to which he was not accustomed.”

Whilst Chesterton claimed that he was inclined towards mercy in judging cowardice, he was utterly unprepared to tolerate pacifism. Pacifism, he felt, elevated cowardice to an ideal and denigrated bravery as a vice. It is one thing, he argued, to “feel panic and call it panic,” quite another to “cultivate panic and call it patriotism.” Chesterton regarded

---

57 G. K. Chesterton, “The Innocence of Israel,” 149.
“absolute pacifism and the denial of national service simply as morally bad, precisely as wife-beating or slave-owing are morally bad.” He suggested that this “tomfool pacifism” was a Jewish ideal, and he warned Jews that if they do not want to see what antisemitism really means, they should “avoid one thing like plague and poison, and that is idealism.”

The most vitriolic English Catholic protagonist to take up the stereotype of the Unpatriotic Jew was the editor of the Catholic Herald. Diamond’s employment of the Unpatriotic Jew stereotype centred on the Jew’s alleged pro-German affinity rather than cowardice (though the stereotype of Jews as cringing sycophants and bullies was also a part of his construction). In an editorial published in November 1914, the Catholic Herald argued that it has been “proved up to the hilt” that Germany has worked “through Jews, not only in Turkey but in France and in England.” The paper made little distinction between the goals of Germany and Jewry. It suggested that this had long been the case. Alluding to the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, the paper claimed that France was nearly “wiped off the map of Europe by German power and German intrigue, working sedulously and carefully through Judaism and the French republican leaders!”

The paper returned to the “affinity between the German and the Jew” in 1916, arguing that they are both cruel bullies when they have “the upper hand” and crawling cowards otherwise. The Catholic Herald concluded that it was “undeniable” that even though “the Jew has been so well treated in this country, ... an enormous preponderance of Jew opinion favours Germany rather than England in the war.”

Hilaire Belloc applied his characteristic irony to his analysis of the accusation that Jews were unpatriotic. Belloc, unlike Chesterton and the Catholic Herald,

---


60 See “Germany and the Jews,” Notes and Comments, Catholic Herald, 26 August 1916, 8; See also “Germany and Jewry,” Notes and Comments, Catholic Herald, 14 October 1916, 12.

61 Belloc employed a number of techniques to mask his prejudice so that it appeared as reasoned consideration of the “Jewish Question.” As Cheyette observed, he adopted a “tone of blanket irony” throughout his novel, Emmanuel Burden, whereas in his analysis of the “Jewish Question” he adopted the carefully modulated “language of reason.” See Cheyette, Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society, 160. At the times of its publication, Moses Gaster, a Rumanian born Anglo-Jewish scholar and the Haham of the Spanish and Portuguese Sephardim in London, recognised the
acknowledged that “Jews were found fighting gallantly in all the armies.” Belloc did not find this hard to accept, but in his construction of the Jew it only reinforced the problem of the Jews’ foreignness. He described it as a cruel fate for the Jew to fight in a European war, as it meant the Jews were fighting when they had “no national interest in the fight.” It was “mere insanity, crucifying their nation to no purpose.” The Jews, he concluded, must be fighting for Jewish honour, which is to say for the Jewish nation. It was thus folly to accuse the Jews of lacking in patriotism. “There is no race which has produced so few traitors,” he argued, for it “is not treason in the Jew to work now for one interest among those who are not of his people, now for another.” Belloc concluded that it was true that the Jew will serve France versus the Germans, and then Germany versus the French, but he stated that this was because the Jew is a national of neither country. In other words, he is patriotic, but patriotic to Israel, not to France or Germany. One of Belloc’s recommendations was that the Jews, as a specially recognised foreign people, should be exempt from military service throughout Europe.

Belloc applied the same irony-laden approach to his construction of Jewish bravery. “The man who accuses the Jews of cowardice,” he informed his readers, means that the Jews “do not enjoy a fight of his kind.” Belloc contended that Jews demonstrate their bravery in ways that non-Jews find difficult to understand. Belloc pointed to the Jewish assassin who killed the “Russian Prime Minister.” “Is it cowardice in a young man to sacrifice his life deliberately for the sake of his own people?” he asked. No coward, he suggested, would “walk up in a crowded theatre, surrounded by all the enemies of his race, and shoot their chief in their midst.” This sort of behaviour and attitude, Belloc argued, can be found in Jews “all over threat presented by Belloc’s The Jews. He observed that The Jews was “written in a very persuasive, insinuating style: it is neither vulgar nor aggressive, balanced in tone and careful in marshalling alleged facts. The reception with which it was met proves it to be one of the most dangerous books which has appeared for a long time.” According to Gaster it received almost “universal approval” from the newspapers. As chapter six will show, it certainly received a positive reception from English Catholic periodicals. Moses Gaster [Observer, pseud.], draft of article about Jews in England, 25 April 1922, box 1 of typescripts, Moses Gaster Archive, John Rylands University Library, Manchester. My thanks to Dr Maria Haralambakis for bringing this document to my attention. Israel Zangwill also considered Belloc’s book a significant threat. See Israel Zangwill’s notes on Belloc’s The Jews (25 pages), 1922, A120/90, Israel Zangwill Papers, Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem.

Europe.” As a second example, he stated that he knew of an elderly Jew in France during the Dreyfus Affair who distributed leaflets proclaiming the guilt of the army in cafes frequented by solders. He did this, he stated, whilst wearing a “smile of insult.” He argued that whilst such behaviour may be viewed as “insolence,” it was also an act of “courage of the very highest quality.” Those who accuse the Jews of cowardice, he concluded, are merely “confounding their own form of courage with courage as a universal attribute.” Belloc therefore suggested that Jewish courage – manifest in the murder of non-Jews and the distribution of insulting literature – is alien because the Jews are alien, but that it is no less a form of bravery for being different.

The Secretive Jew

Another stereotype, closely related to the accusation of cowardice, was the Secretive Jew. According to this stereotype, the Jews use false names and nationalities to hide their identity. This was a reoccurring accusation in the works of the Chesterbelloc. Gilbert Chesterton incorporated the stereotype of Jewish secrecy into his construction of the Jew in his fictional and his non-fictional works. For example, in *The Ball and the Cross* (1910), a story about two brave protagonists, a Roman Catholic and a militant Atheist who are open about their beliefs and are prepared to fight to the death to defend them, a Jewish pawnbroker is vilified for being of the “nasty Jew” type that hides his Jewishness:

there are no hard tests for separating the tares and wheat of any people; one rude and efficient guide is that the nice Jew is called Moses Solomon, and the nasty Jew is called Thornton Percy. The keeper of the curiosity shop was of the Thornton Percy branch of the chosen people; he belonged to those Lost Ten Tribes whose industrious object is to lose themselves. … The name over his shop was Henry Gordon, but two Scotchmen who were in his shop that evening could come upon no trace of a Scotch accent.

According to the narrator, the Jew’s adoption of a non-Jewish name to hide his Jewishness is just one aspect of his cowardice. The shopkeeper is amused and

---

65 The incident that Belloc had in mind was probably the assassination of Pyotr Arkadyevich Stolypin, the Prime Minister of Russia until he was killed in 1911 whilst attending the Kiev Opera House. The assassin, Dmitri Bogrov, was Jewish.

confused at the idea of people actually fighting for what they believe in. The notion of chivalry, the story implies, is foreign to the Jew. The protagonists conclude that the Jewish shopkeeper, with his “slave’s philosophy,” deserves to be “ruled like a dog or killed like a cockroach.” In one of Chesterton’s later short stories, “The Five of Swords” (1922), the murderous Jewish moneylenders are cowards who hide behind a bodyguard as they are too cowardly to confront the men they have ruined. They also conceal their Jewish identity behind false names. One of the protagonists of the story, a detective, asks whether there is “any check on businesses changing hands or men changing names? Miller may be twenty years dead, if he was ever alive. Miller may stand for Muller, or Muller for Moses. The back doors of every business today are open to such newcomers, and do you ever ask from what gutters they come?”

The stereotype of Jewish secrecy also found its way into his non-fictional works. In The New Jerusalem (1920), he stated that “the folly of the fashion by which Jews often concealed their Jewish names, must surely be manifest by this time even to those who concealed them.” Chesterton’s solution was for the Jews who choose to remain in England to be dressed in the robes of an Arab so that everyone knows they are foreigners. Gilbert’s brother, Cecil Chesterton, similarly maintained that when “a Jew commits the contemptible act of changing his name into some ludicrous pseudo-European one,” it was his duty to “draw attention to the plain truth about it.”

Belloc argued that one of the main causes of friction between Jews and non-Jews is the “Jewish reliance upon secrecy.” “It has,” he continued, “become a habit for so many generations, that it has almost passed into an instinct throughout the Jewish body.” Belloc conceded that the reason for the change of names was largely that of self-protection, but he maintained that “the practice does nothing but harm to the Jew.” “There are,” he continued, “other races which have suffered persecution, … and we do not find in them a universal habit of this kind.” Belloc’s formulation of the Jewish secrecy stereotype was also manifest in his fiction. For example, in Emmanuel Burden, 67 G. K. Chesterton, The Ball and the Cross (1910; repr., New York: Cosimo, 2007), 22-24. This story is discussed in Cheyette, Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society, 180-182, 185.

68 G. K. Chesterton, “The Five of Swords,” 306. This short story is discussed in Cheyette, Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society, 197-198.

69 G. K. Chesterton, The New Jerusalem, 228.

70 This is discussed in chapter six.


the narrator observed that Barnett, the Jewish schemer and money lender, changed his name from a Jewish one because it was “necessary to his career in England.” It was not just the modern Jew that Belloc accused of secrecy and deception. Alluding to the conflict over Granada at the end of the fifteenth century, Belloc suggested that the Spanish Inquisition was a justifiable evil compared to the risk that the Muslims, assisted by their “ubiquitous secret Jewish allies,” might have halted the re-Christianization of Spain.

It was not just the Chesterbelloc that embraced this stereotype. Canon William Barry, who combined the myth of the Jewish Antichrist with stereotypes of Jewish greed, also included the stereotype of Jewish secrecy into his construction of the Jew. Barry stated that the Jew should be treated openly as a Jew and “without disguising him … under the misleading name of Russian, still less of Englishman, to neither of which he is entitled.” His conclusion was taken directly from Belloc’s book: The Jew must be persuaded to “give up his many aliases.” “Respect his peculiarities, but recognize them,” he stated, and if necessary introduce “legislation founded on his separateness.” Another source of this stereotype was the Catholic Herald. Charles Diamond incorporated the stereotype of Jewish secrecy into his multifaceted construction of the Jew. According to his newspaper in 1916, a group of Jewish money lenders “had dropped their Jew names and taken Irish names in order to disarm suspicion, and the better to swindle others.” Conversely, the Catholic Herald reported, “paragraphs appeared about Jewish soldiers who were alleged to have won the highest military decorations in Russia for their bravery.” The paper concluded that it is “all right, of course, to praise Jews when they do something meritorious. It appears to be all right even to invent such stories.” In 1919, Diamond maintained that the Jew “is an intrusion, a foreign element in the Christian body politic,” and “he endeavours to get round this by all sorts of dodges and trickery, and tries to hide his Semitic origin and principles by changing his name and pretending to be what he is not.”

73 Belloc, Emmanuel Burden, 68. Barnett may be based on Sir Ernest Cassel, a Jewish financier whose spectacular rise from humble beginnings and his friendship with Edward VII resulted in much resentment. See Charlotte Lea Klein, “The Portrayal of the Jew in English and German Fiction and Drama (1830-1933),” Ph.D thesis, University of London (1967), 53.
76 “There are Jews and Jews,” Catholic Herald, 16 September 1916, 2;
frequently returned, throughout the late 1910s and the 1920s, to the idea that Jews hide behind non-Jewish names except when they achieve – or purchase – some honour or distinction. Then the Jew has no problem being held up as a credit to his people.  

The stereotype of Jewish secrecy sometimes coalesced with the stereotype of the Unpatriotic Jew, resulting in an even more inflammatory construction: The Jewish spy. According to the Catholic Herald in 1917, England was “honeycombed with Jew spies and traitors, using, of course, assumed names.” These pro-German Jew spies, the paper argued, “are adapt[s] at treachery, and their co-religionists and friends in the press and elsewhere are ever ready to slander and abuse anyone who calls attention to their proceedings.” Gilbert Chesterton also argued in 1917 that “where the Jew is dangerous, as a spy and not a soldier, ... is by the weapon of the spy, which is secrecy.” He concluded that “it took our journalists such a long time to admit that a Jew was a Jew that it naturally took them even longer to learn that a Jew was a German spy.”

Conclusion

The stereotypes of the Jew examined in this chapter were widely held in English society during the timeframe of this project. Cowardice and a lack of patriotism were common perceptions. The stereotype of cowardice was contradicted by the large proportion of Anglo-Jews who signed up for the armed forces during the First and Second World Wars. However, according to Colin Holmes and Todd Endelman,

---

81 Jews were accused of shirking military service, avoiding civil defence and fire watch duties, crowding air raid shelters and causing panic. The stereotype of the Jew as “weak,” “cowardly,” “alien” and “non-physical” (and yet also “powerful”), was, Kushner concluded, “strongly ingrained in the public mind.” Kushner, The Persistence of Prejudice, 122-123. In an anthropological study of working class attitudes in London, James Robb noted that several interviewees stereotyped Jews as lazy, greedy, unscrupulous, mean, cowardly, warmongering, cunning, dishonest and unpatriotic. Robb, Working-Class Anti-Semitism, 104-119.
82 According to Kushner, during the Second World War, “as was the case in the 1914-18 conflict, a disproportionate number of Jews joined the Forces – 15% of Anglo-Jewry or 60,000 men and women compared to 10% of the population as a whole.” Kushner, The Persistence of Prejudice, 123.
whilst Anglo-Jews rushed to enlist, many Russian born Jews showed little interest in signing up. This was principally because they did not want to fight on the same side as Russia, the country that had driven them away through state organised pogroms. Prominent Anglo-Jews were “vocal opponents of entente with Russia and war with Germany.” Endelman observed that “once war was declared, ... their pro-German or neutralist sentiments evaporated, but the damage was done.” Measures debated and drawn up by the government to ensure that Russian Jews in England enlisted in the army were supported by the Jewish Chronicle and the Board of Deputies. The threat to repatriate Russian Jews was however resisted by various “Jewish socialist groups, trade union branches, and friendly societies,” which together had formed “the Foreign Jews Protection Committee.” They were supported by some well known Anglo-Jewish figures, such as Moses Gaster and Israel Zangwill. English resentment towards Russian Jews not serving in the army during the war boiled over into a more general resentment against all Jews. This resentment was stimulated by and in turn charge of cowardice was also contradicted by the high proportion of Jews in the British Battalion of the International Brigades during the Spanish Civil War, perhaps as high as 20% according to Richard Baxell, British Volunteers in the Spanish Civil War (Warren & Pell, 2007), 24-25. Endelman noted that in 1914, “acculturated, middle-class Jews responded to the call to arms with enthusiasm” and that “in sermons, editorials and public statements, rabbis and notables beat the drum, identifying the British national cause with Jewish ideals.” The “outpouring of patriotism,” Endelman observed, “was not confined to the privileged strata,” as “close to ten thousand [Jewish] men were on active service before conscription came into force.” Endelman, The Jews of Britain, 183-184. Kushner concluded that “not until the successes of the Israeli army in the post-war world has the cowardly Jewish image been put to rest.” Kushner, The Persistence of Prejudice, 126.

83 See Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 126-137 and Endelman, The Jews of Britain, 185. Endelman observed that in the Jewish East End, “few were eager to sacrifice themselves or their children in a war in which, in their view, Jews had no stake, a war, moreover, in support of the hated tsarist regime many of them had fled” (185).

84 Endelman, The Jews of Britain, 184.

85 According to the measures proposed by Herbert Samuel, Russian Jews of appropriate age would be required to enlist in the British army or return to Russia for military service. Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 127.

86 Endelman, The Jews of Britain, 185. See also Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 128-129.

87 Endelman, The Jews of Britain, 185. Zangwill was a pacifist and was ambivalent about, though not unequivocally opposed to, the First World War. Whilst he supported the Jews Protection Committee, he also supported calls for Jewish enlistment. He nevertheless objected to the way Britain had become involved in the war, advocated peace, and was opposed to “un-thinking war fever.” For more on this, see Meri-Jane Rochelson, A Jew in the Public Arena: The Career of Israel Zangwill (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2008), 2, 134, 173-180. In line with his equivocal support of the Allied war effort, Zangwill approached Moses Gaster to persuade him to translate into Romanian a speech by David Lloyd George which justified Britain’s involvement in the war. See Israel Zangwill to Moses Gaster, copies of letters, 23 September 1914 and 16 October 1914, MS294/1/17, Zangwill Papers (Harry S. Ward collection), Hartley Library, Southampton. Gaster’s translation of the speech (translation dated 1 November 1914) can be found in box 2 of handwritten items, Moses Gaster Archive, John Rylands University Library, Manchester. My thanks to Dr Maria Haralambakis for bringing this document to my attention.
reinforced pervasive stereotypes of Jewish foreignness and cowardice. In some cases resentment bred violence. In June 1917, huge crowds attacked houses and shops in the Jewish quarter in Leeds whilst bystanders watched. Jews were suspected of harbouring pro-German and anti-ally sympathies and according to Léon Poliakov, they were even accused of guiding enemy air raids to their targets. It therefore seems clear that whilst some English Catholics embraced the stereotypes of Jewish cowardice, disloyalty and secrecy, these stereotypes were not peculiar or unique to the English Catholic discourse. Significantly, unlike the myths examined in the previous chapter and the constructions examined in the next two chapters, it is notable that the stereotypes of cowardice, disloyalty and secrecy were in fact confined to only a small number of English Catholics (i.e. Gilbert and Cecil Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc, William Barry and Charles Diamond). The Chesterton brothers, Barry and Diamond, adopted these stereotypes with an almost religious fervour. Belloc tended to apply his characteristic irony, suggesting in a more oblique manner that the Jews were patriotic and brave, but in an alien and unchristian way. The Jew’s alleged incomprehension of Christian conceptions of bravery, patriotism and honesty, was something that these individuals agreed upon.

Not only did only a few English Catholics embrace the stereotypes of Jewish cowardice and disloyalty, they were occasionally countered by images of Jewish bravery and service. The most notable examples were found in the Universe during the editorship of William Dunbar McConnell, a recent convert to Catholicism and a social reformer. The Universe under McConnell highlighted a number of accounts of Jewish heroism and statesmanship, and criticised the Catholic Herald for doubting these incidents. The previous chapter discussed an episode in which the Catholic Herald

---

88 See Endelman, *The Jews of Britain*, 185-186 and Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society*, 130-137. Disturbances also occurred in other urban centres, such as Bethnal Green.


90 The novelist Graham Greene would also appear in the list of English Catholic authors who engaged in these stereotypes if the timeframe of this study had extended into the 1930s. Several of Greene’s characters, such as Carleton Myatt, a Jewish merchant in *Stanboul Train* (1932), and Sir Marcus, a Jewish arms dealer in *A Gun for Sale* (1936), are represented as greedy, money-oriented, cowardly, unpatriotic, sneaking, feminine, lustful and ugly. For a discussion of Greene’s anxiety-ridden representations of Jews and Women, see Andrea Freud Loewenstein, *Loathsome Jews and Engulfing Women* (New York: New York University Press, 1993), 241-311.

91 William Dunbar McConnell was editor of the Universe from 1912 until October 1917. Very little is known about him except that in 1912 he was a recent convert to Catholicism with ideas about social
ridiculed reports that a Rabbi-Chaplain had been killed whilst comforting a dying Catholic soldier with a crucifix. The Universe conversely celebrated the brave sacrifice of the rabbi and criticised the Catholic Herald for its “little-minded criticism.” According to the Universe, “seeing what the crucifix has symbolised to the Jew for the past 1900 years – that it is not only the embodiment of the negation of all his beloved traditions, but that it has been made the excuse for pillage, torture, murder, and massacre, this was as fine an act of humane tolerance as any Christian could desire.” The Universe reported an incident in which a prejudiced restaurant-keeper insulted a Jewish soldier who had been awarded the Victoria Cross for bravery. According to the paper, the “anti-Semite” who ran the restaurant was “a man who nurtures ill-feeling against a whole people in his own bosom, and fosters it in the bosoms of others – a class of man whom all right-minded citizens – certainly all Christians – should leave severely alone, to stew in the juice of his own unreasoning hate.” The paper praised the valour, service and statesmanship of Jews on a number of other occasions whilst under the editorship of McConnell.

Of the stereotypes of the Jew considered in this chapter, the Greedy Jew is the easiest to trace back to the early teachings of the Church. It has been replicated in myth since the beginning of the Christian era and it developed even stronger roots during the Middle Ages. By the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, the stereotype of the parasitical Jewish usurer and financier was pervasive in the general English discourse. One of the ways that the stereotype was embedded into the English discourse was the image of Shylock and Fagin. Considering its long heritage

reform and socialism. These ideas were unpopular with the shareholders of the paper. There was an attempt to remove him from the paper and it seems that he left suddenly, presumably having been encouraged to leave, in October 1917. An editorial note in the Universe on 26 October 1917, simply stated that McConnell had “severed his connection” with the paper. Editorial announcement, Universe, 26 October 1917, 1. See also Aspden, Fortress Church, 48-49. For a short entry on McConnell, see F. C. Burnand, ed., Catholic Who’s Who & Year Book, 1917 (London: Burns & Oates, 1917), 80.

92 “Miscellany,” Universe, 13 November 1914, 8. See also “The Hero Rabbi,” Jewish World, 4 November 1914, 7, which praised the Universe and criticised the Catholic Herald for its reporting of this episode.

93 The Passing Hour, Universe, 30 October 1914, 3.


95 See for example: “Jewish Statesmen,” Notes and Comments, Universe, 5 November 1915, 2; The Passing Hour, Universe, 31 March 1916, 3.


97 There is evidence that the Shylock image continued to have a significant impact on English popular opinion in the 1930s and 1940s. According to Tony Kushner, “a survey on the major influences
in Christian and English culture, it is perhaps unsurprising that of all the stereotypes considered in this chapter, it was the one that had the broadest uptake amongst English Catholics. It was not just Belloc, Barry, Diamond and the Chesterton brothers who embraced the Greedy Jew stereotype. Members of the Catholic Guild of Israel also referred to the dangers of Jewish money and capitalism. Even defenders of the Jews, such as Maude Petre, did not entirely escape the stereotype of Jewish financial power.

Extrapolating, it seems likely that Shakespeare’s play was one of the most important.”

This supposition is supported by Colin Holmes’ observation that one of the core images of the Jew in British society during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century was the Jew as Shylock. Kushner, The Persistence of Prejudice, 110-111; Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 112.
4. Constructions of the Freemason and the Masonic-Jewish Camarilla

During the early centuries of the Christian era and the Middle Ages, the Jews were assigned a number of roles in traditional Christian myths. Some of these myths, as chapter two has discussed, continued into the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century English Catholic discourse. Being protean, these myths evolved, so that the role of diabolical villain did not have to be fulfilled by the Jews. From the eighteenth century onwards, host desecration, the murder of innocent Christians, sorcery and association with Satan and the Antichrist, accusations traditionally associated with “the Jew,” were incorporated into constructions of “the Freemason.” The Church began its conflict with Freemasonry in 1738, when Clement XII presented the first of a series of papal encyclicals which vilified the Freemasons and declared that Catholics were forbidden to join Masonic lodges.1

Freemasons were also associated with a number of contemporary stereotypes similar to those typically associated with constructions of the Jew. Freemasons, it was alleged, hide behind a cloak of secrecy and deception, are hostile to the nations within which they reside, protect the interests of fellow members over the general community and constitute a State within a State. According to these stereotypes, at best Freemasonry is non-Christian and at worst it is aggressively anti-Christian. Alongside these stereotypes a conspiratorial myth developed in which the Jews and the Freemasons both played a role. Probably the earliest recorded linkage of the Jew and the Freemason occurred in 1806. A few years prior to this, Augustin Barruel, a French Jesuit, argued in Mémoire pour servir à l’histoire du jacobinisme (1797), that the French Revolution was fermented by the Order of Templars, which he claimed had not, contrary to popular opinion, been destroyed in the fourteenth century. Freemasonry, Barruel alleged, was merely a front to disguise the continued existence of the Order. The leaders of the French revolution, he argued, were these Masonic

---

1 The declaration by Clement XII, “In Eminente” (1738), preventing Catholics from entering Freemasonry was followed by the following papal encyclicals condemning the society as secretive, revolutionary and anti-Christian: Benedict XIV, “Providus” (1751); Pius VII, “Ecclesiam” (1821); Leo XII, “Quo Graviora” (1825); Pius VIII, “Traditae Humilitati” (1829); Pius IX, “Qui Pluribus” (1846), “Singulares Quamdiu” (1864), “In Multiplicis” (1865); Leo XIII, “Humanum Genus” (1884) and Benedict XV, “Codex Juris Canonici” (1917). Extracts from these can be found in The Condemnation of Freemasonry by the Church (London: Coldwel, [1929]). A copy of this document can be found in the Freemasons Collection at the John Rylands University Library, Manchester.
Templars along with the Bavarian Illuminati, who were the “enemies of the human race” and “sons of Satan.”\(^2\) A few years later the Jews were incorporated into this conspiracy myth. Barruel received a letter in 1806 which claimed to have been sent by an army officer called J.B. Simonini. The letter congratulated Barruel for unmasking “the hellish sects which are preparing the way for Antichrist” and suggested that the “Judaic sect” was the real power behind the Illuminati and the Freemasons.\(^3\) The letter argued that the Jews founded the Freemasons, the Illuminati and other anti-Christian sects, and that Jews were pretending to be Christians in order to infiltrate the Church. It claimed that “in Italy alone, over eight hundred ecclesiastics, including a few bishops and cardinals, were actually working on their behalf.”\(^4\) According to notes published by his colleague, Father Grivel, Barruel went on to write a manuscript about the ongoing Jewish-Templar-Masonic conspiracy. This went even further than the accusations in the Simonini letter, though he destroyed the manuscript shortly before he died.\(^5\) This conspiracy myth resurfaced in the 1860s and 1870s, a time of crisis for the Church as the Risorgimento seized and dismantled the Papal States and occupied Rome in order to create a unified Italy.\(^6\) A few years after the occupation of Rome, Pius IX declared in an encyclical, “Etsi Multa,” that:

> Some of you may perchance wonder that the war against the Catholic Church extends so widely. Indeed each of you knows well the nature, zeal, and intention of sects, whether called Masonic or some other name. ... For from these the synagogue of Satan is formed which draws up its forces, advances its standards, and joins battle against the Church of Christ.\(^7\)

The *Tablet*, the semi-official paper of the Catholic Church in England, similarly blamed the capture and desecration of Rome – and the almost simultaneous invasion

---

\(^2\) Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide*, 30.

\(^3\) Ibid, 31-32. According to Cohn, Léon Poliakov has convincingly argued (in a private communication with Cohn), that the letter by Simonini was fabricated by the French political police (31-32n2).


\(^7\) Pius IX, “Etsi Multa,” 21 November 1873. The text for this encyclical can be found on Papal Encyclicals Online: http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius09/p9etsimu.htm
of France by Prussia – on sects, Jews, Freemasons, devil worshippers and host desecrators.  

The myths and stereotypes associated with the Freemasons were often not merely similar to the myths and stereotypes associated with the Jews; in some cases they combined and coalesced, so that Jews and Freemasons were represented as diabolic allies, conspirators, or the same entity. The “Judeo-Masonic Conspiracy” or “Masonic-Jewish Camarilla,” was a complex construction combining traditional myths with contemporary stereotypes. This chapter first examines the Diana Vaughan hoax, an episode with its centre in France, which occurred in the years leading up to the Dreyfus Affair. During this episode, Masonic lodges were accused of Satanic sorcery and worship. Some English Catholics, including the editors of the Tablet, accepted the purported evidence at face value. Though ostensibly an anti-Masonic affair, it involved myths typically associated with constructions of the Jew (e.g. host desecration and Satanic sorcery). Jews were also accused of trying to help the Freemasons to cast doubt upon the evidence presented against them. The second section examines English Catholic constructions of a Jewish-Masonic alliance during and in the aftermath of the Dreyfus Affair. As Jacob Katz (1970) observed, “the Jewish-Masonic image as a diabolical pair gave the anti-Dreyfusards one of their most

---


9 This is not to deny that there were Jews who were members of Masonic lodges, just as there were many Protestants (including Anglican clergy), and despite the papal prohibitions, many Catholics. A number of prominent Anglo-Jews were Freemasons, including two British Chief Rabbis (Joseph Hertz and Israel Brodie) and a Haham (Solomon Gaon). There were also dedicated Jewish lodges. In at least one instance, a Masonic service was held within an English synagogue. This was reported in “Masons in Synagogue: Unique and Picturesque Service at Brondesbury,” The Jewish Guardian, 2 November 1923, 6. For a discussion of Anglo-Jewish participation in Freemasonry, see John Shaftesley. “Jews in English Regular Freemasonry, 1717-1860,” Transactions of Jewish Historical Society of England, XXV (1977). Conversely, there was also prejudice against Jews in many lodges. Jacob Katz points out that the relationship between Jews and Freemasons often continued to be marked by ambivalence, especially in Germany during the interwar period, despite the increasingly popular joint vilification of Jews and Freemasons. Jacob Katz, Jews and Freemasons in Europe, 1723-1939, trans. Leonard Oschry (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970).

10 There are hundreds of books about the Dreyfus Affair. George R. Whyte, The Dreyfus Affair: A Chronological History (Houndmills, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008) provides a meticulous day-by-day account of the episode and a comprehensive twenty nine page list of Dreyfus related primary and secondary sources.
potent propaganda weapons whilst the controversy was raging.”\(^{11}\) Significantly, the Dreyfus Affair continued to be referred to as a Jewish-Masonic conspiracy decades after the pardoning and exoneration of Alfred Dreyfus. The third section examines the Catholic Federation, an organisation which was created and supported in order to unify English Catholics into an organised phalanx to combat the Masonic forces which were believed to be aligned against the Church and responsible for the crisis in France. The final section looks at the English Catholic reception of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, a fabricated document which was presented in some English newspapers as evidence of a diabolical Jewish-Masonic conspiracy to dominate the world. The section is short as whilst many of the accusations that form a part of the Protocols were a pervasive aspect of the English Catholic discourse, the Protocols themselves was not embraced as an authentic document.

**The Myth of “Palladian” Freemasonry**

The Diana Vaughan hoax was a long-running anti-Masonic episode which came to its dramatic conclusion in 1897. In 1885, Léo Taxil (formerly Marie Joseph Gabriel Antoine Jogand-Pagès), a French writer, lapsed Catholic and expelled Freemason, started to invent elaborate stories about devil worship and sinister rituals in certain Masonic lodges. Taxil wrote a series of fanciful anti-Masonic works such as *L’Antéchrist ou l’origine de la franc-maçonnerie* (the Antichrist and the origins of Freemasonry). Taxil pretended to be a repentant Catholic. Among the admirers of his writings were the Bishops of Grenoble, Montpellier, Coutances and Port-Louis and the editors of *La Croix, L’Univers*, and *La Civiltà Cattolica*.\(^{12}\) There were also reports that Taxil had a personal meeting with Leo XIII in 1887.\(^{13}\) It has proven difficult to verify

---

\(^{11}\) Katz, *Jews and Freemasons in Europe*, 162. Katz focused primarily on Jewish efforts to enter and obtain equal status within lodges rather than the myth of a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy, but he does discuss this (though not in the context of England) in the final chapters of the book (160–229).


\(^{13}\) A meeting with the pope was reported in the entry for Léo Taxil in Pierre Larousse, ed., *Grand Dictionnaire Universel du XIXe Siècle*, Deuxième Supplément (Paris: Administration du Grand Dictionnaire Universel, [1890]), 1903. Taxil also mentioned the meeting when he gave the speech in April 1897 in which he admitted that Diana Vaughan and Palladian Freemasonry were a fabrication of his own devising. His announcement that the affair had been a hoax was reported in a number of English and French newspapers. See for example “The Diana Vaughan Case,” *Times*, 21 April 1897, 6. A transcript of Taxil’s speech, along with interjections from the audience, was recorded in *Le Frondeur*, 25 April 1897. The speech outlined the efforts Taxil adopted to integrate himself into the Church
whether this meeting actually occurred, but Leo XIII certainly expressed antipathy towards the Freemasons in official documents and it seems plausible that he did not look upon Taxil’s anti-Masonic efforts with displeasure.14

In the 1890s, Taxil crafted the memoirs of Diana Vaughan, a fictitious female apostate from “Palladian” Freemasonry whom he claimed to know and represent (the Mémoires d’une Ex-Palladiste).15 He also wrote Le Diable au XIXe siècle under the pseudonym of Dr Bataille. These works contained elaborate tales about a circle of Satanic Freemasonry, the so-called Palladian lodges, which had supposedly been set up by Albert Pike.16 The tales included bizarre accounts of host desecration, magical rites which employed “the skulls” of “martyred missionaries” and the literal manifestations of Lucifer, Asmodeus and a number of other demons.17 In August 1895, the Tablet stated that “much attention has recently been called to the doings of the various sects of Freemasons abroad by the sudden conversion of one of their high priestesses, Miss Diana Vaughan, ex-Grand Mistress of the Luciferians or Palladians.” Taking the Mémoires d’une Ex-Palladiste at face value, the Tablet reported that prior to converting to Catholicism, Diana had tried, unsuccessfully, to set up a reformed sect of Palladium Freemasonry, because despite “the strange perversion of mind” which had led her to “the worship of Lucifer,” she was not blind to the “degrading character of the rites practised by her fellow-worshippers.”18

14 On 20 April 1884, Leo XIII promulgated an encyclical, “Humanum Genus,” which condemned Freemasonry. This can be accessed via the Vatican website, www.vatican.va. In 1902, Leo sent out an apostolic letter, “Annum Ingressi.” The apostolic letter declared that the purpose of Freemasonry is to “urge war against God and against His Church.” The letter stated that Freemasonry embraces in its “vast net almost all the nations” which it has achieved by “binding governments to its purposes, now by promises, now by threats.” It stated that Freemasonry occasionally advances a “humanitarian programme” as it is “filled with the spirit of Satan” who knows how on occasion to take the appearance of “an angel of light.” Leo XIII, “Annum Ingressi,” 18 March 1902. A copy of this apostolic letter can be found in the Leeds diocesan archives: Apostolic Letter of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII, 1902, Acta Ecclesiae Loïdensis, vol. XII, Leeds Diocesan Archives.

15 Diana Vaughan was the name of Taxil’s secretary/assistant.

16 Albert Pike was a prominent lodge master in American Freemasonry.

17 See Arthur Edward Waite, Devil Worship in France or the Question of Lucifer (London: George Redway, 1896), 67, 104-109, 144-156, passim.

the existence of “Palladian” Freemasonry. The *Tablet* responded in October with an equivocal endorsement of his efforts. The paper first responded to his refutation in a book review. The *Tablet* concluded that *Devil Worship in France* is a “clever but not convincing book of an honourable opponent.” According to the book review, Waite succeeded in casting some doubt upon the lady herself, Miss Diana Vaughan, but not the evidence of Satanism in Masonic lodges. The paper remained profoundly confident that there is “an inner Masonry whose workings are unknown to the general run of Masons,” and “that Satanism is practised under circumstances at least pointing to Masonic association.” “The net result,” the review concluded, “is that we should receive all evidence as to Palladian masonry with caution, and suspend a final judgement until we have exacted evidence as irrefragable as the nature of the case admits.”

A week later, the *Tablet* reported that the Anti-Masonic Congress had set up a “special committee” to deal with the “burning questions” relating to Diana Vaughan. On the one hand the report acknowledged that the “fantastic and legendary accretions” in the “writings published under the pseudonym of ‘Diana Vaughan’” may have “unduly discredited” some of the more sober reflections on the anti-religious hostility and “demonolatry” of Freemasonry. However, the report went on to state:

That there is in France a sect devoted to the worship of Lucifer, as the champion of rebellious humanity, is, we believe, a well-attested fact, and the propagation of this diabolical creed has been ascribed by M. Taxil and M. Ricoux to an inner ring of the Masonic body called Palladic Masonry.

The report then referred back to the review of *Devil Worship in France* which appeared in the previous issue of the *Tablet*, stating that “we reviewed in these columns last week the work in which Mr. Waite, on behalf of Masonry, traverses and impugns these statements, but without any conclusive refutation of their general drift.”

---


21 The Anti-Masonic Congress was an annual gathering inaugurated in 1895 to enable Catholics from different countries to meet and rally their forces against the threat of Freemasonry. “The Anti-Masonic Congress,” *Tablet*, 17 August 1895, 250-251. The Anti-Masonic Congress was still debating the existence of a conspiracy to destroy all nations and found a universal Masonic republic in their place in 1912. It was suggested that Freemasons planned to break down national identities by replacing all other languages with Esperanto. “Esperanto and Freemasonry,” *Catholic Herald*, 13 April 1912, 7.
Referring to Waite’s volume, the Tablet concluded that in attempting to refute the evidence of a connection between Satanic sects and Freemasonry, “the Scotch verdict of ‘Not proven’ is ... the most favourable that can be registered on his review of the situation.”22 The editor of the Tablet was, it seems, reluctant to dismiss the core accusations of Satanic Freemasonry found in Mémoires d’une Ex-Palladiste and Le Diable au XIXe siècle. Significantly, Diana Vaughan was not the only item on the agenda at the Anti-Masonic Congress. The role played by the Jews in the Masonic movement was also discussed at the Congress. One speaker claimed that the “leading spirits of the craft were Hebrews” and that as Freemasonry is entirely in the hands of the Jews, “Anti-Semitism was the most efficacious weapon with which to counteract its pernicious effects.” “For this reason,” the speaker continued, “all true Catholics should support the Anti-Jewish crusade.”23

As the Tablet was sympathetic to the myth of Palladian Freemasonry, it unsurprising became the main forum in England for individuals to share their views about the Diana Vaughan Affair.24 Diana Vaughan had some fervent admirers. One reader, Herbert Jones, a member of the Canons Regular of the Lateran,25 expressed his admiration for the “noble-minded lady who has left the Satanic Society.”26 According to Jones, those who doubt the existence of Miss Vaughan and “talk of deception in the matter are themselves the real dupes of Jew Masons.” He cited a letter from the Bishop of Grenoble which stated that Nathan, Freidel and other prominent Freemasons have been “sent about to cast discredit on Miss Vaughan’s damaging attack on masonry.” According to Jones, Nathan is an English Jew and the “present Grand Master of


24 For letters discussing Diana Vaughan and Palladian Freemasonry, see: Tablet, Letters to the Editor: 24 October 1896, 660-661; 2 January 1897, 21-23; 9 January 1897, 64-65; 16 January 1897, 102; 23 January 1897, 138-139; 20 February 1897, 299; 6 March 1897, 379; 10 April 1897, 577; 17 April 1897, 617-618; 24 April 1897, 657.

25 A Roman Catholic religious order based in Rome but with a presence in England.

26 Herbert Jones, Letters to the Editor, Tablet, 10 April 1897, 577.
French and Italian Freemasonry,” whilst “Freidel, the other Masonic deceiver, ... has been very busy spreading the report that Diana Vaughan is a nonentity.” Jones also stated that “it is well known in Holland that ... a certain M. Rosen, in reality a spy of the Italian Archmason Lemmi, has been visiting many Dutch ecclesiastics and repeating to them that Diana Vaughan is a myth.” Jones claimed that Rosen “pretends to be a convert from Masonry,” but in reality he is a “Jewish Rabbi and a leading mason.” Jones lamented that there are “credulous Catholic journalists” who are being convinced by these Freemasons that Diana Vaughan does not exist. “It is,” he concluded, “a Masonic plot to cast discredit on the damaging revelations of Masonic devilry revealed by Diana Vaughan.” Another reader of the Tablet, Francis Merrick Wyndham, a convert from Anglicanism who went on to become Canon of Westminster Cathedral, sent many letters to the Tablet contributing “evidence” of Diana Vaughan’s existence. He also published a booklet in the same year containing extracts from Masonic texts to demonstrate that a person from any religion, including “a Jew or a Mohammedan,” can be admitted to Freemasonry just as long as they believe in the Great Architect of the Universe. He stated that it logically follows that “a Luciferian or a Satanist” can be admitted to Freemasonry, just as long as he accepts that “Lucifer or Satan is the Great Architect of the Universe.” In response to an announcement that Diana Vaughan would soon make a public appearance, another Catholic advocate of the lady expressed hope that when she appears, sceptical journalists will not continue to “attack a defenceless woman” but rather “give her a fair hearing.”

Credulity over Diana Vaughan’s revelations was not confined to the pages of the Tablet. Baroness Mary Elizabeth Herbert, a close friend and associate of Cardinal

27 Jones probably had Ernesto Nathan in mind, who was Jewish and a Freemason. He became mayor of Rome in 1907.
28 Herbert Jones, Letters to the Editor, Tablet, 23 January 1897, 138-139.
29 Francis M. Wyndham, Letters to the Editor, Tablet: 2 January 1897, 21-22; 16 January 1897, 102; 23 January 1897, 139; 20 February 1897, 299; 10 April 1897, 577. Francis Merrick Wyndham was born into an illustrious family. He was the son of Colonel Charles Wyndham, the 3rd Baron Leconfield, and Elizabeth Scott, daughter of the 4th Lord Polwarth. Wyndham took Anglican Orders but converted to Roman Catholicism in 1868. He was ordained priest of the Congregation of Oblates of St Charles in 1871, was elected Superior of the Bayswater Community in 1891 and was appointed Canon of Westminster in 1909. See F. C. Burnand, ed., Catholic Who’s Who & Year Book, 1915 (London: Burns & Oates, 1915), 478.
31 Archibald J. Dunn, Letters to the Editor, Tablet, 6 March 1897, 379.
Vaughan, wrote a review article in the Dublin Review about two books by Domenico Margiotta on the subject of Freemasonry and the worship of Lucifer. Margiotta was one of Léo Taxil’s “auxiliary” assistants. Herbert announced that “in spite of the superhuman efforts to conceal their proceedings made by the freemasons throughout the world,” the “true nature” of Freemasonry is becoming known through the revelations of former members “of the sect.” She accepted Margiotta’s claims that Adriano Lemmi, a prominent Italian Freemason, was a convicted thief, a secret Jew convert and a Satanist schismatic (Margiotta claimed that a rift existed in Freemasonry between the Palladian “Luciferians” and the Satanic schismatics). She also accepted at face value his lengthy discussion of Diana Vaughan’s “noble and generous character” and her consistent refusal to “profane a consecrated Host,” even though this was, according to Margiotta, insisted upon by “the order.”

On 19 April 1897, a large audience, consisting largely of Catholics and Freemasons, gathered in the auditorium of the Société Géographique in Paris in order to finally meet Diana Vaughan. The audience was consequently stunned when Taxil rather than Diana Vaughan appeared on the stage and announced that the whole tale of Palladian Freemasonry was a hoax. Diana Vaughan, the illusive ex-Grand Mistress of the Luciferians, did not exist. Taxil thanked the Catholic bishops and editors who had encouraged his exposés of Satanic Freemasonry. The reaction of English Catholics was mixed. Some were embarrassed about the credulity of their fellows. Two weeks before the hoax was confessed, an anonymous book reviewer in the Month stated that he found it “quite inexplicable” that in England, “Catholics should be found to swallow down any extravagant and prurient absurdity which M. Léo Taxil may choose

32 Mary Elizabeth Herbert, the Baroness Herbert of Lea, was an English Catholic philanthropist and a prolific author of religious books and pamphlets. She converted from Anglicanism to Catholicism in 1866, largely under the influence of Cardinal Manning. She also became a close friend of Cardinal Vaughan. She was the foremost benefactor to Vaughan’s project to create the Foreign Missionary College at Mill Hill. See Robert O’Neil, Cardinal Herbert Vaughan: Archbishop of Westminster, Bishop of Salford, Founder of the Mill Hill Missionaries (Tunbridge Wells, Kent: Burns & Oates, 1995), 158-162, 174-176, passim.
33 Taxil described Margiotta as an “unexpected auxiliary” rather than an “accomplice,” because in the beginning he was “one of the hoaxed.” According to Taxil, when Margiotta realised his mistake, he decided to play along and “declare himself an accomplice,” rather than be ridiculed as “a blind volunteer.” Bernheim, Samii and Serejski, “The Confession of Léo Taxil,” Heredom, 159.
34 Mary Elizabeth Herbert, review of Adriano Lemmi: Supreme Head of the Freemasons and Le Palladisme; Or the Worship of Lucifer, both books by Domenico Margiotta, Dublin Review, CXVIII (January 1896), 192-201.
35 See Bernheim, Samii and Serejski, “The Confession of Léo Taxil,” Heredom, 137-168.
to invite them to believe about Freemasonry.” The reviewer found it humiliating that “respected ecclesiastics” defend such absurdities in “our public journals.”  

Herbert Thurston, a prominent Jesuit scholar examined in chapter two in connection to the ritual murder accusation, was no friend to Freemasonry. Nevertheless, in 1898, as part of an article which discussed the ritual murder accusation, he stated that the “Diana Vaughan episode” was a “pitiable exposure of credulity.” He concluded that the end of the anti-Masonic episode, the “disappearance into thin air of the impalpable ‘luciferians,’” seems only to have “added new zest to the pursuit of the unquestionably very real and substantial Israelites.” Other Catholics were angry. The Tablet directed its anger at Taxil. The Universe also focused on the “discreditable” actions of Taxil, regarding it as no surprise that he only “narrowly escaped personal chastisement at the hands of his dupes.” Conversely, the Paris correspondent for the Catholic Herald vented his frustration on the credulous Catholics who had lapped up the “ridiculous and grotesque stories” about Palladian Freemasonry and the Catholic newspapers that

---

36 “The Diana Vaughan Hoax,” review of La Fin d’une Mystification, by Eugène Portalié, Month, LXXXIX (April 1897), 442. The reviewer pointed to claims in Diana Vaughan’s memories about the arrival of the Antichrist and the election of a Pope who would renounce Christ for Lucifer. He wrote a long letter to the Tablet on 13 April 1897 in response to letters by Francis Wyndham and Herbert Jones. Wyndham and Jones had accused him of not reading Diana Vaughan’s memoirs carefully, as the references to the Antichrist in her memoirs were not her views but those of “the Palladists.” For the two letters, see Letters to the Editor, Tablet, 10 April 1897, 577. The reviewer explained that he had focused on the Antichrist myth because being a familiar Christian narrative it was easy to discuss succinctly. He went on to summarise and dismiss some of the more absurd narratives about so-called Palladian Freemasonry, such as “the birth story of Sophia Walder, begotten and suckled by a devil,” “the embracing of the chaste Diana by the beautiful demon Asmodeus,” “the profanation of hosts” and “the blasphemous parodies of Masses and devotions.” Reviewer, Letters to the Editor, Tablet, 17 April 1897, 617-618. The Tablet later acknowledged “the sagacity” which led to the Month seeing through the hoax. Notes, Tablet, 24 April 1897, 648.

37 Herbert Thurston published a number of articles and books which were highly critical of Freemasonry, though they were written without the hysterical diabolisation of some of his contemporaries. His main concerns seem to have been that Freemasonry was deistic, secretive, revolutionary, conspiratorial, anti-Christian, anti-clerical and anti-Catholic. See for example Herbert Thurston, Freemasonry (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1921); Herbert Thurston, “The Popes and Freemasonry,” Topics of the Day, Tablet, 27 January 1923, 108; Herbert Thurston, “The Church’s International Enemy,” Month, CXLVIII (November 1926), 385-397; Herbert Thurston, No Popery: Chapters on Anti-Papal Prejudice (London: Sheed and Ward, 1930), 55-86. His criticisms were mainly directed at “continental” Freemasonry. However, he observed that whilst English Freemasonry was “convivial,” “philanthropic” and not driven by an anti-clerical animus, when it came to the practices of their continental brethren, they were only slightly less culpable as they simply “shrugged their shoulders and looked another way.” Thurston, “The Popes and Freemasonry,” 108.

38 Thurston, “Anti-Semitism,” 562. Thurston wrote a letter to the Tablet in January 1897, the nature of which suggested that he already believed the Diana Vaughan revelations were “an exploded myth.” Herbert Thurston, Letters to the Editor, Tablet, 2 January 1897, 22-23.


40 “The Diana Vaughan Case,” Universe, 24 April 1897, 4.
swallowed the alleged revelations as if they were gospel. The correspondent reported that every absurd story about Diana Vaughan was raised “to the height of a dogma” and Catholics who refused to accept them had been branded as “a traitor to the Church and perhaps nearly a Freemason, too.”

After Taxil’s announcement, narratives about Palladian and Satanic Freemasonry largely faded from English Catholic discourse. They did not however completely disappear. Colonel James Ratton, an English Catholic, retired army doctor and author, helped to keep them alive for a little while longer. In 1901, he published *X-Rays in Freemasonry*. This repeated traditional stereotypes about the anti-Christian nature of Freemasonry and its alleged war against the Church. It repeatedly emphasised Jewish involvement in Freemasonry and informed readers that the Jews killed Christ and have clung onto their “anti-Christian” principles and ideals ever since. According to Ratton, these ideals include “the expectation of another Messiah, who, we know, will be Antichrist.” He argued that Freemasonry is Satanic and that “the Bnai-Bérith,” whose goal he suggested was the domination of Freemasonry and the reestablishment of King Solomon’s Temple, is a branch of Freemasonry closed to non-Jews with the exception of visits by the “Inspectors General of the Palladium.” Ratton added new material when he republished *X-Rays in 1904*. He argued that Zionism is of interest because it has been prophesised that when the Jews return to Jerusalem, “anti-Christ will appear in their midst.” According to Ratton, Freemasonry, guided by the Jews, is preparing to move its headquarters to Jerusalem, and when the

42 Though articles about the influence of Satan and Antichrist, especially in Russia and Mexico but also in modernist and spiritualist movements in the West, continued to be quite common in English Catholic periodicals.
43 Ratton published a number of books on diverse, not exclusively religious subjects. Several of his books were however concerned with the Antichrist and the apocalypse. The *Catholic Who’s Who* observed that Ratton had “made a special study of the Apocalypse, and is the author of several well-considered works.” Burnand, *Catholic Who’s Who & Year Book*, 1908, 335. During the early years of the twentieth century, Ratton accepted the myth of the Jewish Antichrist. Ratton’s views about the Antichrist and the apocalypse did however change significantly sometime between 1904 and 1914. He still referred to the Jews’ rejection of Christ, but he no longer believed in the Jewish Antichrist. He argued that Nero was the Antichrist prophesised by Daniel, and that all subsequent millenarian traditions of the Antichrist are based on the exegetical writings of St. Irenaeus (which he suggests were faulty). James Ratton, *Antichrist: An Historical Review* (London: Burns and Oates, 1917); James Ratton, “Antichrist,” Letters to the Editor, *Universe*, 4 December 1914, 4.
44 James Ratton [A. Cowan, pseud.], *X-Rays in Freemasonry* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1901), passim.
“Bnai-Bérith” joins them, “then will anti-Christ appear in alliance with the Sovereign Pontiff of Freemasonry, and incite the international Masonic forces to persecute the Church in such fashion as has never been before.”46 Montague Summers, an eccentric convert to Catholicism, continued to argue that Albert Pike, the alleged founder of Palladian Freemasonry, had been the Grand Master of “societies practising Satanism.”47 Father Cahill, an Irish Jesuit, argued in Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement (1929), that Freemasonry is associated with occultism, Satanism, the Antichrist, Judaism, Jewish rites, the Cabala and a Judaeo-Masonic anti-Christian movement.48 He concluded that the Diana Vaughan hoax was probably a plot to discredit the “reliable evidence” that Freemasonry is associated with Satanism.49 According to the Catholic Times, Father Cahill, unlike prominent Freemasons, does not expect readers to accept “even a single point” from his book on faith, for he “proves everything.”50

The Dreyfus Affair and its Aftermath

Coming soon after the embarrassment of the Diana Vaughan Hoax, the Dreyfus Affair proved to be another difficult predicament for English Catholics at the end of the nineteenth century.51 The English secular press accused the Church in France of siding against Dreyfus and provoking anti-Jewish agitations and riots. Many of the English Catholic newspapers understandably felt the need to defend the Church from this accusation.52 By the time of the second court martial of Dreyfus in 1899, there was

---

47 Summers, The History of Witchcraft, 8. Summers was introduced in chapter two.
48 Edward Cahill, Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement, 2nd ed. (Dublin: M. H. Gill, 1930), 67-95. The first edition was published in 1929.
49 Ibid, 70-71.
51 According to Ruth Harris, the significance of the Diana Vaughan episode was not that certain Catholics were fooled by the hoax, “but that it revealed their phantasmagoric fears on the eve of the Dreyfus Affair.” Ruth Harris, “The Assumptionists and the Dreyfus Affair,” Past and Present, 194 (2007), 185.
52 See for example, “Dr. Mivart’s Attack on the Pope,” Notes of the Week, Catholic Times, 20 October 1899, 7; “Religious Liberty in France,” Notes of the Week, Catholic Times, 17 November 1899, 7; “Rennes – and After,” Topics of the Day, Tablet, 16 September 1899, 441-442; “The Dreyfus Case in Rome,” Rome Correspondence, Tablet, 16 September 1899, 453; “Another Canard about the Holy See,”
hope and expectation in English Catholic newspapers that Dreyfus would be acquitted so that the affair could be closed. Consequently, there was some disappointment when he was once again found guilty. Despite the disappointment, some English Catholic papers had expressed considerable hostility towards Jews and Freemasons prior to the retrial. As we saw in the previous chapter, the editor of the *Month* argued that the Jews had provoked the Dreyfus agitation by engaging in nefarious usury. Turning to the question of why Jesuits were being blamed for the agitation, the editor accepted the suggestion that this was a consequence of the anti-clerical fanaticism of the Freemasons.

The linkage of Jews and Freemasons in the *Month*’s explanation of the Dreyfus Affair was relatively incidental rather than conspiratorial in tone. Conversely, the *Tablet* was explicit in its declaration of an alliance between Jews and Freemasons. In late 1899, when the problematic nature of the guilty verdict against Dreyfus was hard to deny, the *Tablet* expressed the hope that he would be acquitted and regret when he was once again found guilty. This was neither from a sympathy for Jews nor from an absolute rejection of antisemitism. In 1897, the *Tablet* legitimised the use of an “anti-semitic policy” by Christian and Catholic political parties as the necessary if regrettable means of dealing with “the alliance” between Jews and Freemasons. The paper stated that:

> In criticizing the Anti-Semitic policy of the clerical party on the Continent, it must be remembered that the Ghetto is there the focus and centre of the Liberal warfare against Catholicism, and that Jews and

---

53 The strongest example of this can be found in the *Catholic Times*. The paper suggested on 1 September 1899 that “hatred of the Jews has played a large part in the sad drama,” and on 22 September that it was “a shame that, whatever may be known behind the scenes, a man on public trial for his liberty and his reputation should have been found guilty on evidence such as has been gravely received by the Court Martial at Rennes.” “The Condemnation of Dreyfus,” *Catholic Times*, 1 September 1899, 7 and “French Catholics and the Dreyfus Case,” *Catholic Times*, 22 September 1899, 7. The *Catholic Herald* reported that it seems impossible to imagine any civilised country finding Dreyfus guilty based on the evidence presented. “The Dreyfus Case,” *Catholic Herald*, 15 September 1899, 12.


55 The *Tablet* attributed the miscarriage of justice to an unwitting wrong. It suggested that the officers involved were “suddenly called away from the parade-ground and told to turn themselves into judges. They have had no previous training to qualify them for the task thrust upon them, they have never been taught to sift or weigh evidence, and there had been nothing in their past careers to fit them to approach the questions submitted to them in a judicial frame of mind.” “Rennes – and After,” Topics of the Day, *Tablet*, 16 September 1899, 441.
Freemasons form every-where the vanguard of the forces of infidelity. … The alliance of the Synagogue with the Lodges is in all continental countries the symbol of the triumph of infidelity over Christianity, and the creed of modern, no less than of ancient Judaism, is hostility to the Christian name.  

The paper again revealed its narrow interpretation of unacceptable “anti-Semitism” during the Dreyfus Affair when it argued that:

We shall not, we trust, be accused of palliating or condoning the excesses of anti-Semitism, by pointing out that the Jews, in France, Italy, and Austria, the three principal Catholic nations of the continent, exercise a political influence entirely disproportioned to their numbers, and that this influence is always exercised against the religion of the country. In close alliance with the Freemasons, … they form the backbone of the party of aggressive liberalism, with war to the knife against the Church as the sum and aim of its policy.”

Though the paper did not use the term “conspiracy” (it instead referred to a “league of combined forces”), the editor of the Tablet clearly had a Judeo-Masonic camarilla in mind.

In the years following the pardoning of Alfred Dreyfus, a backlash occurred against the Church in France, at least partly as a consequence of the Church’s perceived role in the crisis. Whilst many Catholic priests and newspapers had agitated against Jews and Freemasons, the Assumptionist Fathers and La Croix foremost amongst them, there is some truth in Michael Burns’ suggestion that the desire to reduce Church influence led to little distinction being made between those who had a role in the agitations and those who had none. Burns argues that the “policies and practices of the Waldeck-Rousseau and Combes ministries confirmed that Dreyfusards, once on top, were not immune to their own brand of intolerance and revenge.” Burns concludes that in retaliation for earlier persecutions of Jews, Protestants and Freemasons, a campaign was orchestrated “to punish Catholic priests, monks, and nuns.” However, whilst there may have been some Jews and some Freemasons who were involved in calling for retaliatory measures against the Church

56 “Antisemitism in the Austrian Election,” Tablet, 27 March 1897, 481-482
57 “Captain Dreyfus and His Champions,” Topics of the Day, Tablet. 12 February 1898, 238.
58 Michael Burns, France and the Dreyfus Affair: A Documentary History (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 1999), 171.
in France, a significant let alone corporate agitation by Jews and Masons is a fantasy rooted in the nineteenth century myth of a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy.

Life for members of religious orders and institutes was soon made very difficult. According to Burns, by 1904, thousands of religious schools had been closed and priests and nuns were fleeing the country to avoid persecution.²⁹ Many of the orders were suppressed and exiled. The Assumptionist Fathers, the religious order responsible for the hostile representations of the Jews and the Freemasons in La Croix, were among the first to be targeted shortly after Dreyfus was pardoned in 1899.⁶⁰ According to Ruth Harris, the Assumptionists believed that “Masonic lodges were literally dens of iniquity, peopled by the Devil’s consorts.” They believed they were “locked in an actual struggle with the Evil One.”⁶¹ Conveniently forgetting its own articles about the Jews during the Dreyfus Affair, which at the most generous could be described as ambivalent, the Tablet, on 16 September 1899, described La Croix as an “irresponsible rag” because of its role in agitating against Jews during the Dreyfus Affair.⁶² Two weeks later it expressed sympathy for La Croix now that it was the turn of the Assumptionists to be harassed. The Tablet argued that “some words of La Croix which are less unreasonable than the quotations which have been going the round of the English press may be quoted, not as condoning its faults but in the spirit of giving it its due.” According to the Tablet, La Croix stated that: “the Dreyfus affair was a source of division and suffering. Let it be closed and let silence follow the vicious agitation which has been aroused amongst us by our worst enemies, the Freemasons and foreign Jews.” The Tablet concluded that whilst these comments by La Croix are “perhaps not all that could be desired,” they at least provide a counter-balance to the savage attacks that have appeared in various English newspapers.⁶³ The Catholic Times also rallied behind the Assumptionists. It acknowledged that the Assumptionists had shown “neither tact, prudence, nor ordinary common sense,” during the drama and had been “preaching race-hatred and stirring up strife” when they should have been “preaching religion,” but it concluded that “two blacks do not make a white.” The

²⁹ Ibid.
³⁰ La Croix, which was owned and run by the Assumptionist Fathers, frequently expressed extreme hostility towards Jews and Freemasons.
³¹ Harris, “The Assumptionists,” 185.
³² “Opinions on the Dreyfus Judgement,” News From France, Tablet, 16 September 1899, 454
Assumptionists, the paper argued, had violated the canons of “fair journalism” and “good taste” but were not guilty of any “illegality” and should not thus be persecuted or punished.  

By the end of 1905, many of the religious orders in France had been banned and the Church and State were separated. This was considered by some English Catholics as sufficient evidence of a plot against the Church, and in some cases as evidence of a Jewish-Masonic camarilla. In 1906, Canon William Barry excoriated Freemasonry, which he alleged was in close alliance with the Jews. He claimed that Freemasonry, like Socialism, falsely professes the cause of “universal peace,” which it pursues by “running down the Army.” The Freemasons, he argued, have always been eager to do mischief to the Army and the Church, which was why they supported the Dreyfusard cause. According to Barry, the crisis in France is not a battle between Republicans and the Church as such, but between Freemasonry and the Church. Barry stated that Combes and Waldeck-Rousseau, the leaders of the French government, take their orders from the Grand Orient. Combes, Barry asserted, depends on the lodge to keep his position and if he refuses to carry “out their designs to the letter,” he will be “speedily flung aside.” Barry concluded that people in Great Britain know little about Masonic mischief in France because “the people here are guided by the telegrams that appear in the daily papers” and “these telegrams come from the great news agencies, which are in the hands of syndicates which are generally controlled by Jews.” “The alliance between the Freemasons and the Jews,” Barry concluded, “is a very close one.”

The Catholic Times also responded aggressively to the separation of Church and State in France. Whilst it focused primarily on the role of Freemasonry, it too suggested that Freemasons had been aided by the Jewish press which controlled the flow of information. In a series of editorials published in December 1905 through to March 1906, the Catholic Times informed its readers that “the Catholic Church is a

65 This is discussed in Maurice Larkin, Church and State after the Dreyfus Affair: The Separation Issue in France (London: Macmillan Press, 1974).
determined enemy of Freethinkers and Freemasonry.” The Catholic Times suggested that the Freethinkers and Freemasons were united in a “methodical campaign for the destruction of every form of religion,” the “dechristianisation” of society, the suppression of the religious orders and the persecution and humiliation of the priesthood. The paper stated that the Grand Master of the Grand Orient in Rome threatened that “justice will speedily overtake” any brother within the lodge who has “anything whatever to do with the clericals.” The paper concluded that this meant that they would be “assassinated.” The reason why “so little attention has been paid to the abominable persecution of the Catholic Church,” the paper explained, is that “most of our daily papers are now largely owned by Jews, who have, with a few exceptions, selected Freemasons as editors or contributors.”67 The Catholic Times returned to the accusation that Jews control the press a few months later. It concluded that soon Christians “shall have to prostrate ourselves before every Jew we meet in the streets, since they will become the masters of England as they are already of the rest of Europe.” The paper stated that it deplored the persecution and massacre of Jews, but it concluded that Jew incurs such risks when they encourage anarchy. It protested against “the most universal falsification of news of which the Jewish correspondents of the London papers are guilty, and which is tending to direct public opinion against Christianity and Christians.”68

Anti-Masonic stereotypes and the myth of a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy continued to be invoked in the second and third decades of the twentieth century. For example, the Catholic Gazette, the periodical of the Catholic Missionary Society, accused Freemasonry of being deistic, secretive, actively conspiratorial, anti-Christian and anti-Catholic.69 An article in the Catholic Gazette in 1916 argued that in addition to the current war (i.e. the First World War), there is a “a greater conflict which has never ceased from the fall of the Angels to the present moment, the conflict between good and evil.” Catholics, the article argued, must strengthen their defences against


69 See Catholic Gazette: “Freemasonry,” September 1915, 9-13; The Question Box, August 1914, 18-19; The Question Box, December 1923, 335.
the anti-Catholic attacks. One aspect of the supposed world conspiracy was the Reuter’s news agency, which was, the article explained, “Prussian-Jewish-Masonic.” The article concluded that its reports were “written by Atheists or Jews” and animated by a “vicious” and “mendacious” hostility to the Church.\textsuperscript{70} Articles and editorials in the \textit{Catholic Times} accused Masonic lodges of engaging in murder, treachery and revolution, and being anti-clerical, politically manipulative and violent in their hatred of the Church in France.\textsuperscript{71} The \textit{Month} similarly accused Freemasonry of being secretive, sinister, anti-national, revolutionary, bolshevist, anti-Christian and anti-Catholic.\textsuperscript{72} The \textit{Month} tended to keep its criticism of Jews and Freemasons separate, but an editorial in November 1923 linked them together. Alluding to the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria and his wife in 1914, the event usually cited as the trigger for the First World War, the editorial referred to the rousing of Christian Hungary during the war in response to “the tyranny of the Freemasons, who scarcely concealed their share in the Serajevo murders, [and] the notorious crimes and treacheries of the Jews.”\textsuperscript{73}

Another prominent contributor to the stereotype of the Judeo-Masonic alliance was Hilaire Belloc. Alluding to the Freemasons, Belloc stated in the \textit{Eye Witness} in September 1911, that “the Jewish element in every European country tended not so much to produce these secret societies as to control them one they arose.” He observed that the more important secret societies could be identified by their “quasi-Hebrew” ritual. Belloc stated that the Jew everywhere flocks into “the organisation of masonry and the bodies affiliated to it.” Belloc concluded that “though the Jewish race and secret organisation were not synonymous,” they were closely connected and it was notable, he suggested, that the secret societies always “tended to attack exactly that

\textsuperscript{71} See for example, \textit{Catholic Times}: Roman Correspondent, “Freemasonry and the Struggle,” \textit{Roman Events}, 24 October 1913, 8; Special Correspondent, “French Freemasons and the Anti-Clerical Spirit,” 7 November 1913, 9; Clerical Correspondent, “Freemasonry in France,” 30 October 1914, 8; C. E. Jeffery, “Freemasonry and the War of 1870,” 13 November 1914, 8; “The Irish Police and Freemasonry,” Notes of the Week, 17 November 1916, 3.
\textsuperscript{73} “Catholic Prospects in Hungary,” Miscellanea, \textit{Month}, CXLII (November 1923), 440-441.
which the Jew had always attacked in Europe.” In a speech at the Catholic Congress in Norwich in 1912, Belloc blamed the Jews and Freemasons for the revolution which two years previously had deposed the monarchy in Portugal and established a republic in its place. According to a report in the Catholic Federationist, Belloc had stated that it was not the change of regime per se that bothered him, but the fact that “it had been done by the universal method of modern secret societies, modern Masons, and modern financial Jews through committees, clique, and sham elections.” According to the report, Belloc stated that a “minority acting secretly and in conspiracy through Masonic institutions controlled by cosmopolitan and Jewish financiers” sought to “uproot in Europe the Catholic Church.” This supposed struggle “between the Catholic Church and its enemies was,” Belloc concluded, “the most important event in the world.” He made similar claims about Jews and Freemasons at a meeting of the Irish Catholic Truth Society in 1913 and the English Catholic Truth Society in 1917. By the time he completed The Jews, Belloc had revised his opinion about the nature of the Jewish-Masonic connection. Freemasonry was no longer merely allied with or infiltrated by the Jews, it had been founded by them. Belloc stated that Freemasonry is a “specially Jewish institution” which “the Jews had inaugurated as a sort of bridge between themselves and their hosts in the seventeenth century.” He concluded that as a consequence of the Masonic influence in Britain, the nation has been manipulated into the role of “official protector of the Jews in other countries.” Britain, he surmised, has thus become the ideal location for a “permanent establishment and rooting of Jewish power, and for the organisation of a Jewish base.” Belloc later stated in a letter to Mrs. Reginald Balfour that the Dreyfus struggle had been between Catholic culture and “the anti-Catholic Freemasons.”

The most consistent and frequent English Catholic antagonist to the Jews and Freemasons was not Belloc, pugnacious as his constructions of the Jew-Freemason were, but Charles Diamond, the maverick editor of the Catholic Herald. The Catholic

---

75 Summary of Belloc’s speech, in “Notes from Norwich,” Catholic Federationist, September 1912, 3-4.
76 See “Mr. Hilaire Belloc on the Church and the Modern World,” Catholic Times, 24 October 1913, 10 and “Mr. Hilaire Belloc on Catholic Progress,” Catholic Federationist, June 1917, 2.
Herald’s constructions of the Freemason from circa 1912 onwards, like its constructions of the Jew, became increasingly acerbic. The paper’s hostility towards Freemasonry was not merely an instrumental component of its hostility towards Jews (or vice versa). The paper attacked Jews and Freemasons with equal passion. According to the Catholic Herald, “Freemasonry is a detestable form of secret tyranny as is proved by its implacable hatred of Catholics on the Continent.” The paper argued and produced reports suggesting that Freemasonry is “anti-Christian,” “anti-Catholic,” “anti-nation,” “anti-social” and a “State within the State.” The paper alleged that Freemasons conspire to discredit and attack Catholics, and in particular Catholic priests, as part of its organised campaign against religion. The paper also suggested that Freemasonry has secretly and insidiously infiltrated and “honey-combed” the British army, navy and war office. Its main concern was that as a result these institutions were suffused by a “subtle anti-catholic spirit.” It also hinted at Masonic naval officers participating in the “most shocking” rites and rituals whilst their vessels were docked in foreign countries.

Whilst the Catholic Herald excoriated Jews and Freemasons independently, the paper’s construction of the Freemason not only closely mirrored its construction of the secretive, disloyal, anti-social and anti-Christian Jew, it also coalesced with it. For example, the paper stated that “the worst elements of Jewry, as of Atheism and Freemasonry ... are the enemies of Christian civilisation as well as of Freedom and Justice.” After the war, one of the articles in the Catholic Herald that accused the Pharisees of murdering Christ and contemporary Jews of failing to improve during their two thousand years of penitence for this “unparalleled crime,” went on to report that whilst the “defeat of Germany” in the war was a “blow to German Jew interests and ambitions, we may rest assured that the Jew trader, the Jew speculator, the Jew

financier, the Jew Freemason, the Jew, politically and socially, will emerge from the ordeal the gainer as a whole by the cataclysm.”

The paper announced that the “Young Turks” who led the violent revolution in Turkey were predominantly Jews and Freemasons. “Freemasonry in Turkey,” the paper reported, “is of the atheist Jew brand” and the “Young Turks” who have been put in control of the Ottoman Empire by the Freemasons are “chiefly Salonica Jews, revolutionists, anti-Christians, and atheistical Masons, almost without exception.” The paper blamed the Jews and Freemasons for other revolutions of an anti-clerical nature. For example, in the late 1920s, the paper attributed the persecution of Catholics in Mexico to the “forces of evil represented by Atheists, Freemasons, Communists, Jews and all the other forces of infamy.”

During and subsequent to the First World War, the Catholic Herald repeatedly returned to the Dreyfus Affair and the crisis in France, which had, it suggested, been provoked by the “Masonic-Jewish camarilla.” The paper suggested that the Jews and Freemasons exploited the crisis in France as an opportunity to persecute and exclude Catholics from political positions, to plunder the Church and disestablish the Catholic religion. The paper asked, “has any body of Jews, here or elsewhere, protested against the Jew-freemason-atheist plunder of the French Catholic Church?” The Catholic Herald reasoned that Alfred Dreyfus must have been a Freemason and that the Freemasons supported the Dreyfusard cause because he was a brother of the Lodge. The reality of the case, the paper suggested, was that “a traitorous French Jew was punished for his guilt of treason.” The paper repeatedly argued that when a reporter from the Daily Mail was sent to France to investigate the retrial of Dreyfus and concluded that he seemed to be a little guilty, Dreyfus’ Jewish-Freemason brothers would not accept it. They got their way, the paper concluded, and

87 “Freemasonry and the War Office,” Catholic Herald, 1 April 1916, 4.
consequently a second reporter was sent to France with instructions to write “that Dreyfus ‘was innocent’, in face of the evidence and of his own convictions!”91

The Catholic Federation

Louis Charles Casartelli, the reluctant Bishop of Salford diocese from 1903 to 1925, blamed the Church’s crisis in France on the disunity of French Catholics.92 In his monthly Bishop’s message for March 1913, he stated that “a comparative handful of Freemasons has succeeded in monopolising the political and executive power over nations pre-ponderatingly Catholic.”93 In August 1914, he concluded that Catholics in France had succumbed to the “sectarian hostility of their enemies,” as despite constituting “the great bulk of the nation,” they lacked effective organisation and were thus “rent into contending factions” and rendered “easy victims to skilful and united foes.”94 He was concerned that if the Church was so open to attack in a country like France with a Catholic majority, it could also be vulnerable in England.95 Casartelli regarded Freemasonry as a malign force, but he also expressed a grudging admiration for it. Casartelli asked, “why should Catholics not take a leaf out their book?”96 He attributed Freemasonry’s success to the efficacy of a well-organised force and

91 “1,000 Dreyfus Cases,” Notes and Comments, Catholic Herald, 31 May 1919, 6. The Catholic Herald repeatedly claimed that the Jews and Freemasons had pressured Lord Northcliffe, the owner of the Daily Mail, to declare that Dreyfus was innocent irrespective of his actual guilt. See for example, Catholic Herald: “The Greek Scandal,” Notes and Comments, 12 August 1916, 2; “Northcliffe and the Dreyfus Affair,” 9 September 1922, 6; “Trotsky Wants to Come Here,” 29 June 1929, 4.
92 For a good introduction to Casartelli, see Broadley, Louis Charles Casartelli. Casartelli was a well respected Orientalist, an expert in Sanskrit and Zoroastrianism, with a doctorate in oriental languages from Louvain. He taught Iranian language and literature at Manchester University and was elected to the Royal Asiatic Society in recognition of his scholarship in 1889. According to Broadley, it was largely against his own will that he was appointed bishop of Salford in 1903. He expressed his views about his unsuitability for the post and would rather have dedicated his life to scholarship. Whilst he subsequently threw himself into the role, bringing his intellectual abilities to the task, he was regarded as a distant figure to his clergy, and he apparently regarded his work as bishop as a burden. Broadley, Louis Charles Casartelli, 1-7; Aspden, Fortress Church, 29.
concluded that it is an adversary whose tactics should be learnt from, even adopted, since they have proven so effective.

Another concern for Casartelli was Socialism. His solution to the so-called organised threat of Socialism and Freemasonry was for all Catholics to be part of an equally effective and organised movement. The Catholic Federation, inaugurated in 1906, was envisaged as the backbone of an overarching movement to unify and guide the actions of Catholic individuals and organisations. According to the Catholic Federationist, the monthly periodical of the movement, the Catholic Federation was spreading throughout Europe and America to “weld the Catholic forces into one grand phalanx to combat in a practical manner the evils of the world” and the Federation in England was destined to “marshal the forces of the Catholic Church in the great battles of the future against the rising tides of Freemasonry, Socialism and an anti-Christian democracy.” Casartelli stated in his diary that there was great enthusiasm for the Catholic Federation, with some 40,000 people attending a demonstration which had been organised by the new organisation in October 1906. The Catholic Federation soon spread from Salford to other dioceses (and archdioceses) such as Westminster, Liverpool, Leeds and Portsmouth. The Salford diocese remained the main focus of Catholic Federation activity and the Salford branch the most proactive body within the movement. As Peter Doyle has observed, “for many people inside and outside the movement,” the Salford Federation “was the Catholic Federation.” In addition to the Catholic Federation, Casartelli also supported the Catenian Association, a Catholic fraternal organisation, as an acceptable alternative to Freemasonry. In November

---

97 For introductions to the Catholic Federation, see Broadley, Louis Charles Casartelli, 178-189 and Doyle, “The Catholic Federation,” 461-476.
99 Louis Charles Casartelli, diary entry, 13 October 1906, box F162, Casartelli’s Diaries, Salford Diocesan Archives.
100 Doyle, “The Catholic Federation,” 461; Fielding, Irish Catholics in England, 113. The failure of the Catholic Federation to develop a power base in Westminster was largely due to Cardinal Bourne’s antipathy towards the organisation. He kept a tight reign on the Westminster branch, informing them that “they did not make policy” and that their role, at most, was “purely advisory.” Michael J. Walsh, The Westminster Cardinals: The Past and the Future (London: Burns and Oates, 2008), 97.
102 Originally a circle of Catholic businessmen, the organisation expanded into a Catholics only fraternal organisation with Casartelli’s blessing. The rules and regalia of this organisation were closely modelled upon the constitutions and regalia of Masonic lodges. For an introduction to the Catenian Association, see Peter Lane, The Catenian Association, 1908-1983 (London: Catenian Association, 1982).
1909, Casartelli informed Cardinal Bourne, the head of the English hierarchy, that the Association “has already succeeded in weaning a number of Catholics from Freemasonry.”\textsuperscript{103} He claimed in 1911 that the Catenian Association kept young Catholic men away from Freemasonry and rescued others from “its clutches.”\textsuperscript{104} As Martin Broadley observed, “the Catholic Federation and the Catenian Association were the fruits of Casartelli’s early vision for an organised and unified force of Catholic laity and clergy.”\textsuperscript{105}

When Casartelli helped to inaugurate the Catholic Federation, his primary concerns were “the supposedly malevolent and organised forces represented by Freemasonry and Socialism.”\textsuperscript{106} There is little evidence that Casartelli initially had the Jews in mind. The \textit{Catholic Federationist} did however occasionally link Jews and Freemasons in the early days of the organisation. For example, in January 1911, an article in the \textit{Catholic Federationist} described Freemasonry as a malign body that was “sapping and mining the very foundations of Christianity in the political state, because there has been no corresponding lay movement of sufficient strength to counteract it.” The article suggested that another anti-Catholic enemy was “Nathan, the Jewish and Infidel Mayor of Rome, and others of kindred breed.” Organisations like the Catholic Federation, the paper argued, are required to counter such “enemies of the Church.”\textsuperscript{107} A month later the paper praised Karl Lueger, the mayor of Vienna, as “an ideal Catholic Federationist.” The paper argued that “the Jew and Freemason had almost annihilated ever vestige of social Catholicity” in Vienna, but upon taking office, Lueger immediately set himself to restoring the ancient religious customs of the city.\textsuperscript{108}

Jews became a more significant factor in the Catholic Federation’s construction of anti-Christian forces after Belloc published \textit{The Jews} in 1922. Belloc


\textsuperscript{105} Broadley, \textit{Louis Charles Casartelli}, 178-179.

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid, 178.

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Catholic Federationist}, January 1911, 2. Ernesto Nathan, the mayor of Rome, was Jewish and a Freemason.

\textsuperscript{108} “A Great Catholic Federationist,” \textit{Catholic Federationist}, February 1911, 2.
argued, convincingly as far as Casartelli and the Catholic Federationist were concerned, that bolshevism was a Jewish movement. By no means, Belloc explained, were all Jews supporters of bolshevism. As far as Belloc was concerned, the idea that bolshevism was part of an “age-long plot, culminating in the contemporary Russian affair,” was a “hallucination” as deluded as the idea that the Order of the Templars was behind the French Revolution. Nevertheless, he contended, there was “a great element of truth” in the assertion that the destruction of Russian society was an act of Jewish “racial revenge.”

“The perfectly explicable but deplorable exercise of vengeance by the Jews,” Belloc asserted, was “directed against what we euphemistically term the governing directing classes, who have been massacred whole-sale.” Belloc maintained that bolshevism and the revolution in Russia was at heart a Jewish movement. According to his diary, Casartelli “spent much time” reading Belloc’s The Jews. He seemed to find Belloc’s analysis of bolshevism persuasive, as he noted in his diary entry that Belloc “maintains that Bolshevism is essentially a Jewish movement” and that his book was “wonderful.”

The Catholic Federationist was also persuaded by Belloc’s analysis of the Jewish problem. The periodical regretted that so many critics have ignored Belloc’s warnings, concluding that people were simply unprepared to face the problem and thus preferred to deny its existence. 

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion was fabricated from a number of narratives written in the nineteenth century and published in Russia in various editions and under various

109 Belloc, The Jews, 168-69. William Barry and the Catholic Herald both repeated the idea that the revolution in Russia was an act of Jewish racial revenge. According to Barry, the Bolsheviks “have done fearful vengeance on the Tsardom in retaliation of its anti-Semitic policy; and they make no secret of the hatred which they cherish towards Christian faith and Christian virtues.” William Barry, “The Everlasting Jew,” Universe, 12 May 1922, 8. The Catholic Herald argued that the “Russian-Jew-Communists” were acting callously out of a “desire for vengeance, for retribution, for the destruction and debasement of the Russian people.” “Trotsky Wants to Come Here,” Catholic Herald, 29 June 1929, 8.


111 Ibid, 167-185. Belloc continued to assert that bolshevism was a Jewish movement in Hilaire Belloc, The Church Today, Universe, 10 February 1928, 7. He stated that “the Soviet Government is predominately Jewish. Not, perhaps, because it is Jewish, but certainly because it is Bolshevist.”

112 Louis Charles Casartelli, diary entry, 28 June 1922, box F163, Casartelli’s Diaries, Salford Diocesan Archives. My thanks to Bill Williams for bringing this diary entry to my attention.

names between 1903 and 1907. The Protocols was alleged to contain the notes of a series of meetings in which the leaders of a secret Jewish organisation conspired to dominate the world and destroy Christian civilisation. The unusual twist to the Protocols was that the Freemasons were expendable pawns rather than equal members of the conspiracy, the unsuspecting “Goy cattle,” who would be kept in a state of fear and sacrificed as necessary. The ultimate goal according to the document was a Messianic Age during which the world will be ruled by a Jewish King from the line of David. In 1905, the Protocols was incorporated by Sergey Nilus into a text about the Antichrist. He added a note at the end of this version, stating that the arrival of the Jewish “Antichrist,” the “King born of the blood of Zion,” was imminent. The first English translation of the Protocols, based on the Nilus text, was published in England in February 1920. The Protocols was received with varying degrees of enthusiasm by mainstream English newspapers and periodicals, including the Morning Post, Spectator, Blackwood’s Magazine and the Times, until it was exposed as a fraud by the Times in August 1921. Significantly, and somewhat surprisingly, the Protocols barely featured in the English Catholic discourse during this interval. Before they were exposed as a hoax, Canon William Barry mentioned them, but only in passing, as one of a number of prophetic forecasts of an apocalyptic conflict between the Church and forces led by the Jews. Whilst the Catholic Herald rarely missed an opportunity to incorporate a new stereotype or myth into its composite constructions of the Jew, in this instance it equivocated. A review of the Protocols in the paper stated that, “if we are to take the ‘documents’ as they stand, they undoubtedly reveal a...
scheme of Satanic cleverness, developed through many centuries for the destruction of religious, political and social freedom.” The review acknowledged that the Protocols, with its images of Jews “pulling the strings of Freemasonry,” might be “a piece of calculated anti-Semitic propaganda.” It nevertheless concluded that “whatever be the real origin of these documents it is well to be reminded that anti-Christ is always in our midst.”120 Whilst many of the themes found in the Protocols can be found in the English Catholic discourse – e.g. stereotypes about Jewish greed and secrecy, the myth of the Jewish Antichrist, and the Judeo-Masonic conspiracy theory – the Protocols themselves were not taken very seriously by English Catholics in the 1920s.121

**Conclusion**

Freemasons, like the Jews, were associated with the prophecy of the Antichrist. They were also accused of devil worship and Satanic practices. The Tablet equivocated about the specifics of the Diana Vaughan revelations but it remained “profoundly convinced” that an inner circle of highly secretive Satanic Freemasonry existed. However, whilst these accusations of literal diabolism were found in letters and articles appearing in The Tablet and Dublin Review during the Diana Vaughan Affair, they were relatively rare after it was revealed to be a hoax. The embarrassment of the Diana Vaughan episode may explain why The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, when it appeared in England, was almost totally ignored by the English Catholic press. There was however little reprieve in the vilification of Freemasonry in the English Catholic discourse. Freemasons continued to be vilified, but the main accusations in the early twentieth century were provoking social unrest, inciting revolution, supporting bolshevism, anti-clericalism, anti-Christianity, secrecy and plundering the Church in France, rather than Satanism (though accusations of Satanism by no means entirely disappeared). Many of these accusations and stereotypes were shared with the Jews. Constructions of the Jews and the Freemasons were often linked in a Jewish-Freemason camarilla, alliance or conspiracy. In some cases the Jews and the

120 Review of The Jewish Peril: Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, Catholic Herald, 20 March 1920, 5. This review was written whilst Diamond was in prison. Whilst the Catholic Herald equivocated over the Protocols, it nevertheless repeatedly accused the Jews and the Freemasons of working together to undermine Christian society and to plunder the Church.

121 Ehret has also observed that the Protocols was largely disregarded by English Catholics. See Ehret, “Catholics and Antisemitism,” 59-60.
Freemasons were accused of waging a campaign to exonerate Dreyfus irrespective of his guilt or innocence, and exploiting the Dreyfus Affair to destroy the army and the Church. The Catholic Federation, like its international predecessor, the Anti-Masonic Congress, was established with the aim of unifying Catholic forces into an organised phalanx to make sure that the conflict between the Church and the Freemasons did not degenerate into a crisis like it had in France. Sometimes the language used to describe the Jews and the Freemasons in the English Catholic discourse suggested not just a series of events but an ongoing war – in some cases an apocalyptic battle – between Christian civilisation and anti-Christian forces bent on its destruction.
5. Constructions of the Zionist Menace (1917-1922)

This chapter examines English Catholic constructions of “the Zionist Menace.” These constructions drew upon contemporary stereotypes, suggesting that the Jew was exploiting his political power, commercial expertise and dominance in finance, in order to wrest control of Jerusalem from Christians and Muslims. Catholics were urged to heed the warning signs of a Zionist domination which would prejudice the Church’s interests. There was also an explicitly religious dimension to these constructions. Zionism was linked to the rejection and murder of Christ. Why, it was asked, had a Christian army wrested the Holy Land from “the Turk” simply to hand it over to the Jews? How could Zionism be supported when the Jews had desired the sacrifice of Christ? Why was the scene of the Passion being handed over to the hereditary enemies of Christianity? English Catholic periodicals were largely indifferent to Zionism prior to the Balfour declaration in November 1917. However, a steadily increasing wave of hostile constructions of the Zionist Menace (and Jews generally) can be found in most of the English Catholic periodicals from circa 1919 onwards. The first section of this chapter examines constructions of Zionism and the Zionist during and subsequent to the Balfour declaration but prior to 1922. The second section focuses on 1922, a year in which the intensity and frequency of anti-Zionist constructions increased dramatically. This was initially in anticipation, and then subsequently as a consequence, of the ratification of the British Mandate.

The Balfour Declaration (1917-1921)

Approximately six months prior to the Balfour Declaration, Nahum Sokolow, an important Zionist and close associate of Chaim Weizmann, met with Monsignor Pacelli (29 April 1917), secretary of the Department of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, and Cardinal Gasparri (1 May 1917), the secretary of state at the Vatican. A trip to the Vatican had not been part of his original itinerary for his time in Italy, but it

1 “Zionist Menace,” “Jewish Menace” and “Semitic Menace,” were used in articles discussing the so-called threat posed by Zionism. See for example, “The Zionist Menace,” Notes and Comments, Universe, 6 August 1920, 1; “The ‘New Witness’ and the Jews,” Topics of the Month, Month, CXXXVI (September 1920), 268; “Jewish Menace,” Catholic Herald, 6 May 1922, 4; John McLaren, “The Jews in Palestine,” Correspondence in Brief, Catholic Times, 14 August 1920, 4.

2 Monsignor Pacelli became Pius XII in 1939.
was arranged at the last minute by Sir Mark Sykes. Sykes was a devout Roman Catholic and a prominent official in the British government. Most English Catholics responded with ambivalence if not vehement antipathy towards Zionism during this period, which makes Sykes’ passionate endorsement of Zionism a distinctive – though not unique – component within the English Catholic discourse. His unusual position as an English Catholic on the subject of Zionism did not go unnoticed by Cardinal Archbishop Bourne. In a letter which was forwarded to the Prime Minister, Bourne stated that “unfortunately, for some unaccountable reason, Mark Sykes has been favouring this movement.” Sykes was not merely favouring Zionism, he was instrumental to negotiations between Zionist leaders and the Vatican. Whilst he was positive about Zionism, Sykes had as a young man absorbed some of the stereotypes of his environment, including some prejudices from his mother. He expressed some of these prejudices in a letter to Edith Gorst, his future wife, whilst on board the RMS Norman heading to South Africa in 1900. He observed that “the majority of the passengers are Jews of the most repulsive type,” that they “jabber about the mines all day long,” and that “it is for these beasts that we are fighting.” He expressed hope that “they will be made to pay” and stated that he “would extort the last farthing, from the most jingo loyal Jew in the British Empire, before I’d fine a traitorous gentile.” In a letter written in January 1917, Sykes attributed the Russian persecution of Jews partly to the ritual murder myth, which he himself rejected, and partly to the defence of an “ignorant, backward, labouring people” against the “fiscal agility of intelligent aliens.”

---

3 For a copy of the letter in which Sykes informed Sokolow that he had prepared the way for his visit to the Vatican, see Sir Mark Sykes to Norman Sokolow, copy of letter, 14 April 1917, DDSY2/12/7, The Papers of Sir Mark Sykes, Hull History Centre, Hull.

4 Sykes (1879-1919) was a government minister in the War Office from 1915 to 1916, and from 1916 to 1919 the deputy of the war cabinet secretary. He was also attached to the Foreign Office as an advisor on Near Eastern Policy. For more on Sir Mark Sykes, see Roger Adelson, Mark Sykes: Portrait of an Amateur (London: Jonathan Cape, 1975).

5 Other English Catholics who were positive about Zionism, believing that it was part of the solution to the so-called Jewish problem, included Gilbert Chesterton and Father Arthur Day (discussed in the next chapter).

6 Cardinal Bourne to [Prime Minister and Mr. Balfour], extract of letter, 25 January 1919, FO 371/4179, fols. 307-308, Foreign Office Papers, National Archives, London. This letter is examined in more detail later in this section.

7 According to Roger Aldelson, his mother, Jessica, was the “dominant force in shaping his personality” and was responsible for “bringing Mark into the Roman Catholic Church.” She “detested present-day politicians, bureaucrats, businessmen, socialists, atheists and the nouveau riche,” but in particular she “hated the Jews and Freemasons who she was convinced were out to destroy the old order of England.” Adelson, Mark Sykes, 25-26.

8 Mark Sykes to Edith Gorst, letter, 22 April 1900, DDSY2/1/2A, fol. 31, The Papers of Sir Mark Sykes.
Whilst he attributed it to their unfortunate environment, i.e. “the pale, the ghetto,” he concluded that in Russia there are Jews the like of which are not to be found elsewhere: “repulsive, grasping, griping, fawning, insolent.”

Like many other Englishmen of his period, Sykes rejected the ritual murder myth but accepted the stereotype of the Jews as fiscally agile usurers. Despite these prejudices, Sykes believed that Zionism was a political movement which could be made to play a pivotal role in fulfilling British ambitions in the Middle East. He also considered Zionism an essential movement for the regeneration of the Jews and Jerusalem. He arranged important meetings between prominent Zionists and political leaders in various countries, including the Vatican, and helped pave the way for the Balfour Declaration.

Nahum Sokolow, aware of the short shrift that Theodor Herzl had received from Pius X in 1904, had not considered an approach to the Vatican, and was surprised when he found out that Sykes had arranged a visit as a fait accompli. A number of issues were discussed during his meeting with Cardinal Gasparri, such as the persecution of Jews in Russia and the prospects for Zionism. When the discussions turned to the Holy Places, Sokolow repeated the assurances that Herzl had given to Pius X (i.e. that their inviolability would be respected). According to Sokolow, Gasparri assured him of the Church’s sympathy. He also informed him that the Church had its own expectations which centred on Jerusalem and extended to Bethlehem, Jericho, Tiberias and Nazareth. According to Sergio Minerbi (1990) and Leonard Stein (1961), Sokolow recorded the “chill” he felt “in his bones” in a letter he wrote to

---


10 In a letter to Sokolow, Sykes stated that “in Zionism lies your people’s opportunity. In alliance with those other forces of regeneration and illumination which are centred on Jerusalem and which radiate through the world, it may be that you and your successors will play a part in establishing a moral order which will enable mankind to combine universal material progress with mutual subjection and charity.” Mark Sykes to Norman Sokolow, 27 May 1918, in Nahum Sokolow, History of Zionism, vol. I (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1919), xxxviii.

11 According to his diaries, Theodor Herzl realised during his visit to the Vatican that the salient problem was not the question of the Holy Places as he had hitherto presumed. The Papal Secretary explained to him that “as long as the Jews deny the divinity of Christ, we certainly cannot make a declaration in their favour” or “agree to their being given possession of the Holy Land again.” Pius X told him that “the Jews have not recognized our Lord, therefore we cannot recognise the Jewish people.” “Gerasalemme,” the pope informed him, “must not get into the hands of the Jews.” Theodor Herzl and Raphael Patai, ed., The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl, Volume IV, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Herzl Press, 1960), entries for 23 and 26 January 1904, 1593-1594, 1603.

12 See Minerbi, The Vatican and Zionism, 105.
Chaim Weizmann, a key Zionist leader, as it finally dawned on him that discussions about the Holy Places had been at crossed purposes. Whilst Herzl, Sokolow and Weizmann had interpreted “Holy Places” as a selection of prominent religious buildings, the Vatican had broad territorial interests in mind. Despite these unresolved differences in territorial expectations, Gasparri expressed, at least according to Sokolow, sympathy with the establishment of a Jewish autonomous home. Three days after his meeting with the secretary of state, Sokolow met Benedict XV. According to Sokolow, the pope expressed support for the Jewish settlement of Palestine whilst reiterating the importance of the Holy Places for the Church. Sokolow stated in a note that he repeated his assurance that the Holy Places will be respected, and that Benedict responded by saying: “yes, yes, I think we shall be good neighbours.” Sokolow concluded that the pope was broadly favourable to the idea of a Jewish national home in Palestine. The *Jewish Chronicle* accepted Sokolow’s claim. Initially Catholic periodicals did likewise. Citing the *Jewish Chronicle*, the *Catholic Times* and the *Month* both reported that the pope was sympathetic to Jewish efforts in Palestine. However, the only original evidence of these discussions is Sokolow’s own account.

---

13 Chaim Weizmann was the president of the Zionist Organisation. Despite his position of leadership, he did not get on well with other prominent Zionists such as Leopold Greenberg (the editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* and *Jewish World*) and Moses Gaster (the Haham or senior Rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese congregations). Weizmann thought that Gaster was “a good Zionist” and attributed the interest of Mark Sykes to his influence, but he suggested that Gaster was jealous of his leadership and “never pulled his weight in the movement.” See Chaim Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1949), 117-118, 229-230. According to a letter from James A. Malcolm (president of the Armenian National Delegation) to Mark Sykes on 3 February 1917, Greenberg, Weizmann, “and other Jewish gentlemen,” had informed him that Gaster was “rather dictatorial” and would need to be “dealt with dexterously.” The letter suggested that Malcolm and Sykes wanted Weizmann rather than Gaster to take the leading role in imminent negotiations. Malcolm informed Sykes two days later that Sokolow and Weizmann were “very annoyed” to discover that Gaster had kept discussions with Sykes to himself. James A. Malcolm to Sir Mark Sykes, 3 and 5 February 1917, DDSY2/4/203, The Papers of Sir Mark Sykes. According to Weizmann, Gaster had a habit of keeping “his ‘finds’ to himself, and to play a lone hand.” Weizmann, *Trial and Error*, 229. Greenberg and Weizmann also did not see eye to eye. Greenberg thought that Weizmann’s approach to Zionism was timid, vague and secretive, but they did bury the hatchet when cooperation was needed. See David Cesarani, *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841-1991* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 127-131.


Minerbi suggests, reasonably enough, that “it is not unlikely that on occasion Sokolow heard what he wanted to hear.”

Vatican sympathy for Zionist goals, such as it was, evaporated after the Balfour declaration and the capture of Jerusalem. At the end of 1917, Cardinal Gasparri pointed out to Charles Loiseau, a French author appointed by France as a semi-official representative to the Vatican, that “the bells of the Vatican do not chime over the conquest of Jerusalem. It is difficult to take back a part of our heart that we have given to the Turks, in order to hand it over to the Zionists.” English Catholic periodicals conversely were initially enthusiastic about the British army’s capture of Jerusalem. The *Month* was pleased that “the Turk,” whose crimes against Armenia “have made him the outlaw of mankind,” was no longer ruler of Palestine. An editorial stated in early 1918 that “as for the Holy Land, whether a Jewish State is erected there or not, the fact that the main source of European civilisation is now free from the barbarian must needs betoken a new starting point in history.” As far as the *Month* was concerned, the main problem for Zionism was Jewish rather than Christian anti-Zionists. The *Month* observed, quite correctly, that many Jews, especially in the West, had no intention of moving to Palestine. It also observed that the land would not be able to support more than a small proportion of world Jewry. Nevertheless, it initially expressed no concern about the prospect that the “ancient race” may for the “first time in history since the days of Titus” be given “the opportunity of reunion.” In November 1917, the *Universe*, though enthusiastic about the prospect of Jerusalem being “wrested from the Turk,” was not particularly keen about “the establishment of large Jewish colonies in the Holy Land,” though the paper was not yet as scathing

---


18 According to Minerbi, at this time there was no official diplomatic relations between France and the Holy See, and so Loiseau was “in charge of semi official relations with the Vatican.” Ibid, 8.


20 “Jerusalem and Zionism,” Topics of the Month, *Month*, CXXXI (January 1918), 88. The opposition to Zionism of Anglo-Jews who did not want to jeopardise their rights as Englishmen was also observed in Notes, *Tablet*, 23 March 1918, 371. These periodicals were not wrong about Jewish opposition to Zionism. As Daniel Langton has observed, “in the nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries, a majority of Western Jews, whether religious or non-religious, conservative or progressive, were keen to distance themselves from Zionism.” Daniel R. Langton, *Children of Zion: Jewish & Christian Perspective on the Holy Land* (Cambridge: Woolf Institute of Abrahamic Faiths, 2008), 14.

about Zionism as it would soon become. For now it declared that “the government has definitely come down on the side of the Zionists” and concluded that “if everyone else is pleased, Catholics need not concern themselves greatly, though no one can expect them to have any great enthusiasm for the scheme.” Of all the English Catholic periodicals, the Catholic Times was the most favourable. Like the other periodicals, the paper stated that it was pleased that “the Holy City” had been “set free once and for all from the rule of the Turk.” The paper reported that Weizmann and Sokolow had “worked hard for success and can now discern at no great distance the realisation of their ambition.” The editorial’s one reservation was that “in the Christian era they have not been distinguished by a love of agriculture,” but it concluded that the Jews are a “clever people” and they may well “make Palestine a centre of light and learning for all the members of their race.” The paper repeated its enthusiasm for Zionism a week later, though despite its positive framing, it did maintain the stereotype of the Jewish financier. It suggested that it is likely that a large number of agricultural Jews will migrate to Palestine and that it would be beneficial for the new colony if some of the wealthy commercial Jews should go with them, to “help and direct the young community.” The paper also concluded that whilst it was impossible at this time, it would have been better “if the Jews could start their new national life with full powers of autonomy.” The editorial concluded that “we wish well to the idea of handing over Palestine to the Jews, and trust they will succeed,” but it questioned the wisdom of some Zionists who were “talking of an extended kingdom of Israel, towards Damascus and the Euphrates.” According to the paper, its only concern was that “the present Palestine will give quite enough scope for Jewish activity and enterprise for years to come,” and it concluded that their “sphere of operations” can always be “enlarged” if they succeed in making Palestine flow “with milk and honey.”

Isaiah Friedman observed that with the exception of a “short interlude” during 1917 and 1918, the Vatican maintained a consistently unsympathetic attitude towards Zionism. This observation correlates with the tone of anti-Zionist comments in

25 “The Kingdom of Israel,” Notes of the Week, Catholic Times, 23 November 1917, 3.
26 Friedman suggests that the Vatican, having set its own eyes upon Palestine, was interested in cooperating with Sokolow during this “short interlude” period because Jewish influence in Europe and
English Catholic periodicals, which became more notable from January 1919 onwards. Cardinal Bourne decided to visit Palestine to see the situation for himself. He arrived on 19 January 1919 and stayed until March. Shortly after his arrival in Jerusalem, Bourne wrote a letter, the content of which he hoped would reach the Prime Minister (David Lloyd George) and the Foreign Secretary (Arthur Balfour). The letter, which found its way to the Foreign Office, drew upon the Christian usurpation myth about the old Israel being replaced by the new Israel, as well as stereotypes about Jewish finance and pro-German affinity. It stated that claims that Zionists had obtained the approval of the Vatican had “no foundation.” “The whole movement,” Bourne stated, was “quite contrary to Christian sentiment and tradition.” It was acceptable for Jews to live in the Holy Land, but “that they should ever again dominate and rule the country would be an outrage to Christianity and its Divine Founder.” Invoking the stereotype of Jewish finance and pro-German affinity, Bourne stated that this would, furthermore, place the country under the “controlling influence of Jewish, which is German, finance.” Bourne asked whether this was “really what England desires after recent experiences?” Bourne’s anti-Zionist views correlated with sentiments expressed in a speech by Benedict XV in March of that year. The pope vehemently criticised Zionism and the colonisation of Palestine by non-Catholic foreigners. He referred to the Jews as infidels who were being “placed in a privileged and prominent position.” Minerbi suggests that reports that Bourne sent to the Holy See during his visit to Palestine “worried the pope” and influenced his allocution. This correlates with views expressed in the Foreign Office.

27 Cardinal Bourne to [Prime Minister and Mr. Balfour], extract of letter, 25 January 1919, FO 371/4179, fols. 307-308, Foreign Office Papers. According to Sir Eric Forbes Adam, a foreign office official, the letter was not sent directly to the Prime Minister, but it was forwarded to the Prime Minister and to Mr. Balfour. Bourne did stress in his letter the urgency of its content being impressed upon them. Eric Forbes Adam to Archibald Clark Kerr, 25 March 1919, FO 371/4179, fol. 306, Foreign Office Papers. Extracts from these letters can be found in Doreen Ingrams, Palestine Papers, 1917-1922 (London: John Murray, 1972), 59-61.

28 For an extract and discussion about the speech, see Minerbi, The Vatican and Zionism, 129-144.

29 See Minerbi, The Vatican and Zionism, 29, 122, 129, 133-135. It is difficult without more evidence than is currently available to determine whether the Cardinal’s hostility to Zionism really determined the pope’s policy or whether Vatican policy guided Bourne’s hand. The former was the perception at the Foreign Office. For example, Archibald Clark Kerr, a foreign office official (and later the ambassador to China, Russia and the United States), stated in a letter to Eric Forbes Adam, that Cardinal Bourne’s “reports to Rome seem, in part at least, to have inspired the Pope’s fears.” Archibald Clark Kerr to Eric Forbes Adam, draft letter, 19 March 1919, FO 371/4179, fols. 165-166, Foreign Office Papers.
English Catholic periodicals started to express a stronger antipathy towards Zionism in 1919, though this was still restrained compared with the tone adopted in 1922. The *Month* reported that as Palestine is already inhabited, “it would be foolish and criminal to attempt to dispossess its present occupants.” It also noted that “although Jerusalem is the spiritual centre of Judaism, it is also the birthplace of Christianity, and cannot now be exclusively appropriated by the older religion.” The reference to the “older religion” in this context was probably intended to invoke the idea of Christianity as the newer, better religion, the religion of the New Testament, rather than Judaism, which was often represented as a petrified religion, the religion of the Old Testament. The *Month* was not as yet too worried about Zionism as it noted that many influential European Jews were antagonistic to the project. The periodical concluded that this was “not to be regretted” considering “the anti-Christian temper which the Zionists are developing.”

The Catholic Herald reported in July 1919 that Zionists were opposed by the Muslims and Jews already living in Palestine, that Zionism is provoking the Arabs to threaten to massacre all the Jews, and that the Holy Places should be put in the hands of the Catholic Church. Like the *Month*, the Catholic Herald was also not so worried at this stage. “Zionism,” the paper reported, “has few attractions for the vast body of the Jews.” With its characteristic contempt for Jewry, the Catholic Herald concluded that the vast body of Jews “prefer the pavements of Paris and London to the road from Jerusalem to Jericho and the profits of the Stock Exchange or of the non-productive or parasitic or destructive occupations they mostly pursue to the slower rewards of useful and honest work.”

On 30 July 1920, at the Sixth National Catholic congress held in Liverpool, Bourne spoke out again against Zionism and repeated a number of stereotypes about Jewish financial power. He claimed that “men of every class and creed” had visited him whilst he was in Jerusalem and their message was the same: “a loud and emphatic protest against Mr. Balfour’s promise and against the projects of the Zionists.” He argued that the projects of the Zionists were going beyond “a home for nationless Jews” and that “the representatives of Zionism” were attempting to control the
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political situation in Palestine. He implied that the Zionists were exploiting Jewish finance, allowing Jews to “obtain loans at a very low rate of interest,” whereas Christians and Moslems have to borrow at “terms far too onerous for acceptance.” They do this, he claimed, in order to acquire most of the land from Palestinians impoverished by the war. He stated that he had received an official report that the new Hebrew University will lead to Jews of all professions being sent throughout the land to “monopolize every lucrative and influential position.” There was, he stated, every danger of a “Zionist economic and financial domination” irrespective of efforts by British administrators to manage affairs in the Holy Land. Whilst Bourne was concerned about the social impact of Zionism, he was equally worried – perhaps more worried – about the religious consequences of Zionism. He stated that:

The salient fact that a new non-Christian influence is being deliberately set up in the land where countless generations of Christendom have longed and striven to oust a non-Christian power, is so tremendous in its import that, without the smallest anti-Jewish prejudice, men of every Christian nation are justified in asking, as they are actually asking, what is the purpose, what is to be the outcome, of so grave a political departure?”

A few months later the Tablet reiterated the concerns expressed by the Cardinal. The paper observed that the Cardinal “was able to bring forward abundant and disturbing evidence that the introduction into Palestine of Jews from abroad is being accompanied by action which threatens to place, if not political, at least economic and financial domination in the hands of the Zionists.” The paper concluded that “the Zionist policy as it is being carried out is at once unjustifiable and fraught with political danger, and if persisted in may involve Great Britain in serious difficulties.”

Other Catholic periodicals were issuing similar warnings around this time. The Month reported that the Muslim and Christian Arabs resent the “State-aided immigration of a foreign and not very acceptable race” and that Cardinal Bourne has been the “only public man to call attention to the danger.” The editorial lamented that the New


34 “Arab and Zionist Jew,” Topics of the Day, Tablet, 27 November 1920, 696-697. In later years, the Tablet reminded its readers about the “perspicacity” of Cardinal Bourne’s remarks at the Liverpool Congress on the perils of Zionism. See for example, News and Notes, Tablet, 14 September 1929, 322.
Witness, the paper run by Gilbert Chesterton, though “keenly alive to the Semitic menace and so vigorous in denouncing it, took no notice of this authentic instance of the evil influence of Jewish finance.” The Month deduced, quite correctly as it happens, that Chesterton and the New Witness were very happy “at the prospect of getting some Jews out of Europe.” An editorial in the Universe stated in August 1920 that with regard to “the ‘Zionist scourge’, the Cardinal has now come forward with facts known for some time to many others besides ourselves.” The paper added an additional “consideration” that again revealed the religious dimension of the objection to Zionism:

The only result of persistence in the present attempts on the part of certain elements … to set up “a Zionist domination” will be another “small war” on our hands. The British peoples will certainly not fight in such a cause – least of all Catholics, who have been so grievously affronted in a directly religious interest [emphasis mine].

By May 1920, the Catholic Times still seemed to be reasonably supportive about plans for establishing a Jewish settlement in the Holy Land. The paper did however warn that life in Palestine will not be as free of anxieties as it has been for the Jews living in Great Britain. The Catholic Times expressed concern that though a “minority amongst the population,” they would play a leading role in public affairs, and that this was bound to cause resentment. Prophetically enough the Catholic Times warned that there was a danger that quarrels may develop into “actual warfare” between the Jews and “their neighbours.” The paper nevertheless concluded that “the Jews are a prudent race, and we may assume that they will be tolerant and will do what they can to make the British suzerainty a success.”

The Catholic Times contained a small number of anti-Zionist opinion pieces after Bourne’s speech, but these did not appear to be representative of the paper itself. A letter to the editor of the Catholic Times in August 1920 called for “British Catholics” to “awaken to the Jewish menace in the Holy land.” The letter expressed concern about the “extraordinary influence exercised by Jews in British Governmental circles.” However, the author’s principle concern, much like Cardinal Bourne, was not political but religious. His fear was that “the official

35 “The “New Witness” and the Jews,” Topics of the Month, Month, CXXXVI (September 1920), 268. Chesterton’s endorsement of Zionism is examined in the next chapter.
control of the scenes of the Passion and the Redemption is on the verge of passing into the hands of Jews – the hereditary enemies of Christian tradition.” The author supported comments by (unspecified) “Swiss Catholics,” suggesting that even if the British government tries to restrain Zionists, “the hostility, the cunning and the tenacity of the Semitic spirit will continually and stealthily endanger the existence of the Catholic works in Palestine, and will, moreover, begin the identical persecution and secret opposition we are all familiar with on the Continent of Europe.” The author clearly did not mean the persecution and oppression of Jews living in Europe; he meant a so-called persecution of the Church by the Jews.\footnote{John McLoren, “The Jews in Palestine,” Correspondence, \textit{Catholic Times}, 14 August 1920, 4.} An article in the paper in September by Sir Valentine Chirol, an English Catholic, Foreign Office diplomat and senior correspondent for the \textit{Times}, was also very critical of Zionism. The article suggested that Christian missionaries were being expelled from the country and that the Jews were exploiting and oppressing the non-Jews. It announced that “the aggressive action of the Zionist authorities” was “provoking active opposition” and that “it is a scandal that the whole future of the country should be imperilled for the ambitions of one tenth of the people, backed by the Zionist organisation of Europe.”\footnote{Valentine Chirol [Verax, pseud.], “Palestine’s Troubles,” \textit{Catholic Times}, 25 September 1920, 5. Chirol bitterly criticised French Catholics in 1899 for what he perceived as their role in the Dreyfus Affair. He also criticised Cardinal Vaughan for his “relapse into silence” about the role played by his “co-religionists in France” during the Dreyfus Affair and his claim that the Catholic Church was the “one qualified guardian of social morals [just when it] stood convicted of complicity in one of the most odious conspiracies of all times.” See Linda Fritzinger, \textit{Diplomat Without Portfolio: Valentine Chirol, his life and the Times} (London: I.B. Tauris, 2006), 115-120 and Valentine Chirol [Verax, pseud.] to the Editor, \textit{Times}; 26 September 1899, 9; 3 October 1899, 10.}

Bourne spoke out again against Zionism at the Catholic Truth Society conference in Leicester in September 1921. Bourne stated that the essence of the problem was whether the Zionist project was designed to set up “‘the’ or ‘a’ National Home in Palestine.” He argued that it needed to be clarified whether the plan was to provide them “their true place of dwelling or merely to allow a small colony to find a home therein.” Unless the promise was clearly defined and reduced in scope, it would, he suggested, “have to be withdrawn, if it be not already washed out in blood.” He again concluded with a religious warning which was closely related to the Christian foundation myth. “It would,” he stated, “be a gross outrage to the whole sense of Christianity were these sacred lands and the Holy Places which have been wrested
from the hands of the infidel by the soldiers of England, to be placed now under the
domination of those who have rejected the name of Christ.” An editorial in the
*Tablet* described the Cardinal’s comment about the outrage to Christianity if the Holy
Places be placed in the hands of “those who had rejected the name of Christ” as “very
pertinently pointed out.” The paper repeated Bourne’s disclaimer that this should not
be taken as indicating anything “against the Jews as Jews.”

The *Catholic Herald* contained a number of articles critical of Zionism during
the final months of 1921. It reported remarks by Monsignor Barlassina, the Latin
Patriarch of Jerusalem, which suggested that the Jews in Palestine were publishing
insulting remarks about the pope in the Zionist newspapers and introducing to the
Holy Land scandalous fashions and “forms of amusement far from favourable to good
morals.” Another article in the paper suggested that there was a national and a
religious element to “the Zionist question.” Firstly, the Jews were no longer a political
people and thus had no right to be treated as a nation. The article warned Catholics not
to be taken in by Zionist formulations, which suggest that “just as every nation
(Ireland included) has the right to its own land and its own proper independence, and
may endeavour to assert these rights by every lawful means, so has the Hebrew nation
a right to its ancestral territory and its own proper existence.” The paper reasoned that
this was a flawed argument since the Jews are an “ethnical religious unit,” “a race and
a church,” but not a “political people.” It concluded that Zionism is “the assertion of
an impossible revindication, and on the part of a small minority of a race which has
long ceased to form that political entity which is expressed by the word ‘People.’” The
paper then turned to the religious dimension, explaining that in any case it could never
be a just aspiration, as “the sacrifice of Christ, desired by a people that declared itself
responsible for itself and for its children, before God, and before man, constitutes an
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40 Extracts from Bourne’s speech, reported in various newspapers, can be found in file Bo1/93, Cardinal
speech can be found in “The Zionist Peril,” *Universe*, 7 October 1921, 12.
41 Notes, *Tablet*, 1 October 1921, 427.
42 “Pope Censored in Palestine: Britain’s Preferential Treatment of the Jews,” *Catholic Herald*, 3
September 1921, 3. In a lecture delivered in Rome in April 1922, the Patriarch elaborated upon his
earlier remark about immoral amusements. He stated that Zionism has brought “brothels” and
enormous prescription of right before history, and before civilisation (which be it remembered, is Christian).”

The British Mandate (1922)

Interest in Zionism, measured by the number and intensity of articles and editorials in the English Catholic periodicals, increased dramatically in 1922. The ratification of the British Mandate, with its support for a Jewish national home as promised in the Balfour Declaration, was imminent. Zionism was no longer viewed as just a potential or developing threat, but rather as an immediate menace to Christian civilisation. In the early months of 1922, the Catholic Herald led the way. As the previous chapters have shown, of all the English Catholic newspapers, the Catholic Herald was by far the most hostile towards Jews. Diamond frequently wrote articles that combined a number of hostile stereotypes of Jewish greed, secrecy, cowardice and disloyalty (discussed in chapter three), traditional Christian myths about the Pharisees and the Christ-Killers (chapter two), and myths about a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy (chapter four), long before the Balfour Declaration. He similarly relished the opportunity to intertwine anti-Zionist stereotypes into his construction of the Jew. According to an article in 1922, “Zionism is a Jewish political movement which, at its root, is anti-Christian and anti-social.” “The Jew,” Diamond asserted, “is of all men the most intolerant on earth and the least amenable to social discipline. Heaven help any people under Jew rule.” The article argued that “when he emerges from the Ghetto the Jew is an odious, domineering and unscrupulous exploiter.” There is no such thing as a Jewish gentleman, the paper asserted. If his position is secure he is a “cobra,” but when it is not he is a cowardly “sycophant.” The article repeated Charles Diamond’s Judeo-Masonic leitmotif, that Jewish homes were full of plunder stolen from the Church with the help of the Freemasons, implying that Zionism was a movement geared towards providing yet another such opportunity. In later years the paper asserted a more explicit link between Freemasonry and Zionism.

43 “A Catholic View of Zionism: Why the Jews have no claim to the Holy Land,” Catholic Herald, 15 October 1921, 3.
45 The paper stated in 1929 that the main authors of Zionist aggression are the Jews and Freemasons, supported by “the B’nai-Berith and other exclusively Jewish Freemason Lodges.” The paper concluded that “the British Palestine policy” can be traced to the “influence of Freemasonry” and that it is
On 2 April 1922, Weizmann met with Cardinal Gasparri at the Vatican. Whilst the conversation was polite, Weizmann left this meeting with little doubt that Gasparri was antagonistic towards Zionism. They met again on 20 April. Weizmann reported that “Gasparri had been quite friendly but again began by claiming that the Jews enjoyed a privileged position in Palestine.” The general tone of the meeting appears to have been fairly ambivalent and Weizmann failed to secure a meeting with the pope. Nevertheless, the *Jewish Chronicle* presumably received reports indicating a favourable meeting as it stated that:

Dr. Weizmann has again been received by Cardinal Gasparri. The interview bore a very friendly character. It is stated that amicable relations were established between the Vatican and the Zionist leaders.

On 12 May 1922, with the ratification of the British Mandate about to be considered, the *Jewish Chronicle* still reported that “the sentiments of the Vatican towards Zionism are now much more friendly” and that Cardinal Gasparri had expressed hope that “friendly relations would prevail between Palestinian Jewry and Palestinian Catholic congregations.” After Gasparri’s meeting with Weizmann, the Rome correspondent for the *Tablet* mentioned “the excesses of some Zionists in claiming the place instead of their due place in Palestine,” but reported that according to the


46 According to a Foreign Office minute, Weizmann sent the Colonial Office a letter informing them that when he met Gasparri (on 2 April), the Cardinal’s attitude “was fairly genial,” but he “gained a distinct impression of hostility on the part of the Vatican towards the Zionist movement.” Mr. Carnegie, Foreign Office Minute, 6 April 1922, FO 371/7773, fols.118-119, Foreign Office Papers. A memorandum by the British ambassador to Italy suggests that Weizmann also met Gasparri prior to 2 April. According to the memorandum, dated 29 March, Weizmann had been astonished when Gasparri asked him “what financial advantages had been offered to the Rothschilds by His Majesty’s Government in order to secure Jewish support for the British mandate.” Sir Ronald Graham, memorandum, 29 March 1922, FO 371/7773, fols. 102-104, Foreign Office Papers.


48 [Rome] Correspondent, “Dr. Weizmann and the Vatican,” *Jewish Chronicle*, 28 April 1922, 27

49 “Dr. Weizmann’s Visit to Italy: Italian and Vatican Attitude,” *Jewish Chronicle*, 12 May 1922, 21. Minerbi observed that at the beginning of 1922, “a random but representative cross section of the Zionist press,” seemed either to be “deluding themselves and failed to plumb the deep roots of the Vatican’s disapproval of Zionism,” or were trying “to soften the Vatican’s opposition.” Minerbi, *The Vatican and Zionism*, 162-163. It seems that this was still the case with the *Jewish Chronicle* in April and early May.
Osservatore Romano, the semi-official Vatican periodical, “an atmosphere of greater common sense now prevails in Zionist circles.”

The relatively positive sentiments which the Jewish Chronicle (and the Tablet) claimed to detect at the Vatican during April and the first half of May were absent from most English Catholic periodicals during the same period. In April 1922, in an article entitled “the Palestine Adventure,” the Universe continued to criticise the Zionist interpretation of a national home for Jews. The paper believed that the “rights of Christendom in the Holy Land” were threatened by “political Zionism and a protected Protestant proselytism.” The paper cited addresses and analyses by the Pope, Cardinal Bourne, Lord Northcliffe and Hilaire Belloc, to demonstrate the direness of the current and future situation in Palestine. The paper also pointed out that the “Zionist adventure, ... is going to cost us any amount well over two million pounds during the coming year,” most of which the paper stated was for defence. This, the paper concluded, will increase significantly once the inevitable Arab agitation breaks out. The Catholic Herald accused “the organ of the [Zionist] movement,” by which it meant the Jewish Chronicle, of attacking Catholics on one day and then claiming their sympathy on the next. The paper repeated its usual mixture of myth and stereotype. Zionism, the paper again affirmed, is “anti-Christian, and especially is it anti-Catholic.” In this, the paper continued, Zionism is “following the well-known Jewish tradition.” It clarified that not all Jews are “anti-Catholic in an active sense,” and yet this has been “the traditional attitude of Jewry towards Christianity.” “That attitude,” the paper clarified, “has not changed in its essence since Christianity first appeared.” The Month also continued to argue that Zionism was an unjust movement. It reported that in one of his last allocutions, “the late Pope protested against the Jewish maltreatment of Catholics in Palestine, and declared that the rule of the Turk was more just and equitable.” “The Israelite,” the paper stated, “once before dispossessed the inhabitants of Palestine, but that was by Divine command: the Balfour Declaration seems hardly a sufficient warrant for a similar exercise.”

51 “The Palestine Adventure,” Universe, 21 April 1922, 1.
53 “The Injustice of Zionism,” Topics of the Month, Month, CXXXIX (May 1922), 465-466.
Despite the *Jewish Chronicle*’s assertion on 12 May that the Vatican was now amicable about Zionism, the mandate did not pass in the May meeting of the League of Nations, largely as a result of last minute reservations expressed by the Vatican and representatives of Catholic countries.\(^\text{54}\) Realising that its interpretation of Vatican support was mistaken, the tone of reporting in the *Jewish Chronicle* turned acerbic.\(^\text{55}\) The *Jewish Chronicle* stated on 19 May that:

Roman Catholicism has always been, if not the oppressor, then the depressor of Judaism; and the attitude of Roman Catholics in regard to Jews in relation to Palestine adopted ever since the Balfour Declaration, goes to show that that body has learnt nothing of religious tolerance and forgotten nothing of religious obscurantism.\(^\text{56}\)

There can be no doubt that the Church of Rome is in this matter pursuing the same old policy born of hatred of the Jews, narrow-minded prejudice against them, and a desire to thwart them in every way as “anti-Christ.”\(^\text{57}\)

Towards the end of June, Cardinal Bourne spoke out against Zionism at the Albert Hall in Bolton. Bourne stated that he felt Catholics needed to be well informed about the state of affairs in Palestine as there seemed to be elements misrepresenting the Church’s position. The *Jewish Chronicle*, which Bourne claimed represented the “extreme party” among the Zionists, had, he observed, misrepresented the Holy See’s position as being hostile to the British Mandate, when in fact the Church had no objection to the mandate for Palestine being given to the British Government. The Church’s concern was not the mandate as such but proposals which would give the Zionists a “privileged position” over other races and religions. He stated that he was not claiming that the misrepresentation was intentional, but nevertheless, he continued, some of the statements contained in the paper were “wanton,” “mischievous” and “absolutely unjustifiable.”\(^\text{58}\) In response, the *Jewish Chronicle* stated that “the most serious opposition to the Zionist policy is undoubtedly that

\(^{54}\) A copy of the Holy See’s submission to the Council of the League of Nations, detailing its objections to the terms of the British Mandate, can be found in: Rome Correspondent, “The British Mandate for Palestine,” Rome, *Tablet*, 8 July 1922, 49-50.

\(^{55}\) See for example, *Jewish Chronicle*: 19 May 1922, 7, 25; 2 June 1922, 8; 16 June 1922, 7; 30 June 1922, 7; 28 July 1922, 7.


instigated by the Vatican.” The Church’s “policy,” the paper concluded, is, “as it has
always been, to depress the Jews where it cannot oppress them; just as it is its policy
to oppress them where it has the power.”

The Jewish Chronicle’s hostility towards the Vatican did not cease when the
mandate finally passed in late July. According to Cesarani, to placate domestic and
foreign critics, Churchill “presented the Mandate in the most anodyne way possible
when it finally came before the House of Commons in the form of a White Paper in
July 1922.” Leopold Greenberg, editor of the Jewish Chronicle, was “mightily
aggrieved,” noting that the White Paper provided only for a small Jewish community
and restrictive immigration. Greenberg regarded the White Paper as a betrayal, but
he seemed to reserve most of his anger not for the British government, but for the
Vatican, anti-Zionist Jews and even Zionist Jews who were, by his reckoning, too
passive. He reported that the Vatican had revealed its “bitter and historic dislike of
Jews” and “its dark recidivism, with its suspicion and its ill will towards our
people.” Greenberg was seriously unimpressed when Weizmann accepted the
watered down mandate as a compromise he could work with. Invoking the stereotype
of Jewish cowardice, he stated that Weizmann’s “humility and gratitude,” could be
compared to “the mealy meekness of the poor terror-stricken rabbi of whom it is told
that, when pelted with dates because he approached some petty ruler, he received the
missiles with ‘humility and gratitude’, saying that he might have been pelted with
cokernuts.” The Month interpreted events very differently to the Jewish Chronicle,
suggesting that the “terms of the British Mandate” were a victory for Zionists, as
“there is little in this long document to remove the fundamental objection to the
Zionist policy in that land.” The periodical suggested that as things stand, “the owners
of the country are henceforth to be under the heel of the international Jew.”

59 “Next Tuesday’s Debate,” Jewish Chronicle, 30 June 1922, 7.
60 Cesarani, The Jewish Chronicle, 130.
61 “The Mandate Confirmed,” Jewish Chronicle, 28 July 1922, 7. Greenberg predicted in March 1919
that the British government would not honour the spirit of the Balfour Declaration, informing Zangwill
that, “in fact, it seems to me they have sucked the Jewish orange and thrown the pulp into our face.
Having got the kudos they wanted out of their benevolent intentions to the Jewish people, they are now
disposed to hold us at arms length.” Leopold Greenberg to Israel Zangwill, 31 January 1919, A120/364-
81/82, Israel Zangwill Papers, Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem.
62 “Mr. Churchill’s Interpretation,” Jewish Chronicle, 28 July 1922, 8.
63 “Palestine Mandate Approved,” Topics of the Month, Month, CXL (August 1922), 168-169.
In the months between the first and the second attempt at ratification, the antipathy towards Zionism in the *Universe* and *Catholic Herald* continued unabated. An editorial in the *Universe* stated that it was a pity that relations between Britain and the Vatican had been “marred by the totally unnecessary difficulties in which the Government’s flirtation with Zionism has involved it. Ministers have only themselves to thank when they find the Vatican rising objections to the Palestine mandate before the Council of the League of Nations.” It is, the paper reported, “only in the interests of religious and political peace that the Vatican has intervened with the League of Nations at Geneva. Its assistance should be welcomed lest worse befall.” The paper referred to the “continual preferential treatment of the Jews everywhere” under the “Zionist influence” and “the invasion of Russian ‘Bolshevised’ Jews” which undermines “the social and moral order of the country.” “In the Holy City itself,” the paper observed, “there is terrible evidence of decline in moral conditions.” “It is intolerable,” the paper reported “that the fame of the British Government for even-handed toleration throughout nearly all parts of the Empire should now be sullied at the bidding of cosmopolitan Jewry.” The *Universe* concluded that whilst such things go on, “it is absurd to pretend, with nineteenth-century Liberalism, that there is no such thing as a ‘Jewish Question.’ No Catholic wants to be anti-Jew. In their own interests, the Jews should not force Catholics into that position.” In response to the White Paper which curtailed the scope of the Jewish home in Palestine, the paper reported that these offer some “crumbs of comfort,” even though “they be few and unsubstantial.” The paper asked, “to what end did we liberate the Holy Land from the Moslem?” Was it simply, the paper replied to its own question, “to sell it to the Jew?” At the end of July, after the mandate had been passed, the paper continued to regard the White Paper and the amendments to the British Mandate as making little difference to the situation.

The *Catholic Herald*’s construction of the Zionist Menace, which drew upon an array of Christian myths about the diabolic Jew and stereotypes of the parasite Jew,
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was considerably more hostile than any of the other English Catholic periodicals. Charles Diamond claimed to have exposed “the anti-Catholic and anti-Christian Jewish attitude underlying this movement.” He stated that “the awful and blasphemous language of Jews regarding Our Blessed Lord and His Blessed Mother cannot be put into print, especially their horrible insults of Our Lady.” Such remarks, Diamond stated, he had heard with his own ears. In response to claims made by “some truculent Atheists and Protestants of a certain type” about “Catholic prejudice against the Jews,” Diamond asked: “Who has ever heard any Catholic say a word against the Jewish religion? Who has ever heard any Catholic attack the Jewish nation?” Diamond went on to state:

On the contrary, Catholics praise and admire the virtues of the Jewish people. But when Jews attack and abuse and insult the Catholic and Christian name; when they indulge in horrible blasphemies against Christ and His Mother; when they assail by word and act the faith and the rights of the Catholic Church and of Catholics; when they become traffickers in the plunder of the Catholic Church as in France; when they act as described by the Catholic Patriarch of Jerusalem; when through diabolical secret societies they plan to undermine Catholic States and peoples; when they act as usurers; as merchants in the white slave traffic; as exploiters of labour by sweating; as incendiaries; fraudulent bankrupts and forgers, and take the lead in every occupation that enables them to live upon and impoverish those around them, then Catholics and others cannot be blind to their existence, and the evils that the nations suffer from who harbour them.

The article concluded that if such representations are false, then “the whole world has conspired to malign the Jew.” This was, Diamond suggested, about as likely as “the fishes of the sea” having wronged “the monsters that prey upon them.” In July, the Catholic Herald again claimed, as it had done on previous occasions, that it had “no hatred of the Jews.” The claim that the English Catholic press “is worked up to denounce Zionism ‘through hatred of the Jews,’” was, the paper stated, a “fabrication” of the Jew press. It then proceeded to list character flaws of the Zionists and Jews (i.e. the usual stereotypes of usury, aggression, secrecy, deception, bolshevism and criminality). The paper concluded that “if the population of Palestine resists, they will be shot down by the British forces and the Jew heel will be planted upon their
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necks.” The paper criticised the *Daily Mail* for using the inappropriate label, “Russians,” when referring to “the Zionist aggression”. They are, the *Catholic Herald* reported, “Jews, pure and simple.” After the mandate was passed, the *Catholic Herald* started printing letters to give an idea of the so-called “true state of affairs.” The image was that of Jews exploiting their privileged position, and life being made intolerable for Christians and Muslims. According to one letter, though formerly only despised by the Arabs, the Jews were now hated.

The *Catholic Times* had begun by being quite sympathetic towards Zionism but this sympathy gradually evaporated. On 1 July 1922, the paper stated that it hoped Bourne’s protest “will be widely read and noted.” “The mandate was framed to give the Jews the political and economic control of Palestine and the British taxpayer would be left to foot the bill,” the paper reported. The paper asked why British bayonets, lives and treasure should be wasted on “a project fundamentally wrong.” A week later, the paper reported that “the Zionist project was bound to create trouble,” as it has “given to the [Jewish] minority a preponderating and privileged position, to the prejudice of the Catholic, the Arab and the other non-Jewish bodies.” It would seem that the consistently unsympathetic sentiment towards Zionism expressed by Cardinal Bourne and the other English Catholic newspapers and periodicals had, by mid-1922, been absorbed by the *Catholic Times*.

**Conclusion**

When General Allenby marched into Jerusalem in December 1917, the English Catholic periodicals were enthusiastic that “the Turk” had finally been ousted from the Holy city. Jerusalem once again was a Christian city (albeit one held by a Protestant
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power). Whilst the silence of the bells at St. Peter’s would seem to indicate some reservations at the Vatican, these were not, at first, held by the editors of the various Catholic periodicals in England. The Zionist Menace was not as yet a significant construction in the English Catholic discourse. At the conclusion of the First World War, the Vatican’s opposition to Zionism intensified significantly. So too did that of English Catholics. Cardinal Bourne’s letters and public addresses make clear how strongly he opposed the Balfour Declaration. He expressed a number of contemporary stereotypes, such as that to sympathise with Jewish interests was to sympathise with German finance, but his principle concern appears to have been theological. He stated that it would be an outrage to Christianity and to Christ if Jews were ever again allowed to dominate the Holy Land. His salient concern seems to have been that instead of Christianity becoming the new dominant power in the Holy Land, yet another “non-Christian influence,” one that had rejected the name of Christ, was being allowed to dominate the land. Thomas Moloney (1985) suggested that “Bourne was unable to stomach the raw spirit of Zionism.” However, Moloney concluded that whilst “a vein of anti-Judaic feeling” existed in “the British Catholic community between the wars,” Bourne himself always maintained that “his opposition to Zionism was in no way an indication of anti-Jewish feeling.”

It is certainly true that Bourne often stated that he spoke without any prejudice against Jews. Such claims did not always mean a great deal. Charles Diamond also maintained that he did not hate Jews, though this was usually moments before or after presenting a long list of myths and stereotypes about their allegedly anti-social, parasitical, anti-Church and anti-Catholic sentiments and activities. Conversely, prior to the Balfour Declaration, unlike with Diamond, there is little indication that Bourne had concerned himself a great deal with Jews. Nevertheless, the language that Bourne adopted in his anti-Zionism narratives, for example, his references to those who “rejected the name of Christ” and the outrage to Christ if the Jews should “ever again dominate and rule the country,” would seem to suggest that Bourne maintained prejudices towards contemporary Jews based on traditional Christian myths. The idea that the Jews are a wandering people, forced to exist in a degraded exile as a consequence of their rejection of Christ, is an important
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78 Bourne denied that he felt any ill-feeling towards Jews at the National Catholic Congress in Liverpool in July 1920, the Catholic Truth Society conference in Leicester in September 1921, and the meeting at the Albert Hall in Bolton in June 1922.
Christian narrative. The successful return of the Jews to the Holy Land would problematize this narrative. It is likely that it was this factor, rather than the “raw spirit of Zionism,” that was at the root of Bourne’s discomfort.

The English Catholic periodicals for the most part followed Bourne’s lead. The *Catholic Herald*, as previous chapters have demonstrated, already engaged in deprecating representations of the Jew long before the Balfour Declaration. From 1919 onwards, the paper simply integrated the new stereotype of the Zionist Menace into its protean and composite construction of the Jew, which was already based on a hotchpotch of traditional Christian myths and contemporary stereotypes. The paper even suggested that Freemasonry was a major author of Zionism. Its anti-Zionist constructions were the most hostile of those found in English Catholic periodicals. Next in intensity was the *Universe*. Ironically, the *Universe* had been the most sympathetic to the plight of Jews during the war, pointing out instances of Jewish heroism and statesmanship.  

The *Universe* now criticised Jews and Zionism using an array of contemporary stereotypes. The *Month* also came to regard Zionism as a menace to the land. The *Tablet*, the paper owned by Cardinal Bourne, tended to adopt the most neutral sounding language of the English Catholic periodicals. Whilst it generally avoided blatantly hostile rhetoric, the *Tablet* nevertheless reported that the Jews were obtaining unfair advantages and that the Zionist policy was being pursued without thought to the consequences. Of all the English Catholic periodicals, only the *Catholic Times* contained, at least for a time, relatively sympathetic representations of Zionists and Zionism. However, by 1922, even the *Catholic Times* had adopted a hostile tone.

---

79 The sympathetic articles (discussed in chapter three) were all found during the editorship of William Dunbar McConnell, whose short term at the helm of the paper (1912 – October 1917) was ended because the shareholders believed he was too sympathetic towards socialism. The antipathy from November 1917 onwards probably had as much to do with the change of editorship as it did with developments in the Holy Land.
6. Solutions to “the Jewish Problem”

A number of possible “solutions” for the allegedly intractable but entirely constructed “Jewish problem” were discussed by English Catholics such as Hilaire Belloc, Gilbert Chesterton, Arthur Day and Bede Jarrett. Belloc contended that the only practical and moral solution was “privilege” or “recognition.” Both terms were euphemisms for segregation, albeit an allegedly voluntary and mutually beneficial form of segregation. The solution adopted by Chesterton but rejected by Belloc was Zionism. Chesterton did not support Zionism out of any sympathy for Jews. As far as he was concerned, Zionism, an exodus of Jews from Europe, simply provided the best solution. The other solution, explicitly dismissed by Belloc, was conversion.¹ The Catholic Guild of Israel was formed precisely with this solution in mind. Despite their ostensibly benign intentions, a number of ambivalent constructions of the Jew emerged from the Guild. Prominent members, such as Day and Jarrett, believed that Israel constituted an ongoing threat to Christian civilisation and that the Jews were stubborn and motivated by a pathological anti-Christian mentality. However, they also believed that the Jews had good qualities, in particular a distinctive “zeal,” “fire” and “flame,” which could be put to good use if Israel could be brought into the Church. This chapter examines each of these so-called solutions. Of these, Belloc’s “recognition” received the most wide-ranging support from English Catholic periodicals.

Conversion

The religious solution to the so-called Jewish problem was to bring Israel into the Church. Protestant evangelists were active among Jews in England throughout the nineteenth century.² The decision to form a Catholic movement was in comparison remarkably late in coming. As Father Bede Jarrett, the head of the English Dominicans, noted in a two part article published in the Universe in June and July 1917, English Catholics had made almost no attempts to convert the Jews, almost as if

¹ According to Belloc, absorption was impossible and conversion was not an answer as the Jew was no less a Jew for having been baptised. That baptism erased the Jewishness of the Jew or solved the Jewish problem was, he contended, a liberal fiction. See Belloc The Jews, 7-10, 28-29, passim.
they “agreed with Luther’s reported theory: ‘there is no salvation for the Jew.’”

The Catholic Guild of Israel was founded on 18 December 1917 by Jarrett and several associates of the Arch-Confraternity of Prayer for the Conversion of Israel. This initiative received the blessings of Benedict XV and subsequently Pius XI and the archbishops of England. Jarrett’s vision was for the Guild to be a more proactive movement than the Sisters of Sion and the Arch-Confraternity of Prayer. He was content to leave “the Sisters to continue on their side the work for the conversion of Israel as regards prayer,” so that the Guild could concentrate on “the actual work of the conversion of Israel.”

One aspect of the Guild’s mission was to improve the way that Catholics perceived Judaism. Jews, the supposedly lost sheep of Israel, were to be brought to Jesus through love and sympathy rather than through coercion. According to a Guild pamphlet addressed to the children of Catholic schools, “there is something very precious and holy about the Jews.” The pamphlet did suggest that some Jews “have made their money by exploiting Christians, and by all sorts of low, dirty tricks” but it acknowledged that “many Christians are not much better.” The pamphlet also stated that it “was not the Jews who scourged our Lord and nailed Him to the cross but the Roman soldiers. And even those rough men were only agents: it is we who really

---

4 Ehret has also examined the Catholic Guild of Israel. See Ehret, “Catholics and Antisemitism,” 54-58. Ehret made extensive use of Guild minutes and reports, and focused mainly on how the Guild tried to accommodate conceptions of race and determinism. My focus has been the published works of prominent individuals within the Guild, their ambivalent religious constructions, and their desire to bring the Jews into the Church in order to tap into their distinctive “zeal,” “fire” and “flame.”
5 Guild Minute book, entry for 18 December 1917, pp.1-5, CGI Archives; Report of Guild Meeting, 27 November 1923, 8-9, CGI Archives.
6 The Sisters of Sion and the Arch-Confraternity of Prayer were international Catholic organisations (with a presence in London) whose mission was to pray for the conversion of Israel. The Sisters of Sion was founded in 1843 and the Arch-Confraternity of Prayer in 1903 (known as the Association of Prayer until 1909). The only “condition of membership” for the Arch-Confraternity was “the daily recitation” of a prayer for the conversion and redemption of the Jews. In return, the volunteers were promised “300 days indulgence and a plenary indulgence each month.” Report of Guild Meeting, 27 November 1923, 7-8, 33, CGI Archives. According to a guild report, the Arch-Confraternity should be seen as a kind of stepping stone to the Guild: “If Catholics were accustomed from their Childhood to pray for the Jews, they would later on more willingly consent to work for them, and become, in the first place perhaps, Members of the Archconfraternity of Prayer and afterwards Members of the Catholic Guild of Israel.” Report of Guild Meeting, 17 July 1922, 11. The Sisters of Sion still exists but their mission since Vatican II has been to work to improve Jewish-Catholic relations rather than to pray for the conversion of Jews.
7 Guild Minute book, entry for 25 January 1921, pp.35-36, CGI Archives.
crucified our Lord by our sins." Judaism was portrayed in some Guild literature as unfulfilled Catholicism, good as far as it goes, but imperfect. For example, in an important Guild booklet, *I am a Catholic because I am a Jew* (1921), Hugh Angress, Chairman of the Guild and a Jewish Catholic, explained that he was a Catholic because he was an Orthodox Jew and that he had not given up Judaism since the Catholic Church is "the true and complete fulfilment of Judaism." In a lecture to the Catholic Truth Society, Angress refused to accept the title of convert, as whilst he considered the title an honourable one, he had not, he suggested, abandoned being a Jew in becoming a Catholic. "He was a Catholic because he was a Jew, seeing in Catholicism the fulfilment of Judaism." Significantly, Angress seemed only interested in attempts to convert Orthodox Jews. He reported that "in the Ghetto we have the good Orthodox Jew," whereas "in Hyde Park we find the paganised Jew, the Jew who is ashamed to call himself a Jew, at one moment, and who, at another moment, when he has the fighting spirit, and wants to fight for his nationality, will call himself a Jew." "It is," he concluded, "the Ghetto we want!"

Despite the Guild’s comparatively benign intentions, the senior members were not able to entirely master their own prejudices. Their constructions of the Jew were correspondingly ambivalent. Father Bede Jarrett argued in 1917, shortly before the Guild was formed, that the Jews were not merely a foreign presence in England, which would he suggested be of minor consequence, but more importantly they were a power to be reckoned with. "It is time that we realised the power of the Jew here and elsewhere," he argued, "and remembered that this power will increase." The principle threat he believed was the "liberal Jew." He stated that "the orthodox Jew, hating Christ and loving the Law, is driven in upon himself, and consequently is harmless." Jarrett explained that as long as he "remains separated from the world by the walls of the Talmud his anti-Christianism is limited to his own atmosphere." However, when "he leaves his Ghetto and throws off his obedience to the law and mixes with other nations, he arrogates to himself the leadership of Christian civilisation." In a modern

---

8 “Ideas for Addresses to Children on the Conversion of the Jews,” pamphlet, CGI Archives.
11 Report of Guild Meeting, 17 July 1922, 9, CGI Archives.
refinement of the well poisoning accusation, Jarrett explained that “the liberal Jew is the active enemy of Christian ideals and hopes, and works for their overthrow. He does not poison the wells of drinking water, as mediaeval Europe believed; he does endeavour to poison the living springs of Christendom.”

Pointing to reports of Jewish students in Russia stirring up trouble, Jarrett concluded that the problem was caused not by responsible Christian and orthodox Jews, but by “the liberal Jew.” “The Jew,” he argued, is “giving up his Talmudic faith” and without a new faith to replace it he is becoming “violently revolutionary in the varying extremes of anarchism and chaos.” He concluded that the only possible remedy was to give the Jew another religion. “Give him Catholicism, and there is a chance for some steadiness in our political and social life.”

Jarrett continued to express similar concerns after the Guild’s formation. As noted in chapter three, Jarrett argued that English public life was in the hands of the Jews because of their propensity for money. The Jew’s other speciality according to Jarrett was revolution. He blamed the Jew for the anti-Christian revolution in Russia and the Judaizing of Christianity in England and he questioned why the Jew should “worry over Palestine” when “the world is at his feet, for he controls the complete social scale, ruling at one end of it and revolting at the other.”

Whilst Jarrett feared the power and influence of the Jews, he was also influenced by the stereotype of the Smart Jew and passionate about the potential benefits that he believed would accrue from bringing them into the Church. He stated that the Jew is “nearly always a man of ideals, not wholly devoted to finance,” and he “has shown himself a capable artist, a musician, a political leader.” He concluded that the “Catholic Church needs at this present moment, more than anything else, apostles such as the Jews have shown themselves to be, incisive, enthusiastic, unhampered by convention, able to throw themselves with ardour and whole-heartedly into the service of any ideal that can inspire and inflame.” On occasion Jarrett’s language suggests a desire to tap into a

---

13 Bede Jarrett, “The Jew, part II,” Universe, 6 July 1917, 11. When Jarrett referred to “liberal Jews,” he did not have in mind Liberal Judaism. In this context, “liberal” was used to indicate non-religious Jews (including “socialists” and “capitalists”). Jarrett had three main types of Jews in mind: “liberal” (i.e. bad non-religious Jews), “orthodox” (i.e. good but unfulfilled religious Jews) and Christian. Jews from the Liberal Jewish Synagogue were probably viewed as a variant of “orthodox” Jews.
reservoir of Jewish energy for the benefit of the Church. This was particularly evident in a sermon delivered to the Arch-confraternity of Prayers in November 1917. He argued that the Church has “great need of the Children of Israel,” in particular “their flaming zeal” and their “fixed constancy” which has endured through “the vicissitudes of these thousands of years.” These outcast people, he stated, “still have something of the zeal and the flame which perhaps our own hearts lack” and “it is something of that fire, something of that flame, that we ask the Mother of God to bring into our midst.”

Father Day, a Jesuit priest, vice president of the Catholic Guild of Israel and author of several booklets and articles on converting the Jews, expressed similarly ambivalent sentiments. In an article in the *Month*, he referred to his “pro-Jew proclivities,” described Jews as “interesting and attractive” and expressed admiration for the works of Israel Zangwill. He also stated that they are “a race that is on the whole more idealistic and versatile than we are.” Like Jarrett, Day argued that Jews are imbued with qualities that would make them an asset to the Church. “The Jew,” he stated, is “a hard nut to crack,” but the “kernel” is “sweet.” He attributed the difficulty to the “mighty bond of union” between Jews and the “anti-Semite tendency” of some Christians, and encouraged Catholics to look and listen for “the golden quality of the Jew.” In a lecture to the Catholic Truth Society in 1927, Father Day observed that “considering their small numbers,” the Jews exercise “enormous influence,” and he suggested that Catholics should be involved in “directing” this influence.

Father Day also expressed admiration for Bello’s *The Jews*, a book that can hardly be regarded as “pro-Jew.” He suggested that Bello presented the Jew in a “scientific and judicial” manner rather than as an “idealised pastille portrait.” He agreed with Bello that the Jews must accept some of the blame for the historical

---

16 The sermon was reported in “The Conversion of Israel,” *Universe*, 4 January 1918, 6. Nietzsche once suggested that “a thinker who has the future of Europe on his conscience will, in all the designs he makes for this future, take the Jews into account.” Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, §251. He contended that as a result of their long history of endurance through hardship, they had developed extraordinary “psychological and spiritual resources.” Nietzsche, *Daybreak*, §205. Whilst he did not refer to Nietzsche directly, it seems as if Jarrett had this Nietzschean myth of a special reservoir of Jewish power in mind, and that it was something he simultaneously feared and desired.


antipathy that has been felt towards them. He stated that “the fact that their ancestors had rejected Christ was necessarily a bad introduction” and their “strict retentiveness of their Eastern customs was often embarrassing for their hosts.”

During his public address on the occasion of Cardinal Bourne’s attendance of the annual meeting of the Guild in 1923, Father Day acknowledged that their “past experiences at the hands of ill-advised Christians” was possibly the reason why “Jews are so extraordinarily difficult to convert.” He concluded that Jewish resistance “can be dislodged because we can show them, in a kindly way, that if they persist in that attitude of rigid exclusion towards Christians they cannot expect us to include them with any cordiality into our social system.”

Day regularly referred to Jewish hostility to Christians to balance out Christian hostility to Jews. He suggested that “if Jews object to Christians being ‘anti-Semitic’, they should set us the example of not being ‘anti-Christian.’”

An episode that began in 1928 serves to demonstrate the gulf in understanding that separated the Guild from those they were trying to convert. Day published an article on the Mortara Affair in June 1929 after a heated altercation on the subject of forced baptisms with the Anglo-Jewish scholar, Cecil Roth, in the pages of the *Jewish Guardian*. Roth had presented a lecture to the Jewish Historical Society of England in 1928 which had led on to a discussion on compulsory baptisms. Day attended the lecture and subsequently wrote a letter to Roth to discuss his historiography, which Roth published in the *Jewish Guardian* without his permission. The letter explained that whilst under normal circumstances the permission of the parents must be obtained, in the exceptional circumstance in which an unbaptized child is “in danger of death, baptism, which we regard as of primary importance for salvation, should, if possible, be conferred.” Day observed that the Mortara family had broken the law by employing a Catholic servant and thus “to some extent they brought the trouble on

---

21 Report of Guild Meeting, 27 November 1923, 5-6, CGI Archives. The address was also reported in “Catholic Guild of Israel,” *Tablet*, 8 December 1923, 744.
23 The Mortara Affair was an incident in which a Jewish child, Edgardo Mortara, was removed from his family in 1858 and placed in the care of the Church (and adopted by Pius IX). This was because a Catholic maid, afraid that Edgardo was about to die, illicitly baptised him. When she later revealed this to a parish priest, the matter was referred to Church officials, who declared that the baptism was valid. For a detailed examination of this episode, see David I. Kertzer, *The Kidnapping of Edgardo Mortara* (New York: Vintage, 1998).
themselves.” He also claimed that the controversy at the time of the Affair was whipped up by those of “the anti-Popery and Continental freemason type.”24 Roth was not impressed by his arguments. Whilst Day was eager to keep the conversation alive, Roth implied that it was “no iced en passant” that Day distorted the facts, and he stated that he had “no intention to protract the correspondence upon this question between myself and Father Day.”25 Day’s subsequent article defended the Mortara abduction, informing his readers that it should not be “so impossible for Jews to realize the importance we attach to baptism seeing that they, if at all orthodox, regard circumcision as a religious ordinance of the very first rank.”26 He described his encounter with Roth as a “useful object-lesson regarding Jewish mentality when confronted by the Catholic claim.”27

Significantly, Father Day’s perception of what he referred to as the “Jewish mentality” seems to have led him to support Zionism. He believed a national home would enable Jews to open their eyes to the virtues of the Church. “Sunshine and sweat,” Day argued, “will remove, where it has existed, the obsession of bitter memories, and Jews will be in a far better frame of mind for considering the merits of Christianity.”28 Father Day was unusual amongst English Catholics in seeing merit in Zionism. In a somewhat ironic twist, even Hans Herzl, the son of the Zionist leader, Theodor Herzl, stood opposed to Zionism whilst under the care of Father Day as a


26 The crux of Day’s argument was that: “If an infant is in serious danger of death, theologians teach that it should be baptised even without the consent of the parents.” He explained that “under such circumstances this sacrament is of eternal importance to the child, and to withhold it, when there is the opportunity of bestowing it, would be a violation of the law of charity.” Furthermore, it is laid down as a “general rule” that in the rare instances that this occurs with a Jewish child, and the child then survives having been validly if illicitly baptised, then they must be “separated from their relations and educated in the Christian faith.” Arthur F. Day, “The Mortara Case,” Month, CLIII (June 1929), 505-507.

27 Ibid, 501.

recent convert to Roman Catholicism. Day was not however alone. The previous chapter showed that Mark Sykes was a passionate advocate of Zionism. Zionism, as the next section will show, was also Gilbert Chesterton’s preferred solution to the so-called Jewish problem.

Zionism

Gilbert Chesterton believed that to “recognize the reality of the Jewish problem is very vital for everybody and especially vital for Jews. To pretend that there is no problem is to precipitate the expression of a rational impatience, which unfortunately can only express itself in the rather irrational form of Anti-Semitism.” Chesterton’s problem was not with Jews per se, but with Jews living in England – and elsewhere in Europe – and pretending to be English, French, German, Italian or Russian, rather than, as he conceived it, living openly as Jews. At a meeting of the Jewish West End Literary Society in 1911, he suggested that as representatives of a high civilization, Jews “could not be expected to have patriotism for the countries in which they made their homes; their patriotism could be only for their race.” According to the Jewish Chronicle, he stated at this meeting that “the broad-minded Jew was a difficulty and an offence in Europe; the narrow-minded Jew was an excellent fellow, whom one admired and regarded with an amount of veneration as one did any other great relic of antiquity, such as the pyramids.” The broad-minded Jews were the cosmopolitan

29 In October 1924, Hans Herzl was brought into the Church by Father Day. In March 1925, Hans published a short article in the Universe which stated that he did not “believe in the necessity of a Jewish National Home in Palestine, because there no longer exists a Jewish problem in Eastern Europe.” Wealthy Jews should, he suggested, lavish their money on “the restoration of Russia, that country which has so long been the national home of the Jewish people,” rather than pouring the money into “the Zionist coffers.” He stated that the only “sort of Mandate in the Middle East” that he could personally conceive was for “the custody of the Holy places of Christendom” to be “held by the Holy See.” Shortly after writing this article he left the Church. According to Father Day, he ceased his full commitment to the Church after only six months, partly because he “got it into his head that his conversion had been too much boasted by the Catholic Guild of Israel.” He referred to Guild members as “stunters” and accused them of “fanaticism.” Hans Herzl, “Jews and Palestine,” Universe, 20 March 1925, 6 and Day, Our Friends the Jews, 18-22. For an examination of Hans Herzl’s desperate and ultimately forlorn search for a faith to give his life meaning, see Ilse Sternberger, Princes Without a Home: Modern Zionism and the Strange Fate of Theodor Herzl’s Children 1900-1945 (San Francisco: International Scholars, 1994). See also Hans Herzl, “How I Became a Catholic,” Universe, 7 November 1924, 1, 12.


31 See Ibid, 221.


33 “Mr. G. K. Chesterton’s Views,” The Jewish Position, Jewish Chronicle, 1 December 1911, 20.
assimilationists, who, he contended, pretended to be good English people and good Europeans, whereas the narrow-minded Jews did not conceal their Jewishness, they talked and dressed like “proper” Jews and embraced the idea of leaving England to form an independent Jewish nation elsewhere. It would be difficult to classify Chesterton’s support for Zionism as motivated by a genuine sympathy for Jews. The support was genuine but not the sympathy. It was motivated by his desire to solve the Jewish Problem by removing as many Jews from Europe as possible. Chesterton stated in *The New Jerusalem* (1920) that “if the advantage of the ideal to the Jews is to gain the promised land, the advantage to the Gentiles is to get rid of the Jewish problem.” Jews leaving Europe for Palestine was, Chesterton suggested, simply the best solution. As one of his critics has observed, “to say that a man wishes you and all your people to live somewhere else, is not to say that he likes you.”

Gilbert Chesterton was unusual amongst English Catholics in adopting Zionism as his solution to the Jewish Problem. By 1925, a few years after his conversion to Roman Catholicism, Chesterton began to waver in his support for Zionism. The business of Zionism, he argued, is falling into “the mud of mere commercialism.” He suggested that the ideal of Zionism was still good, but in practice it was a failure. The problem, he contended, was that it added a “Jewish problem” in Palestine without diminishing it anywhere else. “We have,” he observed, “given him yet another county in which he can be an interloper and a nuisance.” “He probably does not really regard it as his own country,” Chesterton concluded, “for he develops it like all the others.” Chesterton claimed that he still believed in Zionism as the solution to the Jewish problem and he stated that he would like to see it tried again. However, he now believed that it could only be attempted “in some other place or places.” These reservations were probably prompted by the hostility towards Zionism expressed by his fellow English Catholics. In subsequent years, Chesterton continued to maintain that he believed in “the principle of Zionism.” He stated in 1931 that “all the intelligent Christians who feel this nomadic civilisation grating on

36 G. K. Chesterton, Notes of the Week, *G.K.’s Weekly*, 4 April 1925, 27.
their consciousness would, like myself, be very well pleased to see the Jews established as a proper, normal nation on their own real land. This would at once relieve the pressure of the Jewish problem throughout the world.” 39 It is not however clear what location he had in mind.

“Recognition”

Cardinal Manning was a friend and mentor to the young Hilaire Belloc. Belloc made a number of visits to Manning as a young adult (when he was 18 years old) and Manning’s influence upon him was significant.40 Belloc regarded him as the “greatest Englishman of his time” and shared his ideas about the intertwined nature of religion and politics. “The profound thing which Cardinal Manning said to me,” Belloc stated, was that “all human conflict is ultimately theological.” Belloc’s admiration for Manning stemmed from the fact that he “never admitted the possibility of compromise between Catholic and non-Catholic society.”41 Manning’s insight guided Belloc towards his solution to the Jewish problem. For Belloc, the encounter between Jews and Christians was both a theological and socio-political conflict between fundamentally opposing factors. “The continued presence of the Jewish nation intermixed with other nations alien to it presents a permanent problem of the gravest character,” he stated, and furthermore, he continued, “the wholly different culture, tradition, race and religion of Europe makes Europe a permanent antagonist to Israel.”42 Belloc drew his solution from the history of the Church. He explained that whenever the Catholic Church had the power to uphold “the traditional principles of the civilisation of which it is the soul and guardian,” it always recognised the “sharp distinction between the Jew and ourselves.” He stated that the “Catholic Church is the conservator of an age-long European tradition, and that tradition will never compromise with the fiction that a Jew can be other than a Jew. Wherever the Catholic

39 Ibid.
41 Hilaire Belloc, The Cruise of the “Nona” (London: Constable, 1925), 54-55. There was no distinction in Belloc’s mind between authentic European culture and Catholic civilisation. He stated that “the Faith is Europe and Europe is the Faith”; or to put it another way, “the Church is Europe: and Europe is the Church.” Hilaire Belloc, Europe and the Faith (London: Constable and Company, 1920), 3-6.
Church has power, and in proportion to its power, the Jewish problem will be recognized to the full.”

Belloc suggested that “recognition” was the solution successfully adopted by the Church for hundreds of years. He stated that segregation can be imposed by force or achieved by a mutual and amicable agreement in a way that satisfies both the “alien irritant” and the “organism segregating it.” Belloc hoped that the latter option could be adopted, with the Jews openly recognizing their “wholly separate nationality” and “we,” i.e. the non-Jews, recognizing “that separate nationality, treat[ing] it without reserve as an alien thing, and respect[ing] it as a province of society outside our own.” Then the term, “segregation,” which he acknowledged “has a bad connotation,” may be “replaced by the word recognition.” This he suggested was the most practical and moral solution. Belloc claimed that the Jews would benefit from this privileged “recognition.” It is right, he stated, for the “Jewish community” to be “privileged,” because an “alien race, highly differentiated from its surroundings, must be privileged or perish.” Belloc’s description of “recognition” implied that segregation would be voluntary. It was however a very odd sense of voluntariness. It was voluntary only if the Jews would embrace it; if they did not embrace it, it would be imposed. At the end of his book he slipped in this final clause. If the proposal of recognition is “made on our side, the Jew may refuse any such bargain.” Belloc concluded that if he “digs his heels in” and resists, then “the community will be compelled to legislate in spite of him.”

Recognition of separate national status would not be an abstract principle. He argued that Jewish institutions already in existence should be extended, such as Jewish schools, Jewish tribunals and the Jewish press, so that Jewish interaction with non-Jews can be minimised. He stated that once an atmosphere is created “wherein the Jews are spoken of openly, and they in their turn admit, define, and accept the consequences of a separate nationality in our midst,” then, finally, “laws and

44 Belloc, The Jews, 4-5
46 Belloc, The Jews, 304.
regulations consonant to it will naturally follow.” Belloc’s solution was in effect to gradually return the Jews to the ghetto, albeit without the stark walls and locked gates. Jews would be legally confined to operating within their own social and legal institutions and excluded from Christian civilisation. It was a solution that many English Catholics felt they could rally around.

Whilst Gilbert Chesterton’s approach to the Jewish problem was ostensibly different to Belloc’s, with Chesterton advocating and Belloc rejecting Zionism, there were significant similarities between them. Chesterton stated that ideally “as few Jews as possible” would be left in other nations once they had the option of going to “the promised land,” and those who remain should, he suggested, be given “a special position best described as privilege [emphasis mine]; some sort of self-governing enclave with special laws and exemptions.” He stated that the Jews who remain in England should be allowed to occupy any occupation but with one important stipulation:

But let there be one single-clause bill; one simple and sweeping law about Jews, and no other. Be it enacted, by the King’s Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and the Commons in Parliament assembled, that every Jew must be dressed like an Arab. Let him sit on the Woolsack, but let him sit there dressed as an Arab. Let him preach in St. Paul’s Cathedral, but let him preach there dressed as an Arab. It is not my point at present to dwell on the pleasing if flippant fancy of how much this would transform the political scene; of the dapper figure of Sir Herbert Samuel swathed as a Bedouin, or Sir Alfred Mond gaining a yet greater grandeur from the gorgeous and trailing robes of the East. If my image is quaint my intention is quite serious; and the point of it is not personal to any particular Jew. The point applies to any Jew, and to our own recovery of healthier relations with him. The point is that we should know where we are; and he would know where he is, which is in a foreign land.

This proposition that Jews should be required to wear distinctive clothing was not a new idea to Chesterton. In 1913, seven years prior to *The New Jerusalem*, he had already pointed out that in the Middle Ages it was felt that the Jews, “whether they were nice or nasty, whether they were impotent or omnipotent… were different.”

---

48 Ibid, 14.
50 Ibid, 227.
recognition was expressed by “a physical artistic act, giving them a definite dwelling place and a definite dress.” This was a clear allusion to the ghetto and the Jew hat. Chesterton however had different ideas about appropriate though equally distinctive clothing. The Jews should not, he argued, be “excluded from any civic rights when they obey the civic order,” but conversely they should be required to wear “Arab costume,” preferably a “turban and flowing robes.”

Similarly, in 1914, he stated in his regular column in the *Illustrated London News*, that the Jews may one day come to realize that they risk trading the faith of Moses and Isaiah for that of the Golden Image and the Market Place, and they may “wish they were sitting like an Arab in a clean tent in a decent desert.”

Whilst his suggestion that Jews should be encouraged, if not required, to wear distinctive Arab clothing was a part of his peculiarly Chestertonian construction of the Jew, he closely followed Belloc in suggesting special laws and segregation. Whilst Belloc employed the term “recognition” for his solution in *The Jews*, he had already outlined the core aspects of this solution in the *Eye Witness* in 1911 and referred to it as “privilege.” This was, as Kevin Morris has observed, the exact same term that Chesterton employed.

Whilst they disagreed about Zionism, their solutions and terminology for the Jewish problem, at least for those Jews who remained in England, were very similar.

Unsurprisingly considering his construction of Jewish power, Jewish finance and the Jewish Antichrist, Canon William Barry warmly welcomed Belloc’s book. He stated in an article in the *Universe* that Belloc’s book was “an olive-branch held out to Israel.” He agreed with Belloc that the Jews should be recognised as a separate people and treated accordingly. “The whole structure of our civilized world is Christian, not Jewish,” he stated, “and we have to defend it from ruin.” Barry concluded that Belloc had “rung the peal that should wake us up.” Barry’s endorsement of Belloc’s solution was however partial. Elsewhere he seemed to suggest that the Catholic Guild of Israel provided a solution to the “age-long Jewish Question.” While Belloc saw the Jews as an alien friction that could never be absorbed into Christian society, even

through baptism, Barry hoped that Israel could be brought into the Church. He believed it was the “unconverted Hebrew” that was the deadly antagonist “with whom the Church must be at war” rather than the whole of Israel. He did however have some doubts. Whilst he observed that “prophecy has always affirmed that the Jews would come within our sanctuary before the last times,” he also pointed out that “no more persevering enemies of the Catholic Faith exist, or ever have existed, then the children of Israel, whether cultivated or uneducated.”

Most of the English Catholic periodicals welcomed or supported Belloc’s thesis. The editor of the Universe stated in an article about Zionism that “Mr. Belloc’s new book on ‘The Jews’” is “written throughout in a deliberately non-controversial and objective spirit.” The review in the Catholic Times accurately summarised and agreed with Belloc’s analysis, and observed that:

In the East End of London the Irish colony at Wapping have decreed that no Jew push-barrow may cross the bridges. … this was economically a sound provision, for, as Mr. Belloc sees, a wise segregation of the Jews is a proper and not unkind solution of a problem which, however, no Western Government wants to settle as yet.

The Catholic Federationist was also enthusiastic, suggesting that Belloc was ahead of his time in this matter as he has been in others. The Catholic Federationist argued that the Jewish problem is “being ignored” and will “continue to be denied until it is too late either to deny it or remedy it.” The review in the Blackfriars, the periodical of the Dominicans in England, shared Belloc’s anxiety that Jewish and English readers will continue to labour under the false assumption that “Jews are not an alien nation, but fellow nationals only differentiated by a religion.” The only realistic solution, the periodical argued, was “frank mutual recognition of each other’s racial differences, and the personal and legal relations which such a recognition imposes.” The review surmised that The Jews makes “delightful reading” but will probably provoke

56 William Barry, “Sign of the Times II,” Catholic Times, 6 November 1920, 7
59 Shane Leslie, review of The Jews, by Hilaire Belloc, Catholic Times, 29 April 1922, 10.
“irrational Jewish protest” and “scepticism and annoyance in the general mass.”\textsuperscript{61} The Tablet also appreciated Belloc’s thesis, agreeing with its depiction of the recent manifestations of the Jewish problem, namely that bolshevism was a Jewish movement and that Zionism was opening the “flood-gates” to a whole new problem. The review was more equivocal about his “remedial measures,” though it suggested that Belloc convincingly pressed home his argument that “the Jew is inevitably an alien and should accept the disabilities and the advantages of that situation.”\textsuperscript{62} There were exceptions to this enthusiastic response. Father Day of the Catholic Guild of Israel was ambivalent. On the one hand he described Belloc’s thesis as an objective and unprejudiced account. His portrayal of the Jew, Day concluded, was not an idealised caricature but rather an accurate representation. It should, he suggested, “be absolved from the stigma of so-called anti-Semitism.” Day nevertheless expressed some reservations about how “the policy of ‘recognition’” should be applied. The reason for this was clear. Segregation would make it impossible to “mix freely” with the Jews which would undermine proselytism.\textsuperscript{63} The most significant English Catholic protest was made by the modernist and former nun, Maude Petre. Petre did embrace certain stereotypes of the Jew, such as the stereotype of the Jewish financier, but she rejected Belloc’s caricature of the Jew and blamed Christians for going after Jewish money rather than the Jew for going after the Christian. She suggested that the solution to the Jewish problem was neither segregation nor scapegoating but for Christians to rise themselves up to the level of honest rivals.\textsuperscript{64}

Conclusion

English Catholics disagreed about solutions to the Jewish problem. Of the solutions proposed, Belloc’s had the widest support. He proposed a form of segregation which he claimed would be mutually beneficial to Jews and Christians in English society. It was, he suggested, a voluntary proposition, though at the end of his thesis he suggested that it may have to be imposed upon the Jews if they continue to accept their

\textsuperscript{61} Osbert Burdett, “Mr Belloc on the Jews,” review of The Jews, by Hilaire Belloc, Blackfriars, III, no. 26, May 1922, 100-104.
\textsuperscript{62} Review of The Jews, by Hilaire Belloc, Tablet, 27 May 1922, 666.
\textsuperscript{64} Discussed in chapter three.
privileged position in English society without any of the legal limitations. Belloc used the terms “recognition” and “privilege” as polite euphemisms for segregation. Belloc highlighted the importance that the Church placed on the recognition of the Jews when it had the power to do so. The Church’s “recognition,” when it had the power to enforce it, was of course manifest in the form of the physical ghetto. The Church maintained the locked ghetto in Rome until its gates were finally torn down in 1870 by the *Risorgimento*. Belloc observed, never compromised with the “fiction” that a Jew was the same as everyone else. Belloc’s proposal was a return to this ghetto, though probably without the physical walls and locked gates. Belloc’s solution was to varying extents appreciated by the various English Catholic periodicals. Some doubted that Jews would voluntarily embrace “recognition” or the wisdom of trying to enforce segregation, but they almost universally appreciated Belloc’s attempt to solve the Jewish Problem.

The other main solution was conversion. The members of the Catholic Guild of Israel set out to bring Judaism to what they considered to be its rightful fulfilment. In practice, this meant that the Guild set out to convert Jews to Catholicism and to bring their “zeal” and “flame” into the Church. It was felt that the potential Jewish convert contained a reservoir of intellect and energy, which though dangerous when left to work against Christianity, could be of use if tapped by the Church. The Guild was however largely unsuccessful. In his address to the annual Guild meeting in November 1923, Father Day recognised that the work of converting the Jews would be slow. He attributed this to the lingering memory of oppression and persecution.

65 According to Perry and Schweitzer, even after 1870, it was not until the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s that papal pronouncements regarding Jews ceased to regard the ghetto as being the rightful place for the Jews. Perry and Schweitzer, *Antisemitism: Myth and Hate*, 6.

66 Report of Guild Meeting, 27 November 1923, 5, CGI Archives. There are no official statistics for how many Jews the Guild managed to convert. Ehret estimates that the Guild as a whole gained about five converts a year. Ehret, “Catholics and Antisemitism.” Day stated in 1943 that he personally received about twenty Jews into the Church (he joined the Guild in 1923 so approximately one convert a year). According to Day, women were more successful than men as converts, being willing to make “considerable sacrifices.” He stated that “the female sex amongst the Jews seems to possess some striking features of superiority.” He attributed this “phenomenon” to “Our Lady.” Day, *Our Friends the Jews*, 14. A recent study by Nadia Valman suggests that this image of the “spiritual Jewess,” an idealised figure “whose Judaism is not permanently inscribed on her body,” was an important narrative within the general (i.e. not specifically Catholic) English literary discourse. Valman suggests that “a revision of received accounts of antisemitic discourse” is required to deal with the lack of attention that the image of “the Jewess” has received. It has not been possible to remedy this particular lacuna as this was one of very few references to the Jewess found during this project. Nadia Valman, *The Jewess in Nineteenth-Century British Literary Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 3.
unconquered prejudices of senior Guild members and their unceasing attempts to demonstrate that Jews were just as guilty of persecuting Christians as Christians were of persecuting Jews were probably partly to blame for their lack of success. These attempts to demonstrate the bilateral nature of persecution continued after the 1920s. Father Day continued to discuss examples of Jewish hostility towards Christians, which should, he believed, be kept in mind when Jews feel “tempted to complain of the cruelties of the Inquisition.”

Day accepted that some Jews had been treated badly by Christians, but concluded that Jews were often responsible for provoking this ill-treatment.

---

67 Arthur F. Day, Twin Heroes of the Vatican Council (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1938), 7. According to Day, in 1854 the family of two young Jewish converts to Catholicism used violence to try to force them to abandon the Church. Day stated that one uncle attempted to strangle one of the boys. “Whilst threatening the boy’s life, he kept exclaiming at the top of his voice: ‘Renounce, renounce!’” Day claimed that another uncle assaulted the other boy with an iron bar and it was only the intercession of a group of passing soldiers which prevented the incident ending in “martyrdom” (5-6). Jewish parents may have felt anger and confusion at such conversions, but the accusation that the Jews so despise Christianity that they feel compelled to murder their own children to prevent baptism would seem to be a variant of the narrative about Jews murdering innocent Christian children in odium fidei. Felsenstein made a similar observation in connection to English Protestants in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. He referred to the accusation as “the transposed version of the [ritual murder] myth.” Felsenstein, Anti-Semitic Stereotypes, 99-103.
7. Conclusion

The expectation at the beginning of this project was that representations of the Jew in the English Catholic discourse would closely correlate with representations in the general English discourse. At first it looked as if this would indeed be the case. The narratives of Gilbert Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc were the initial focus of this investigation. As chapter three demonstrates, both authors engaged in many of the contemporary stereotypes that were popular in English society during the timeframe of this project. In their fictional and non-fictional works, the Jews were intrinsically foreign, revolutionary, pacifistic, secretive, greedy, exploitative, usurious, plutocratic and incapable of understanding Christian concepts of bravery, patriotism and chivalry. These were common stereotypes of the Jew in English society during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. However, an important discovery during this investigation, was that whilst stereotypes of the greedy financially agile Jew were pervasive in the English Catholic discourse, the stereotypes of cowardly, unpatriotic and secretive Jews tended to be confined to a handful of individuals, namely Cecil and G.K Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc, William Barry and Charles Diamond. There were also counter-examples to these stereotypes. Under the editorship of William Dunbar McConnell, the Universe reported a number of accounts of Jewish heroism and statesmanship, and unlike Belloc’s The Jews, this was without irony or subtext. Another unexpected discovery was that representations of the Jew derived from biblical and medieval myths were at least as pervasive in English Catholic discourse as contemporary stereotypes of the Jew. This was unanticipated, as the conventional wisdom in studies of Anglo-Jewish history and anti-Jewish prejudice tends to suggest that by the late nineteenth century traditional religious prejudices were largely replaced by modern forms of socio-political and racial antipathy.

Racial antipathy proved to be a relatively incidental aspect of the English Catholic discourse. This is not to say that “race” was totally absent. References to the “Jewish race” were found scattered throughout many English Catholic narratives. For example, the Catholic Herald, Father Ronald Knox, Farther Arthur Day, Gilbert Chesterton, Cecil Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc and other English Catholics, referred to the “Jewish race” or the “Hebrew race” on a number of occasions. The following are representative examples:
Nor, as a race, will the Jewish race ever learn from its failures. If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe if one rose again from the dead. The Jews have had their chance, their probation is over now, and the punishment for their neglect of the warnings already given them will be to be left in their blindness.¹

[The Jews] are a factious race, violent in their hatreds and passions, and treacherous to each other, as their history proves. They stoned their prophets, betrayed their leaders, made to themselves idols and denied their God on the slightest provocation.²

Whilst such references to “race” were woven en passant into a number of derisive representations of the Jew, there was little indication of any sympathy for pseudo-scientific race theories in English Catholic discourse.³ This did not however make the representations any less hostile.

The most frequent forms of the mythologized Jew in the English Catholic discourse were the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer. The most prominent source of these representations of the Jew as legalistic Pharisees and the rejecters and murderers of Christ were the sermons and pastoral letters of priests, bishops and archbishops. Hostility towards contemporary Jews was probably not intended by the authors of most of these addresses. The Christ-Killer and the Pharisee often served as caricatures to represent everything reprobate, obsolete, non-Christian or anti-Christian. They were thus convenient symbols which could be drawn upon to contrast with Christian virtues and to illustrate non-Christian vices. However, whilst most of the authors of the sermons and pastoral letters probably had biblical figures in mind rather than

¹ Ronald Knox, “Probation” (1928), in Mystery of the Kingdom, 73. This sermon was delivered at the Carmelites’ Church in Kensington and published in 1928. Other sermons by Knox were examined in chapter two.
³ The one ambiguous exception was Hilaire Belloc. On the one hand he did reject eugenic theories and he stated that “antagonism to the Jews has nothing to do with any supposed ‘Semitic’ race – which probably does not exist any more than do many other modern hypothetical abstractions.” “Hilaire Belloc and the Ministry of Health: The ‘Eugenics’ Horror,” Catholic Federationist, September 1920, 6; Belloc, The Jews, 147. Conversely, Belloc repeatedly referred to “race” as part of his argument that the Jews are a permanent antagonist and friction within European civilisation. He also employed biological language, arguing that the problem was that of “any human organism ... which discovers, present and irritant within its tissue, a foreign body.” Hilaire Belloc, “The Jewish Question: V. The First Solution,” Eye Witness, 5 October 1911, 488. It is difficult to avoid concluding that Belloc engaged in what Cheyette has quite reasonably described as a “heavily racialized semitic discourse.” Cheyette, Constructions of “the Jew” in English Literature and Society, 151.
contemporary Jews, there was an essentialistic quality to these representations and it seems likely that in many cases little consideration was given to any such distinction. In some cases the sermons were in fact framed in such a way as to include contemporary Jews. Significantly, the representations of the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer also appeared outside of sermons and pastoral letters, and in these instances they were often used to reinforce hostile constructions of the contemporary Jew. The most prominent examples of this can be found in the Catholic Herald, which frequently combined stereotypes of Jewish greed, cowardice, secrecy and anti-Christian hostility with narratives about how the Jews and the Pharisees had despoiled the Egyptians, murdered Christ and oppressed the early Christians. According to the Catholic Herald, believing themselves to be still living under the old dispensation that allowed them to despoil the Egyptians and murder Christ, the Jews continue to oppress, persecute and plunder the Church and Christian civilisation.

The Pharisee and the Christ-Killer were not the only representations of the mythologized Jew in English Catholic discourse. The Antichrist, Man of Sin or Lawless One, was described as a very real and very frightening individual rather than merely a symbol or spirit of the times and he was called upon to explain a number of contemporary evils. The Antichrist was often invoked independently of representations of the Jew. Whilst the Jewish Antichrist was a relatively rare representation of the Jew, it was found in the narratives of some prominent individuals, including Father Henry Manning (subsequently Cardinal Archbishop of the English hierarchy) and Canon William Barry. Barry wrote numerous articles about the Jews and the Jewish problem. Citing Manning’s lectures as if they were prophetic forecasts, Barry combined the myth of the Jewish Antichrist with contemporary stereotypes of Jewish greed, secrecy, disloyalty, bolshevism and anti-Christian hostility, to produce a construction of the Jew that was second only to constructions by the Catholic Herald for the hostility and multiplicity of its themes. The Month supported Barry’s construction of the Jewish Antichrist, suggesting that he was already in power in Russia and that Marx had been his evangelist.

---

4 The Catholic Herald during the owner-editorship of Charles Diamond engaged in nearly every type of stereotype, myth and construction of the Jew examined in this thesis.
The most sinister of the Christian myths that survived into the late nineteenth- 
and early twentieth-century was the ritual murder accusation. A number of Catholic 
periodicals on the continent fully embraced the ritual murder accusations, arguing on 
numerous occasions that the Jews, being a vicious race, murdered innocent Christian 
children for religious ritual purposes and to use their blood for medicinal or magical 
purposes. English Catholics conversely tended to adopt a more ambiguous and 
equivocal position. Ritual murder, narrowly defined as the accusation that the Jews 
murdered innocent Christian children as part of religious rituals sanctioned or 
commanded by Judaism, was usually denied by English Catholics, but it was instead 
argued that some “fanatical Jews” or “superstitious Jews” had murdered innocent 
Christian children, sometimes with crucifixion and bleeding to death, either as a 
consequence of *odium fidei* or to use the blood of the victims for magical practices. 
This line of argument was presented by the *Tablet*, Father Herbert Thurston, Father 
Joseph Bampton, Father Arthur Day, Montague Summers, Cecil Chesterton and 
Gilbert Chesterton. It is therefore fair to say that the myth of Jewish ritual murder did 
not cease to exist in the early twentieth century English Catholic discourse, but it 
survived by adapting to remain relevant to the age. The representation of the Jew as 
Ritual Murderer was thus for the greater part replaced by the Jew as Fanatical 
Murderer and the Jew as Sorcerer.

The Jews were not alone in being stereotyped, mythologized and constructed in 
English Catholic discourse during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. The 
Freemasons were stereotyped as secretive, deceptive, revolutionary, unpatriotic, anti-
Christian and anti-Catholic plunderers of the Church. They were also mythologized as 
host desecrators, devil worshipers, Luciferians, Satanic ritualists and servants of the 
Antichrist. The myths and stereotypes associated with the Freemasons were often not 
merely similar to the myths and stereotypes associated with the Jews; in some cases 
the constructions of the Jews and the Freemasons combined and coalesced. They were 
represented as allies and conspirators in a Jewish-Masonic camarilla bent on the 
destruction or subjugation of the Church and Christian civilisation. For decades after 
the Dreyfus Affair, the Jews and the Freemasons were blamed in the English Catholic 
discourse for the religious crisis in France. The exoneration of Dreyfus was seen as the 
work of the Jews and the Freemasons acting in concert. This supposed camarilla was 
also accused of plundering and persecuting the Church in France in the aftermath of
the affair. Anti-Catholic revolutions – in Portugal, Turkey, Mexico and elsewhere – were also blamed on Jews and Freemasons. Such representations of a Jewish-Masonic conspiracy can be found in a number of articles and editorials appearing in many of the main English Catholic periodicals, including the Tablet, Month, Catholic Times, Catholic Gazette, Catholic Federationist and in particular in the Catholic Herald. William Barry attributed the crisis in France not to a battle between Catholics and Republicans, but to a conflict between the Church and Freemasonry. Barry argued that people in Britain were largely unaware of this conflict because a close alliance exists between the Freemasons and the Jews, and it was, he suggested, the Jews who control the flow of information. Belloc also condemned the Freemasons, which at various times he either described as a secret organisation infiltrated by Jews, allied with Jews or setup by Jews as a bridge to the non-Jewish world. Whilst the more bizarre aspects of these constructions (i.e. devil worship and Satanic sorcery) largely (but not entirely) disappeared after the Diana Vaughan Affair, the language used to describe the Jews and the Freemasons in the English Catholic discourse suggested not just a series of incidents but an ongoing war with the Church.

After the Balfour Declaration in November 1917, another construction was incorporated into the English Catholic discourse: the Zionist Menace. This began in earnest in 1919 and reached a peak in 1922 (i.e. in the months leading up to and subsequent to the ratification of the British Mandate). A mutually reciprocal relationship seems to have existed between constructions of the Jew and constructions of the Zionist Menace. In some cases English Catholic periodicals that previously had only mentioned Jews occasionally, now developed a construction of the Zionist Menace which drew upon the mythologized representations of the Pharisee and the Christ-Killer and the contemporary stereotypes of the greedy, unpatriotic, pro-German, secretive and anti-Christian Jew. In the case of the Catholic Herald, it is much harder to determine whether Zionism was a genuine concern of the paper or simply a new theme to incorporate into its long-standing hostile construction of the Jew, which already included nearly every available myth and stereotype. Not only were caricatures of the Zionist incorporated into constructions of the Jew in the English Catholic newspapers; traditional myths and contemporary stereotypes were also integrated into criticisms of Zionism. It is, as Cesarani has suggested, not always clear whether “anti-Zionism” was motivated by “principled objections to Zionism” or
“hostility to the Jews.” However, the nature of the myths and stereotypes linked to the constructions of the Zionist suggest that when such distinctions in primary motive existed, they rapidly evaporated. Whatever the original motive, constructions of the Jew and the Zionist in the Tablet, Catholic Times, Universe and the Month, became increasingly entangled, frequent and acerbic. The main exception was the Catholic Herald; representations of the Jew in the Catholic Herald were already so acerbic and frequent that there was very little scope for the paper to become more hostile. Cardinal Bourne, the head of the Catholic hierarchy in England at the time of the Balfour Declaration, was also hostile to Zionism. Bourne repeatedly clarified that he spoke without the slightest hostility towards Jews as Jews, but he nevertheless claimed on a number of occasions that allowing the Jews to dominate the Holy Land would constitute a special offence to Christ and to Christianity. His objections were predicated on the construction of the Jews as the rejecters of Christ.

English Catholics differed not only in their constructions of the Jew and the Jewish problem, but also in their proposed solutions. Of the solutions proposed, Belloc’s had the widest support. His proposal was “privilege” or “recognition.” Both terms were a polite way, as Belloc more or less acknowledged, of saying segregation. He claimed in The Jews that the form of segregation he had in mind would be mutually beneficial to Jews and Christians. It was, he suggested, a voluntary proposition, though before the end of his book he suggested that it would have to be imposed if the Jews continue to accept their privileged position in English society without any of the legal limitations. It was, in short, a return to the ghetto “solution”. He even acknowledged the debt he owed to the Church for this solution. The Church maintained the ghetto in Rome until the gates were torn down by the Risorgimento in 1870. The Church, according to Belloc, never compromised with the so-called fiction that a Jew was the same as everyone else. Belloc’s solution was appreciated by a number of English Catholic periodicals and individuals. William Barry was impressed by Belloc’s solution to the Jewish problem. Reviews in the Universe, Catholic Times, Catholic Federationist, Blackfriars and the Tablet all approved of Belloc’s attempt to

---


6 According to Belloc, if the segregation is done amicably, taking “full account of the thing segregated as well as of the organism segregating it,” then “the word segregation (which has a bad connotation) may be replaced by the word recognition.” Belloc, The Jews, 5.
solve the Jewish problem. Father Day, vice-president of the Catholic Guild of Israel, welcomed Belloc’s study, suggesting that it presented an accurate rather than “idealised pastille portrait” of the Jew, but he suggested that Belloc’s solution was problematic as it would make it difficult to proselytise to the Jews. The only unambiguous English Catholic condemnation of his study was by Maude Petre, who suggested that rather than segregating or scapegoating the Jews, Christians should look to increasing their own abilities and reducing their own greed.

Another prominent solution, advocated primarily by the members of the Catholic Guild of Israel, was to bring the Jews into the Church. The leaders of the Guild suggested that the potential Jewish convert contained a reservoir of intellect, zeal and energy, which though dangerous when left to work against Christianity, could be of use if tapped by the Church. The Guild was however largely unsuccessful. According to Father Day, he only managed to bring approximately one Jew per year into the Church, and many of these proved to be unsuccessful conversions. His most prestigious convert, Hans Herzl, the son of the founder of the Zionist movement, lasted only six months as a Roman Catholic. Father Day recognised that the work would be slow as the memory of oppression and persecution still remained. The lack of success was probably in large part the consequence of the unconquered prejudices of many senior members of the Guild. Father Bede Jarrett and Father Arthur Day, the president and vice-president of the Guild, often discussed the money lending practices and the aggressively anti-Christian hostility of Jews (especially non-religious Jews). They suggested that when people talk about Christians persecuting Jews, they should not forget that Jews have also been guilty of persecuting Christians.

Having examined the English Catholic discourse for the timeframe in question and analysed its structure, it is now possible to consider, albeit briefly, two final questions. The first question is how Catholic were the anti-Jewish narratives that appeared in the discourse? A comparison with existing studies of English “antisemitism” reveals some significant correlations between the non-Catholic and Catholic discourses. As chapter three discussed, the stereotypes of the Jew which were discovered during this project, though less frequent, were in their content largely

---

indistinguishable from the contemporary stereotypes of the Jew in English Protestant and secular discourses. As Kushner, Holmes and Robb have explained, images of greedy, cowardly, secretive and unpatriotic Jews were frequent and reoccurring aspects of English “antisemitism” throughout the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century.8 Hostile constructions of the so-called Zionist Menace were also not exclusive to the Catholic domain. A number of mainstream English newspapers, including the Times, Morning Post, Spectator, Daily Mail, Daily Express and Sunday Express, incorporated criticisms of the Zionist into their constructions of the Jew, and caricatures of the Jew into their constructions of the Zionist.9 The comparison becomes more complex when traditional religious myths are considered. Studies by Endelman and Felsenstein demonstrate that the representations of the deicide, ritual murderer, sorcerer, Jew-Devil and Antichrist were pervasive aspects of the English Protestant discourse during the seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century. Endelman argued that the Jew Bill of 1753 was a turning point, after which it becomes increasingly difficult to detect traditional Christian constructions of the Jew. He suggested that anti-Jewish prejudices in England were increasingly expressed using secular rather than religious language and images.10 Felsenstein agreed with Endelman’s observation, though at one point he suggested that the turning point was the mid-nineteenth century rather than the mid-eighteenth century.11 Conversely, Kushner and Holmes have both observed that religious constructions of the Jew, including the images of the deicide, ritual murderer and Jewish Antichrist, persisted in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century English “antisemitism.”12 In summary, it does seem that the contemporary stereotypes and mythical representations of the Jew

---

8 Kushner, The Persistence of Prejudice; Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society; Robb, Working-Class Anti-Semite. This was discussed in the conclusions of chapter three.

9 For examples of this see Ceserani, “Anti-Zionist Politics and Political Antisemitism in Britain,” 29-40.


12 Kushner suggested that “a delicate sense of balance” is needed when discussing the importance of the blood libel in Britain by the time of the Second World War, but he also observed that the representations of the Jew as Christ-Killer and ritual murderer, and the image of the Jew with horns on his head, had not entirely disappeared. Kushner concluded that “the legacy of the middle ages had thus survived, albeit more commonly in a watered down and confused form.” Kushner, The Persistence of Prejudice, 106-109. An example of an English Protestant construction of the ritual murder (by M. R. James) can be found in the conclusion to chapter two of this thesis. Colin Holmes observed that “the implications of the Jewish religion, as they were understood by individual commentators, still held an interest and indeed anti-semitism could be defined by some as involving an attack upon Judaism.” Holmes, Anti-Semitism in British Society, 62, 251-252n90. See also Colin Holmes, “The Ritual Murder Accusation in Britain,” Ethnic and Racial Studies, 4, no. 3 (July 1981).
examined in this thesis were by no means exclusively or specifically Catholic. Themes and narratives within English Protestant and secular discourses clearly influenced English Catholics. The influence flowed both ways. For example, Belloc’s *The Jews* was not only well received by English Catholic periodicals, it also obtained favourable reviews in the *Times, Sunday Times, Morning Post* and *Spectator*.\(^\text{13}\) Despite these similarities, the more traditional Christian images of the Jew as Christ-killer, ritual murderer and Antichrist, were probably more common in the English Catholic discourse than in the English Protestant and secular discourses.

The second question is how much influence did continental discourse have on the English Catholic discourse? Once again a correlation can be detected. For example, Jews were portrayed in * Civiltà Cattolica*, the semi-official periodical of the Vatican,\(^\text{14}\) as cowardly, unpatriotic, lying, mean, usurious, revolutionary by nature, enemies of Christianity and Christian civilisation, a State within the State, masters of Freemasonry and Communism, manipulators of the world’s gold and money, the nucleus of secret societies, a deicidal people, and a cursed nation. Constructions of the ritual murderer were also prevalent in * Civiltà Cattolica*.\(^\text{15}\) *La Croix*, a popular French Catholic newspaper, also frequently expressed hostility towards Jews and Freemasons. For example, according to Norman Clary, *La Croix* claimed in 1886 that Drumont’s *La France Juive* and Taxil’s *Frères trois points* had “‘laid bare the two social evils which grow like gangrene in France,’ two social evils, ‘so united up to this time.’” Furthermore, the Declaration of the Rights of Man was, *La Croix* claimed, the work of “Jewish Freemasonry,” and was intended to give “land, influence, government, and press” to “the enemy.” In 1897, *La Croix* reported that a Dreyfusard Syndicate “disposes of not less than 2 million francs, for the purpose of paying secret agents.”

\(^{13}\) *Times*, 27 March 1922; *Sunday Times*, 2 April 1922; *Morning Post*, 11 April 1922; *Spectator*, 29 April 1922, cited by Charlotte Lea Klein, “50 Years Ago Belloc’s The Jews and Galsworthy’s Loyalties Revealed: English Antisemitism in the 1920s,” *Patterns of Prejudice*, 6, no.2, March 1972, 24-25.

\(^{14}\) *Civiltà Cattolica* was founded by Pius IX in 1850. It was constitutionally linked to the Vatican. The periodical’s special statute ensured that before an issue of Civiltà Cattolica could be published, the drafts were sent to the Holy See for approval. The director of the periodical was usually received by the Pope and secretary of state to discuss each issue. See José David Lebovitch Dahl, “The Role of the Roman Catholic Church in the Formation of Modern Anti-Semitism: La Civiltà Cattolica, 1850-1879,” *Modern Judaism*, 23 no. 2 (2003), 181 and Giuseppe de Rosa, *La Civiltà Cattolica: 150 anni al servizio della Chiesa, 1850 – 1999* (Rome: Civiltà Cattolica, 1999), 9, 29.

\(^{15}\) For detailed examinations of antisemitism in *Civiltà Cattolica*, see Dahl, “The Role of the Roman Catholic Church in the Formation of Modern Anti-Semitism”; Kertzer, *The Popes Against the Jews*, 133-146; Charlotte Klein, “Civiltà Cattolica on Ritual Murder”.
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The Dreyfusard syndicate, the paper suggested, was behind an “antipatriotic campaign,” which “in order to save the honour of a Dreyfus, puts in peril the security of the country and threatens the honour of our whole army.”\(^{16}\) It therefore seems likely that in addition to influences from English Protestant and secular sources, the representations of the Jew in the English Catholic discourse were also influenced by continental texts. Furthermore, certain constructions have a clearer correlation with French Catholic discourse than English Protestant discourse. This would seem to apply in particular to the construction of the Freemason and the Jewish-Freemason camarilla. The only prominent examples of the Jewish-Freemason conspiracy narrative in the English non-Catholic context relate to *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Conversely, in the English Catholic discourse, Jews and Freemasons were frequently linked even prior to *The Protocols*. Furthermore, Freemasons were frequently vilified in English Catholic newspapers in their own right (i.e. without invoking the image of the Jew). It therefore seems reasonable to suggest that whilst hostile constructions of the Freemason and the Jewish-Freemason camarilla were not exclusively or specifically Catholic, they were more comfortably embedded in the English and French Catholic discourses, than in the English Protestant discourse.\(^{17}\)

Hannah Arendt once observed that Jews have confused modern “antisemitism” with the “old religious” hatred of Jews.\(^{18}\) Other more recent studies make similar distinctions between modern racial “antisemitism” and old religious “anti-Judaism.” Whilst this project has avoided these semantically problematic terms, it has to some extent validated the distinction. Whilst the mythologized Jew and the stereotyped Jew frequently coalesced and blended in complex and multifaceted constructions of the


\(^{17}\) However, though less common, religious hostility towards Freemasonry was an occasional feature of the Protestant discourse. For example, Penney Hunt, a Methodist minister, pointed out that the Roman Catholic Church does not tolerate Freemasonry and called for the Protestant churches to take a similar stance. Referring to Freemasonry, he concluded that if Protestantism does not look to “the enemy within,” then only Catholicism and Freemasonry will survive. The construction of Freemasonry that appears in his book combines images of anti-Christian rites, paganism, theosophy and the occult, with political accusations, such as the oppression of non-Freemasons in France. Penney Hunt’s *The Menace of Freemasonry to the Christian Faith* (Nottingham: Freedom Press, 1928).

Jew, they were distinct themes in the English Catholic discourse. What this project has problematized is the idea that representations of the Jew in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century were necessarily modern in nature. In the case of the English Catholic discourse, they were often pre-modern or anti-modern. This did not make them any less hostile. Representations of the Jew based on traditional Christian and conspiratorial myths thrived and continued to function. Jews were not, by and large, denigrated as racially or biologically inferior, but they were stereotyped and mythologized as an assortment of villains and diabolists. The language used to describe the Jews, the Zionists and the Freemasons, often drew upon a vocabulary which suggested an apocalyptic war between the forces of Good and the forces of Evil. Even when the Jews were not portrayed as a threatening and diabolical menace, they were branded as social irritants imbued with a stubborn anti-Christian mentality.
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