

ANTI- SEMITISM

Throughout the Ages

by

**COUNT HEINRICH
COUDENHOVE-KALERGI**

A distinguished diplomat, a linguist able to speak 26 languages, a traveller and a scholar, Count Coudenhove-Kalergi all but completed this important and pertinent book before his recent death. It has now been concluded by his son and is published as one of the most striking, if not the most striking, contributions to the most discussed and controversial topic of our day.

Edited and brought
up to date by

Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi



**ANTI-SEMITISM
THROUGHOUT THE AGES**



RELIGIOUS DISCUSSION BETWEEN
CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH SCHOLARS
IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY



JEWS OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY
WEARING JEW BADGES



JEWS OF THE TWELFTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES WEARING
MEDIÆVAL BADGES AND POINTED HAT

Reproduced from the *Jüdisches Lexikon*.

ANTI-SEMITISM THROUGHOUT THE AGES

by

COUNT HEINRICH COUDENHOVE-KALERGI

Edited and brought up to date by

COUNT RICHARD COUDENHOVE-KALERGI

Authorized English Translation by

DR. ANGELO S. RAPPOPORT

WITH 19 ILLUSTRATIONS

HUTCHINSON & CO.

(Publishers) Ltd.

LONDON

Made and Printed in Great Britain at
The Mayflower Press, Plymouth. William Brendon & Son, Ltd.
1935

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. SEMITIC AND JEWISH RACE	23
II. ANTI-JUDAISM IN ANTIQUITY	62
III. HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ANTI-JUDAISM	90
IV. JEWS IN NON-CHRISTIAN COUNTRIES	158
V. ACCUSATIONS RAISED AGAINST THE JEWS	174
VI. EMANCIPATION AND ZIONISM	196
VII. JEW-HATRED TO-DAY	225
NEW ACCUSATIONS	249
THE JEWISH QUESTION	267

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

RELIGIOUS DISCUSSION BETWEEN CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH SCHOLARS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY	<i>Frontispiece</i>
JEWS OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY WEARING JEW BADGES	”
JEWS OF THE TWELFTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES WEARING MEDIÆVAL BADGES AND POINTED HAT	”
	<small>FACING PAGE</small>
TYPES OF JEWS	50
A JEWISH FAMILY IN THE RUINS OF CONSTANTINE’S PALACE	60
THE GHETTO IN BELGRADE	92
A MEDIÆVAL GHETTO SET ON FIRE BY A HOSTILE MOB	134
HERETICS AND JEWS BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL OF THE INQUISITION IN 1481	144
A SYNAGOGUE IN PALESTINE AFTER A RECENT LOOTING BY THE ARABS	170
<i>GALUTH</i> OR EXILE	228
A GATHERING OF FRENCH JEWS IN 1846 IN THE PRINCIPAL SYNAGOGUE IN PARIS	254
AN ANTI-SEMITIC PICTURE PRETENDING TO REPRESENT THE BLOOD-RITUAL	256
JEWISH WORKMEN IN MODERN PALESTINE	276
A VICTIM OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALISTS IN THE THIRD REICH	280

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

“But we must wander witheringly,
In other lands to die;
And where our fathers' ashes be,
Our own may never lie.”

“**H**ABENT *sua fata libelli*,” books have their destinies. I am convinced that the present work on Anti-Semitism is destined to meet with a well-deserved success, because Anti-Semitism is now a topical and even a burning question. Nor will the publisher's publicity-department have any work to do, for a thorough and well-organized publicity campaign on a very large scale has already been launched by no less a person than the Minister of Propaganda in the Third Reich. Once more a mighty wave of Anti-Semitism and religious persecution is sweeping over Germany from frontier to frontier, threatening to submerge the Pisgah heights not only of Judaism but also of Christianity. The present work, therefore, comes at an opportune moment, for every civilized man and woman, surprised and shocked at the mediæval methods introduced in the land of *Kultur*, horrified at the spectre of religious persecution which has made its appearance in Germany, is bound to be interested in the history and causes of Anti-Semitism throughout the ages. The late Count Coudenhove, the author of the present work and one of the most cultured and noble-hearted men that ever lived, writes as follows in his book :

“Had I been asked a few years ago, when I decided to study the Jewish question and to write a book on it, whether this work would turn out Anti-Semitic, my answer to this question would most probably have been in the affirmative. A serious and, as I believe, a thorough study of the subject has set me right.”

Count Coudenhove had thus come to curse, but his sense

of justice, his scholarly mind and his aristocratic heart, compelled him to bless.

"I bow with reverence and admiration to the martyr-people of Israel," he declared. I confess that when I first started to read the present work, I felt tempted to cavil and to criticize, for I differed from the author's views and conclusions when he attributed Anti-Semitism solely to religious motives, but now I feel in honour bound to admit that the learned author was right, to a great extent at least.

There are, of course, as Count Richard Coudenhove, the son of the author, admits in his supplementary chapter, other motives, psychological, national and economical, which account for Anti-Semitism.

The Jews are and have always been a minority in the world, and majorities always feel either hatred or contempt for minorities, but the driving force, the prime motive of Anti-Semitism, is of a religious nature. The Anti-Semitic campaign in the Third Reich, although alleged to be rooted in racial hatred, has convinced me of this fact. Two years ago I wrote in the *National Review* (July, 1933): "The Anti-Semitism of the Nazis, far from being an end in itself, is a mere curtain-raiser, and issues much bigger than Anti-Semitism are at stake."

Recent events have given me right and proved that the fight of the Nazis is not merely of a political but, above all, of a spiritual nature. The goal pursued by the Nazis is the abolition of religion, i.e., of Judeo-Christianity, and the triumph of Paganism, because Paganism means war.

"The days of the Cross are counted," the Nazi-leaders now openly proclaim. "We must deliver the German nation from the pernicious influence of Christianity," writes Ludendorff in his last Manifesto. The curtain-raiser has lasted long enough, and the real play has begun. The turn of both Protestantism and Catholicism has now come, and the mailed fist of the Neo-pagans is raised not only against the Vicar of Christ—but against Christ Himself. "Judah and Rome (and Christianity) are our enemies" is the latest slogan of the Nazis.

"National-Socialism and Christianity are incompatible," declare the Apostles of German Neo-paganism. The triumvirate, Goering, Goebbels and Rosenberg, are out

to "slay" the God of Judaism and of Christianity, and to raise altars to the pagan God Thor. It is "Thor's day"; it is the "Gauntlet against the Gospel." National-Socialism has finally thrown off its mask and its camouflage and appears in its true colours.

This persecution of Judeo-Christianity by the Nazis is, however, not without a tinge of irony. For centuries the Jews were hunted and hounded, molested and massacred in Germany on the charge of having crucified the Saviour, whom the Germans used to claim as *their own*. German scholars maintained that Christ was an Aryan, a descendant of the ancient Medes. Such were the opinions of Professor Haupt, of Delitzsch, of Bible and Babel fame, and of Houston Chamberlain. And now—the Nazis hate and persecute the Jews because they have given Christ and Christianity to the pagan world. The persecutions of Catholics and of Protestants abundantly prove my assertion. "Take him back," the Nazis now thunder, "take Him back, your Galilean Saviour, your meek and mild Redeemer, for meekness is weakness, and we only worship force and violence. Our morality is the master-morality. Take Him back, your Redeemer who preached a Gospel of Love and who said: 'Love your enemies,' for we do not even love our friends, but ourselves. We brandish neither the shield of David nor the Crucifix, but the hammer *Miölnir*. We want our fighting gods, our pagan gods, whom our ancestors worshipped when they emerged from their virgin forests; those were the true German gods. "And Count Richard Coudenhove may be right when he remarks in the last chapter of the present work that the Jews will gladly take the Galilean Redeemer back, Him whom National-Socialism rejects, because they understand Him and His teaching much better than do the Neo-pagans, and He understood His own people much better than He would understand the Neo-pagan Nazis. Did He not say unto His Apostles: "Go not into *any* way of the gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matt. 10, 5-6.)

Indeed, National-Socialism is a religious movement, as Europe may now realize. It has its God or gods, its

Redeemer, its High-Priests and its Apostles ; it has its Bible and its Gospel, not the Gospel of Love, but the Gospel of Hate. It also has its Heaven and its Paradise, not the Judeo-Christian Heaven to which, according to the despised Jews, "the just of all nations are admitted," but the Valhalla, where German heroes continue to fight and, served by the Valkyries with mead and ale, get drunk.

And since National-Socialism is a religious movement and Anti-Semitism, one of its constituent parts, also involves a persecution of the Bible and of Christianity, the Anti-Semitic outbreaks in Germany concern both Jews and Christians. It is, of course, to be hoped that the efforts of the Nazis to extirpate Judeo-Christianity will be doomed to failure. "Religions," wrote Count Coudenhove, "are not to be exterminated by persecution ; on the contrary, persecution helps to strengthen religion and to spread it." The fight, however, will be a long one, and I appeal to all religious men, be they Jews or Christians, to found a league of believers, the *League of the Two Testaments*, for the purpose of putting a stop to Neo-paganism, to religious persecutions and to Anti-Semitism—in the interests of religion, progress and humanity !

A. S. R.

INTRODUCTION AND PREFACE

COUNT HEINRICH COUDENHOVE-KALERGI

MY father, Heinrich, Imperial Count von Coudenhove, the author of the present work, was born on October 12th, 1859, in Vienna, and died at the castle of Ronsperg in Bohemia (now Czecho-Slovakia) on May 14th, 1906.

On his father's side he descended from the ancient aristocracy of North Brabant. The family of Coudenhove had immigrated from Belgium to Germany towards the end of the eighteenth century. Heinrich Coudenhove's father, the son of an Austrian officer and of a Baltic baroness, was an Austrian diplomat, chamberlain, member of the House of Lords, and a great-landed proprietor possessing estates in Austria, Bohemia and Hungary. His grandmother, *née* Countess Hatzfeld, is mentioned more than once in Goethe's *Siege of Mayence*.

On his mother's side Heinrich Coudenhove descended from the great family of Kalergis which, during the Middle Ages, was the leading family in Crete, and conducted the wars of liberation of the island against Venice. The reminiscences of the Venetian branch of the family are kept in the Palazzo Vendramin-Calergi where Richard Wagner died.

Maria Kalergis (by her second marriage Madame Von Muchanoff), the grandmother of Heinrich Coudenhove, was one of the best-known woman of European Society in the nineteenth century—famous for her beauty, intellect and character. As a born Countess Nesselrode she was German-Russian on her father's side, while on her mother's side she descended from the Polish nobility. Educated in the house of her uncle, the Russian Imperial Chancellor Nesselrode, she lived from her earliest childhood in the centre of European politics. On close friendly terms with Chopin, Liszt and Richard Wagner, who dedicated to her his

Judaism in Music, she saw a good deal of Napoleon III, William I, Bismark and Thiers. Heinrich Heine describes her in his poem *The White Elephant*—and Theophile Gautier in his *Symphonie en Blanc majeur*.¹ Her first husband, Johann Kalergis, descended on his father's side from a Russian general and on his mother's side from a Norwegian lady. He became an English citizen and anglicized his name (Kalergi). This name, out of reverence for his mother, Heinrich Coudenhove added to his own.

Heinrich Coudenhove was educated at the Jesuit College, Kalksburg, near Vienna. After obtaining the degree of Doctor of Law he embraced the diplomatic career, and as an Austro-Hungarian diplomat lived in Athens, Rio de Janeiro, Constantinople, Buenos Aires and finally in Tokio. Through his diplomatic posts he travelled extensively in South America, Western Asia, North Africa, Russia, the Caucasus, Hindustan, Indo-China, China, Corea and in most European countries. When he was Austro-Hungarian Secretary of Legation and Chargé d'affaires at Tokio, he married a Japanese lady, Mitsu Ooyama.

He was thirty-six years old when his father died and, being the eldest son, he inherited the estates. He left the State Service and, accompanied by his wife, whom he passionately loved, and his two eldest sons, he removed from Tokio to Castle Ronsperg. Here he led the life of complete independence, devoting his time to intellectual pursuits and interests.

He stepped out of his retirement for the first time in 1897 with a pamphlet when Leo Taxil, in derision of the Catholic Church, had published shocking calumnies against the freemasons which found ready credence in Catholic circles. In his pamphlet, *Mémoire à l'adresse des membres du Congrès Antimaçonique de Trente*, Coudenhove tried to unmask this gigantic swindle aimed both at the freemasons and the Catholic Church.

Under the motto: "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas," he published, in 1900, a *Political Study of Austria-Hungary*. In this pamphlet

¹ Her biography was published by Constantin Photiades in Paris (Plon), while her letters to her daughter were edited by La Mara (Leipsic, Breitkopf and Haertel, 1907).

Coudenhove showed the way how to obviate the threatening disintegration and the decay of the Habsburg monarchy. He recommended national equality of rights and national tolerance, and considered it as Austria's mission to become the bridge between Germany and Russia, between the Germanic and Slavonic worlds of civilization, and to serve the interests and the economic and cultured development of all her nations.

In 1901 appeared his book, *The Essence of Anti-Semitism* ("Das Wesen des Anti-semitismus"). Shortly afterwards Heinrich Coudenhove, then forty-two years old, passed with distinction an examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Prague. His subjects were pure philosophy and Semitic philology, and the dissertation he had submitted was his work on Anti-Semitism.

In 1903 he wrote another pamphlet entitled *The Minotaur of Honour* ("Der Minotaur der Ehre"), "a study of the anti-duelling movement and the duelling-lie," wherein he examined and analysed the ideas of honour from the ethical, religious and juridical points of view and condemned the duel. In order to be able to continue this fight untrammelled he resigned his officer's commission and joined the leaders of the anti-duelling movement.

Henceforth his time and faculties were devoted to a grandly planned work which was to have become his life-work. It was to have been entitled *The Realm of Negation*, and to have established on the basis of Schopenhauer's philosophy the theory and practice of negation of will in all religious systems of the present and the past. The completion of this work would have required many more years.

In 1906 Coudenhove published a section of this work as a separate pamphlet entitled *Characterization of the Away-from-Rome Movement* ("Zur Charakteristik der Los-von-Rom-Bewegung"). This pamphlet dealt with the pessimistic fundamental character of Christianity and with the contrasts resulting from the Catholic negation and the Protestant affirmation of life. While recognizing all the practical advantages of Protestantism, Coudenhove, on account of his pessimistic conception of the world, nevertheless decided in favour of the Catholic idea.

A few days after the publication of this pamphlet Heinrich Coudenhove died of heart-failure. He died in the presumed full possession of health, in the prime of life and on the summit of his activity and creative work.

To describe a personality is always difficult, because all the directness and greatness emanating from the personality cannot be expressed in words. Doubly difficult is it for a son to describe the personality of his father, because the picture must necessarily appear subjective.

And yet I will not evade this task, because the personality of the author, too, determines the importance of his work. And just as words are keys to the personality of their creator, so vice versa the personality of the creator frequently becomes the key to his words.

Heinrich Coudenhove was a great and solitary man.¹ While many smaller and less important of his contemporaries have succeeded in satisfying their vanity by external successes and in attaining glory through ambition, he was too proud, too vain and too wise, to be ambitious.

He strove neither for power nor for glory or wealth, but for the perfection of his spiritual and moral personality, for knowledge and comprehension of the world. He lived more inwardly than outwardly and thus he died—not celebrated—but great.

His external work remained fragmentary. Just as the death of his father had prematurely interrupted his diplomatic activity, so his own death prematurely interrupted his philosophical work. His political career remained fragmentary, his philosophical work remained fragmentary. Neither here nor there could his rich gifts take full effect.

His far-seeing political outlook he proved by the following fact. In 1894, during the war between Japan and China, he wrote from Tokio to the Vienna Foreign Office, predicting clearly and positively the Japanese victory over China, the British-Japanese alliance, Japan's attack of Russia before the completion of the Siberian railway line, and also Japan's victory over Russia.² He was pleased to read over

¹ A sketch of his life is given by S. Münz in *Oester-reichische Profile und Reminiszenzen* (Deutsch-öster-reichischer Verlag, Wien-Leipzig), pp. 269-302.

² See Münz, l.c., p. 293.

these reports in the Vienna Archives a decade later and to notice that his predictions had come true on every point, although at the moment when he wrote them no one thought them possible.

It was his sojourn in the East which had produced the greatest and the most lasting influence upon Heinrich Coudenhove's development. In Constantinople he appropriated the culture of Islam and in Tokio that of Buddhism. Everywhere he studied the languages of the respective countries (so that he ultimately mastered sixteen languages) and plunged into the culture which surrounded him. He was as well acquainted and familiar with the worlds of the Near and the Far East as with his own European home.

The life he was leading at the Castle of Ronsperg was full of a restless and intellectual activity which began at five in the morning. He studied philosophy, politics and theology; constantly perfected his linguistic knowledge; personally instructed his children in the Russian and Hungarian languages; administered his estates, entertained an extensive correspondence with scholars both in the East and in the West whom he also gladly received as guests in his house, and indefatigably and with conscientious thoroughness he worked on the preparation and the writing of his books.

Politically he belonged to no party; as a friend of order and of tradition, he held conservative views; as a champion of tolerance, he was liberal, and as an enemy of injustice, he was socialistically inclined. He took an active part in the peace movement, and his pacifist opinions were such that he did not permit his children to play with lead soldiers in order not to implant in their hearts the germs of martial sentiments and opinions.

Politics and philosophy were the two poles of his intellectual life, but philosophy was continually stepping to the front of his interest. His change from the politician to the philosopher was followed by his change from the thinker to the religious man. During the last years of his life he occupied himself a great deal with the *vita sanctorum* of all religions, and in his enthusiasm for asceticism he finally became tertiary of the Trappist order. Always and everywhere he took the side of religion in its struggle against

irreligion. He was always glad to frequent and to entertain friendly relations with learned Jesuits and Rabbis, with pious Christians and Jews, Moslems and Buddhists.¹ Fanaticism, intolerance and clericalism were, on the contrary, hateful to him.

Intellectually he was almost a free-thinker, but he remained a convinced Christian and a Catholic in his heart. His Christianity was irrational; he found it confirmed through Buddha and Schopenhauer in his ascetic and mystic nature. Although a pious Christian, he nevertheless remained until his death a disciple of Schopenhauer and an admirer of Buddha. Under Buddhistic influence he even gave up hunting for which he had once had a great passion.

Heinrich Coudenhove always remained conscious of the great responsibility which intellect, aristocracy and wealth impose upon their bearers. In the spirit of Tolstoy he considered it his duty, on account of his independence, to fight unselfishly and fearlessly against prejudice and injustice. He was thus an aristocrat in the best sense of the word; not only an aristocrat in appearance and behaviour, but also in intellect and sentiment.

How came this Catholic aristocrat of Aryan descent to intercede in favour of the Jews against their persecutors?

Let us hear what he himself says on this subject: "I confess that I have myself been a theoretical Anti-Semite. When I was much younger I was even a practical Anti-Semite, and this for excellent reasons, because I had had the most unpleasant experiences imaginable with Jewish usurers. Had I been asked a few years ago, when I decided to study the Jewish question and to write a book on it, whether this work would turn out Anti-Semitic, my answer to this question would most probably have been in the affirmative. A serious and, as I believe, a thorough study of the subject has set me right."

And shortly before his death he wrote:

"Although I am now an old boy, not very far removed

¹ In the foreword to his last work he calls himself a man who had ardently pursued and observed for a quarter of a century all the religious problems in four continents, having studied them under the guidance and direction of Christian, Jewish, Mohammedan and Buddhist teachers.

from his fiftieth birthday, I have properly remained what I have always been—namely, a student. Only four years ago I passed an examination for the thirty-fourth time, although I had in the meantime passed eleven years in the service of the State, had partly instructed my children myself and personally administered large estates in Bohemia and Hungary. But I have always studied and will continue to do so as long as I live. Dependent upon no man, pretty well blessed with earthly possessions, nay, overloaded with them, I am able to indulge in the pleasure of engaging in literary activity for the sole purpose of serving truth. I consider myself as the servant of those who set out in search of truth with unbiassed and unprejudiced minds.”

It was therefore his striving for truth and impartial justice, a striving based upon a most thorough acquaintance with the subject, and not at all upon sentiment and interest, which induced Heinrich Coudenhove to take up an attitude against Anti-Semitism. For neither did he feel a particular sympathy for the Jews, nor were any Jews among his intimate friends. On the other hand, his travels and studies had given him the opportunity of gathering knowledge about Judaism and Jewry in all climates and in all walks of life. As a thorough judge of men and peoples, he was thus free from the prejudices of his country and immune against the catchwords of half-educated demagogues.

The rise of the Anti-Semitic tide has now rendered Heinrich Coudenhove's work more topical than it was when it first appeared. The Jewish problem and Jew-hatred are to-day more burning questions than ever.

The public has everywhere seized upon the Jewish question, and everybody who either writes or speaks in public thinks himself authorized and entitled to take up an attitude with regard to it.

In novels and in essays, in newspapers and in periodicals, in popular scientific treatises and in political speeches, laymen approach the problem of race without any discrimination and any critical sense. But these mostly temperamental, often witty utterances *pro et contra*, almost invariably lack expert knowledge of the subject. One's own Anti-Semitic or Philo-Semitic inclination is construed into a system, irrespective of the results of scientific research

on the race problem and the history of Judaism. Instead of availing themselves of logical and scientific arguments, political and spiritual demagogues are working with effective catchwords and are thus contributing to the confusion rather than to the clarification of the Jewish question.

In this mass of contradictory opinions, almost all of which are superficial, biassed and prejudiced, a salutary effect must be produced by the scholarly work of a man who, while holding aloof from the disputes of the day, had investigated the problem of Anti-Semitism—*sine ira et studio*—in an objective and very thorough manner.

It is due to its objective, disinterested and impartial character that the "Essence of Anti-Semitism" could not have been rendered obsolete by contemporary events, for it is a scientific and not a political work, critical but not polemical. To all Philo-Semites and to all Anti-Semites who are disposed to be fair and honest, this book offers the possibility of increasing their knowledge on the subject in question and of revising their opinions.

For the sake of completeness this historical work which closed with the beginning of our century requires a supplement, bringing it up to our own days. For this reason I decided to complete this new edition by adding an essay on "Jew-hatred to-day." In the spirit of my father I analyse and explain the last chapter of this sad history of human frailties and of human errors, the *history of Anti-Semitism in the twentieth century*.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

“Iustitia præcipit parcere omnibus consilere generi
hominum suum cuique reddere, sacra, publica, aliena
non tangere.”

Cicero, *De Republ.*, III, 12.

“**B**LESSED are those who thirst for justice,” says the Saviour in the Sermon of the Mount, the most perfect law for all times, all peoples and all men. This law I have endeavoured to follow in the present work and my exclusive aim is that of contributing, according to my feeble powers, to peace—another commandment of the Sermon—towards Israel, too, by means of justice. I am quite well aware of the difficulties which must tower up against such an attempt. Anybody who writes or utters the slightest word about Israel which is not unfavourable is at once cried down as a Jew or as a freemason. This expedient will have no effect in my case. There is not the slightest trace of Jewish blood in my genealogical tree. Had this been the case, instead of concealing the fact, I would have candidly and most joyfully proclaimed it, because I would have felt proud of a possible kinship with the noblest men and women who ever wandered on this planet. Nor am I or have I ever been a freemason; as an officer and a diplomat I could not have become a freemason on account of my oath; besides, I should altogether never have dreamt of binding myself by an oath to something unknown to me. I am an active member of the Catholic Church which I consider to be the best of all religious communities which now exist or have ever existed. There is only one way, the safest because it is based on figures, which is calculated to prove not only logically, but also mathematically, that the Catholic Church is the best of all religious communities. It is this: it can be demonstrated that nowhere outside the Catholic Church have so many deeds of Christian charity, of pity and compassion, been

perpetrated as within the Catholic Church. The deeds of Christian charity which are being or have been incessantly perpetrated for centuries by Catholic priests, monks, nuns, canonized or uncanonized Saints all over the world, even in favour of suffering heretics, unbaptized people or belonging to another religion, are beyond all competition.

No other religious community can show anything approximately similar. I am, of course, convinced that many believers belonging to other religious communities have accomplished exactly the same acts of pity, but nowhere and never did they produce such a total in such numbers and in such a proportion. No thoughtful man will contradict this statement, for faced by figures, one must be silent. For this reason I say that the Roman Catholic religious community is by far the best. Whatever has been written against the Roman Church in liberal quarters under the title of "Inquisition, Religious Wars, Trials for Witchcraft, *autos-da-fé*, fight against enlightenment and science, intolerance and fanaticism," will never counterbalance the ocean of deeds of compassion achieved in the interests of suffering humanity.

The reader will forgive me for having spoken at such length about myself, but those who are acquainted with the conceptions of the orthodox public will understand that my remarks were absolutely necessary.

I must also point out that the fact of my having frequently quoted passages from the works of enlightened authors is no proof whatever of my own humble opinions being identical with theirs. Although this is a matter of course, there is no harm at all in calling special attention to it. *Sapienti sat.*

CASTLE OF RONSPERG IN BOHEMIA.

February, 1901.

ANTI-SEMITISM THROUGHOUT THE AGES

CHAPTER I

SEMITIC AND JEWISH RACE

1. *Aryans and Semites*

THE Jews! expel them! no, kill them! no, baptize and convert them! no, specific laws will suffice. Thus, for centuries, the cry of the Anti-Semites has resounded in its fourfold nuance in all Kingdoms and in all Countries, Republics not excepted. The reasons invoked are very well known.

They are deicides, stubborn and stiffnecked; they do not understand their own Hebrew Bible, are faithless and mutilate many texts of Holy Writ, distorting their clear meaning and sense; they are usurers and pimps; their *Talmud* permits them to kill the non-Jews, to cheat and deceive them, to ruin them by extortion and usury, to forswear themselves to the detriment of Christians if it be done to the advantage of a Jew; they consider themselves alone as men, while the Christians are cattle and worshippers of idols. They crucify and slaughter little children and use their blood for the preparation of their unleavened bread and for other purposes; in their writings Christ, the Holy Virgin and the Church, are being abused; they desecrate and mutilate Holy Hosts which begin to bleed, and are responsible for the immorality of our times; in their newspapers and in other productions of their Press they corrupt Christian morals, they ruin simple-minded peasants, officers, the commercial and industrial classes and honest artisans, by their usury; they lower the prices

of commodities and wages ; they bribe Kings, Emperors, Cabinet-Ministers, Parliamentarians and Judges ; they seduce chaste maidens and married women, and thanks to their cunning and crafty financial operations, they have lured into their nets all Governments ; they influence the Cabinets of the States and are the leaders of Freemasonry and of Social-Democracy ; they poisoned the wells and by means of witchcraft brought about devastating epidemics ; they worship the golden head of an ass, and they annually fattened and slaughtered a Greek ; they kill and poison prophets ; they are rapacious culture-Bedouins, unscrupulous, cruel, sensual and blood-thirsty ; they hate the whole world and do not believe one word of what the Church is teaching ; even the uncreated holy Koran they consider to be a worthless compilation ; Christ, they say, is a magician, and Mohammed an impostor.

Indeed it is a long record !

I confess that I, too, having repeatedly heard most of the above quoted accusations, had at one time believed them and had even come so far as to pray with the Anti-Semites : “ Oh Lord, send us again Moses so that he might lead his brethren by race to the Holy land. Divide the sea once more and let the two pillars of water stand like a wall of rock. And when the entire people of the Jews will once more have entered these watergroves, then, oh Lord, shut the door so that we poor Christians might at last have peace and rest.”

And indeed everybody who reads the above list of accusations must feel his hair stand on end.

Those, however, who read all these accusations grouped and put together without any regard for either time or origin, and consider their quality and quantity, might perhaps, like myself, suspect that there must be a small hitch somewhere.

“ The Aryan nations are of a settled nature ; they cultivate science, are courageous and brave, their fundamental traits being straightness, honesty, faithfulness, devotion and loyalty.” These lines I once read in an “ Anti-Semitic Catechism.”

I felt highly pleased and extremely flattered when I read such amiable things about the race to which I have the

honour of belonging, and I imagined that Aryan straightness and honesty made it incumbent upon me to follow the instruction of the Apostle who said: "Examine everything and retain the best." I too, I thought, must first investigate the accuracy of the above accusations before accepting them as true. Aryan love of truth and Aryan courage, too, demanded it of me openly to declare what I had found to be clear and evident, without the slightest regard for either Aryans or Semites, Christians, Jews or Moslems. For several years therefore I studied the so-called Jewish question and I now venture to make public the result of my investigations.

The above-quoted Anti-Semitic Catechism was published at Leipzig in 1893 by the firm of Hermann Beyer, and its author is Theodor Fritsch (Thomas Frey). With concise brevity and in systematic arrangement it repeats all the reproaches hurled against the Jews by the Anti-Semites, except those of a religious character. In the opinion of the author it is wrong to attribute to Anti-Semitism a religious motive, the movement being a purely racial and not a religious question.

Let us hear the author himself.

"Nobody ever dreams of attacking the Jews on account of their religion, nor does anybody attempt to disturb their religious worship which enjoys the tenderest forbearance among all classes of society and even among the Anti-Semites themselves.

"To trace the cause of Anti-Semitism to religious hatred, is a gross misrepresentation of the real state of affairs. It is precisely among the freethinkers that the most outspoken Anti-Semites are to be found (Giordano Bruno, Voltaire, Schopenhauer, Feuerbach, Johannes Scherr, Dühring, and others).

"As its very name indicates, Anti-Semitism is directed against the 'Semites,' that is to say against a race and not against a religion. Had the Anti-Semites attacked the Jewish religion they ought to have called themselves Anti-Israelites. Anyone, therefore, who connects Anti-Semitism with religion merely displays his scanty linguistic knowledge. This falsification of a connotation is moreover being practised by certain people in order to mislead and

to deceive the people with regard to the true essence of the Jewish question."

In the first place I must point out that the Catechism is utterly wrong when it declares that "if the Anti-Semites had attacked the Jewish religion they ought to have called themselves Anti-Israelites." This is quite wrong. They ought to have called themselves "Anti-Mosaists," for "Israel" designates a people, viz. the collectivity of the twelve tribes, ten of whom had already disappeared in 722 B.C., after the conquest of Samaria by the Assyrians, without leaving any trace. Henceforth there was no longer any Kingdom of Israel. The definition Anti-Mosaism, on the contrary, would have more correctly defined the conception which the Catechism is anxious to convey.

I will later on expatiate more fully on this point. Let us begin with the definition. Fritsch, in his catechism, defines Anti-Semitism as follows: "What do we understand by Anti-Semitism? *Anti* means *against*, while *Semitism* connotes the essence of the Semitic race; Anti-Semitism therefore means an attack against Semitism. Now as the Semitic race in Europe almost exclusively consists of Jews, under Semites in a narrower sense we understand the Jews. An Anti-Semite therefore in our case means an opponent of the Jews."

In questions 13 and 14 of the Catechism these points are more fully explained and the explanations run as follows:

13. What should Anti-Semitism consist of?

Almost all the European nations belong to the Aryan or Indo-Germanic race, while the Jews are a branch of the Semitic race. The Aryan nations are of a more settled nature; they cultivate agriculture, and pursue trade, art and science; they found States, are courageous and brave; the fundamental traits of their character are straightness, honesty, faithfulness and devotion. They alone are the really civilized nations.

The authentic Semites, on the contrary, are nomads by nature; they have neither a really lasting residence nor a proper national home. They move and march whither the best booty is luring them. They neither construct nor do they cultivate the land themselves, but they seek out

the civilized countries created by the industry of others, exploit the existing favourable conditions, graze, so to say, the pasture-places, leaving them behind waste and desolate. Agriculture, handicraft and art are alien unto them, just as is every kind of honest creative work. They pretend to despise labour, while in truth they are lacking the capacity for it.

Even to-day the Semitic nomads of the desert (Bedouins) practise robbery and pillage in the most open, primitive and natural manner. The Jew, however, may be said to be the Bedouin of Civilization; he follows the same pursuit in a somewhat civilized manner. His domain is "commerce," which in the case of the Jew has an elastic and very wide meaning, the term *Massematten* in the Jewish language being applied both to business and to theft.

The plundering expeditions of these Bedouins of Civilization appear in the shape of pedlary, travelling vendors' shops, pawn shops, payment by instalments, fifty pfennig bazaars, usury, fraudulent bankruptcy, stock exchange speculations, and so on. Some of these "branches" are exclusively in the hands of the Jews. But even as "medical men" for venereal diseases, as perverters of justice, as social democratic agitators, and so on, the Bedouins of Civilization manage to undertake very lucrative predatory expeditions into the pockets of their fellow-citizens.

14. But have not the Jews been forced into such dishonest businesses when honest professions were closed to them?

This subterfuge was sometimes justified in olden days, but it is no longer to-day. Besides, the question still remains open: And why were the Jews excluded from all honest trades? Evidently for the sole reason of their having introduced all sorts of abuses, exploited them and undermined the solid foundations.

The Jews have, moreover, never striven after any honest manual work or trade; chaffering and usury for the Jew were never a makeshift or an expedient, but, as we have seen above, constitute the fundamental trait of the Semitic character. For decades all professions have now been open to the Jews, but we never see them exercising the crafts of masons, carpenters, thatchers, joiners, smiths, lock-

smiths, engine-builders, clock-makers, compositors, and so on. And were we to-day to put all Jew-boys into workshops, offering them free instruction and free board and lodging, they would seize the first opportunity to run away and carry on the trade of chaffering and higgling. The Semite cannot and never will work and produce, but is anxious to exploit and to plunder without either toil or trouble.

Moreover, cunning, craft, hypocrisy, dissimulation and lying constitute the fundamental traits of the Semitic character, to which should also be added obtrusiveness, insolent presumption, selfishness, pitiless cruelty, and unbridled sexual passion. Our German conceptions of faithfulness, modesty, devotion and self-sacrifice for an ideal are incomprehensible to the Jew and only call forth his derision. A virtue to him is only that which promises either personal advantage or enjoyment.

We will now examine this description, and also try to define the ideas and meaning of the terms "Semitic" and "Semitic race" and their application to the Jews.

2. *Sem*

The word *Semite* is derived from a proper name, the name of Shem or Sem, the eldest son of Noah, from whom, as stated in the Bible, all the Semites are said to descend. That is quite plausible. In chapter 9 of *Genesis*, v. 18 and 19, we read in Holy Scripture (according to the orthodox translation of Allioli: (18) And the sons of Noah, that went forth of the Ark, were Shem (Sem) and Ham, and Japheth; and Ham is the father of Canaan. (19) These are the three sons of Noah; and of Shem was the whole earth overspread. The name of Sem is mentioned in the Old Testament fifteen times, as may be seen from Mandelkern's Concordance, viz. twelve times in *Genesis* and three times in *Chronicles*, where the genealogies mentioned in *Genesis* are once more repeated.

In the New Testament it is only the author of the Gospel of St. Luke who mentions the name of Sem in chapter 3, in the well-known genealogy of Christ. All our knowledge of Sem is therefore derived from *Genesis*. In

Rabbinical lore, too, Sem is frequently referred to, and even the Koran mentions him in the Surah known as *Hud*. According to the Hebrew text of *Genesis*, and without taking into consideration the Codex Samaritanus or the Septuagint, Sem was born in the year 1558 after the creation of the world, i.e. about 2400 B.C. He lived six hundred years. He was an hundred years old when he begat Arphaxad, two years after the flood. He lived after he begat Arphaxad five hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

Jewish theologians tried to recognize Sem in Melchizedech, in that holy parentless man who, together with Abel, is mentioned in every canon of Holy Mass.

Sem therefore is an absolutely historical personage for Christians, Jews and Moslems alike. Quite different is the daring view taken by the depraved higher criticism with regard to Sem.

For a long time scholars in this domain have been racking their brains about the origin of the name of Sem. According to some it is simply derived from the Hebrew word *Shem* which, in its literal translation, means *name*, or from *Shama*, to be exalted or high, and would thus mean the Highlander. Other scholars thought of a god in heaven, deriving the word *Sem* (or *Shem*) from *Shamajim* = the heavens (in plural, for there are supposed to exist several heavens). *Arya* (Aryans), too, means in Sanscrit the exalted, the nobles, which would tend to prove the similarity existing between Semites and Aryans in point of megalomania. But this only *en passant*. They were so closely related that one need not wonder very much at their family likeness. And thus all that the *Torah* tells us of Sem is that he and his brother, the ancestor of the noble Aryans, were blessed by their father Noah, because when the latter was drunken and lay uncovered within his tent, they took a garment, laid it upon their shoulders, went backwards and covered the nakedness of their father, when their faces were backwards. And because their brother Ham had not thought of it in good time, it was his son Canaan, and not Ham, that Noah cursed. Why just Canaan is well known.

I hope that the Anti-Semites will forgive me for having

been so explicit about the proper name after which their party has been christened ! As for the free-thinkers, I am afraid that they will find my explanations quite superfluous. They will point out that they had never believed in an historical personage, as described in *Genesis*, and that under Semites they merely understand an ethnical group, a race, and not the descendants of the patriarch Sem or Shem. Anti-Semitism, they assure us, has absolutely nothing whatever to do with religion. But then it is somewhat strange that we should call ourselves after a personage in whose existence we cannot believe without accepting the very supernatural aid of revealed religion. I grant that the Anti-Semites may reply that the name of Shem or Sem, although it is mentioned in the Bible, connotes in their free-thinking view merely a race and has no relation whatever to the person of good old Sem. I am quite ready to accept this explanation, but hope that I shall be permitted to ask another question :

Why do not these gentlemen call themselves *Japhethites* after the brother of Sem and the son of Noah ? Such a designation would not at all be captious religiously, for by preserving the liberty of thought *Japhethites* would merely designate a race and not the descendants of the worthy Japheth. Why, I ask, is the designation of *Japhethites* to be eschewed ?

Now, in my opinion, the reason for this is as follows : The avoidance of the term *Japhethites*, which would surely be the only right antithesis to that of Semites, is based on the Biblical belief that all men on the face of the earth descended from Sem, Ham and Japheth, namely the Semites from Sem, the negroes from Ham, and all the remaining nations, that is to say the Aryans and the Mongolian race, from Japheth. Thus the Chinese, too, as well as the Mongolians, Turks, Tartars and so on, would have to be included among the *Japhethites*, and in such company the Indo-Germanic Anti-Semites, as noble Aryans, would not care to be found, not for all the world, although this is but a poor compliment to the Turanian Hungarians and to the Great Russians. It is for this reason that the Anti-Semites take out one portion only of the *Japhethites*, viz. the noble Aryans, and enthusiastically count themselves

among them. But what about their free thought? For these free-thinkers ought to know that in the ethnological table of *Genesis* there is no question whatever of any nation which could induce us to think even in the remotest degree of either negroes or Mongolians. (Reuss.) Japheth and his sons are all thorough Aryans. The term Japhethites therefore would not at all have been captious, but it was avoided because, just as in the word Semites, the religious conception, that is to say one strictly adhering to the Bible, is an important factor.

I therefore maintain that both the use of the term Anti-Semitism and the avoidance of the word Japhethites, the pendant of the former, must throughout be attributed to and arise from the notions and ideas of the so-called revealed religion. In any case, this is suspicious in view of the assertion that Anti-Semitism had nothing whatever to do with religion.

3. *Semites*

Enough of Sem. Let us now proceed to the terms *Semitic* and *Semitic race*. According to the Anti-Semites, the Semites are a group of nations related among themselves by blood. They are not a group of nations speaking kindred tongues—namely the so-called Semitic languages—but who are allied by race, origin and blood. For only then, so the Anti-Semites maintain, could common abilities, characteristic qualities and peculiarities be conceivable and possible. Now who are these Semitic nations of which the Jews constitute a branch? Of the peoples living to-day the Arabs, the Abyssinians and the remnants of the Chaldeans are the only nations speaking Semitic languages. It was Professor Eichhorn who, in his Introduction to the Old Testament, defined and employed for the first time in 1787 the term *Semitic languages*. Before Eichhorn, as Professor Hommel has pointed out, the Hebrew, Arabic and Aramaic languages were simply called Oriental languages. They were the only languages of this group known towards the end of the eighteenth century. In the genealogical table of *Genesis* Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad, Lud and Aram are mentioned as the sons of Sem. Aram is the ancestor of the Aramæans (Syrians), Arphaxad of the Arabs and the

Hebrews ; but of the languages spoken by the descendants of Elam, Asshur and Lud nothing was as yet known in those days. For this reason the above-named scholar is supposed to have chosen the term "Semitic languages" to designate the languages of the entire group. According to Hommel, the distribution and classification of the Semitic nations and languages, both dead and living, are as follows :

(a) In the south.

1. The Abyssinians who emigrated comparatively late from South Arabia into the African hill country Habish and were converted to Christianity in the third century.

2. The South Arabians or Sabæans, also called Himyars.

(b) In the north and north-east.

1. The Hebrews and Phœnicians (the latter with their colonies in Carthage, Spain, Massilia, Crete and so on), and

2. The Babylonians and Assyrians.

When we finally enumerate the Semitic languages in order of time of the literary works still extant, we obtain the following table :

1. Old Babylonian (the oldest Semitic-Babylonian inscriptions of the Kings, the so-called Izdubar—or Dubar—legends, and so on) from *c.* 2000 to 1500 B.C.

2. Hebrew (the old popular songs in the historical books of the Old Testament, as for instance the blessing of Jacob ; the Song of Deborah ; the Decalogue ; the Jehovist history book *Genesis* 2, 4 and so on ; the oldest Psalms and so on) from *c.* 1500 (anyhow the least of these are of contemporary origin).

3. Assyrian, *c.* 1200 to 600 B.C. (The longer historical inscriptions of the Kings.)

4. New Babylonian (inscriptions of Nebuchadnozzor and his successors, then the Assyrian translation of the three-lingual inscription of the Achæmenidæ).

5. Phœnician (the oldest inscriptions date, according to some scholars, from the seventh century, but the majority are centuries later).

6. Aramaic from *c.* 300 B.C. onwards, since the so-called Chaldaic (better West or Biblical—Aramaic) portions of

the Old Testament can in any case not be ascribed to a later period ; but by far the greatest portion of the dramatic literature still extant begins with the Syriac, the oldest specimens of which date from the second century A.D.

7. South Arabic, in the Sabæan (the himyaritic) inscriptions which are partly to be dated in the first centuries A.D.

8. Ethiopic, the extant literature begins with the Ethiopic translation of the Bible in the fourth century A.D. ; a few Ethiopic inscriptions are scarcely a century older.

Arabic, from the sixth century A.D. to which period also belong the pre-Islamic songs which have come down to us ; then follows from the seventh century onwards one extensive Mohammedan-Arabic literature. The oldest monument of this literature is the Koran, but its golden age was in the beginning of the dynasty of the Abbassidæ.

4. *Language and Race*

Now according to the theory of the Anti-Semites, nations speaking a Semitic language are cognate, precisely because they are speaking the cognate languages, while the Indo-Germans are of the same race because they, too, are speaking cognate languages. This, however, is nothing but a gross error. The fact of their speaking cognate languages is no proof whatever of the kinship and community of race of the nations speaking these languages. The Germans in Eastern Prussia are Germanized Slavs, the Bulgarians are Slavonized Turanians, as are also the Great Russians, while many Italians in Lombardy are Romanized Germans ; such is also the case of many inhabitants of France, and these examples could be multiplied *ad libitum*.

Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu writes :

“ What nationality, as far as the nations of Europe and America are concerned, is based on race ? Is it England with her Bretons, Saxons, Danes and Normans ? Is it France with her Cimbri, Gauls, Iberians, Germans and Latins ? Is it Germany where the Teutons have interbred in the West with the Celts and in the East with the Slavs to such an extent that in many districts of Germany the blue eyes and the fair hair of the Germans are no longer to be met with in the majority of the population ? Is it

Russia, the old Moscovite Russia, with her conglomeration of never Russified Scythians, Sarmathians, Slavs, Tartars and Finns? Is it perhaps (the United States of) America which for over a century has received settlers from all the countries of Europe, or the Spanish-American Republics which invented a veritable gamut of full and half-tones to indicate the various gradations of bastards issued from the interbreeding between Europeans and Indians or negroes? All the nations of our own day are more or less a mixture of races and peoples blended together. All of us, be we Frenchmen, Russians, Germans, Englishmen, Italians, Spaniards, Hungarians, Greeks, Roumanians or Bulgarians, are half-bred, mixed blood. Whether tall or short, big or small, Occidentals or Orientals, may they call themselves Germans, Anglo-Saxons or Latins, full blood I see in none of the modern nations. What would remain of France if we were to stand our test on our own Gallic blood and to proclaim with I do not know what Bretons—'France for the Celts'?"

It will therefore not do to consider nations as being of a kindred race solely because they are speaking cognate languages. It is undoubtedly a great achievement of science to have proved that within the so-called Semitic and so-called Indo-Germanic languages each tongue of the respective groups is a cognate language. The question nevertheless remains whether it can be proved that the Semitic languages really have any connection with the nations descended from Sem, as stated in the often referred to genealogical table of *Genesis*. In other words, is there any connection between the so-called Semitic languages and the so-called Semitic nations?

The genealogical table in *Genesis*, chap. 10, does not solve this riddle. Canaan was the son of Ham and not of Sem, and yet we know that the Canaanites were Semites by speech. Mizraim, the ancestor of the Egyptians, and Kush, the ancestor of the Ethiopians, are equally sons of Ham, Kush being the father of Nimrod who built Ninive. Reuss calls this genealogical table the true and most complete ethnological myth. "The Kushites (also a Hamitic branch)," says Maspero, "apparently spoke a language closely related to the Hebrew, Arabic and the remaining

Semitic dialects. The simplest explanation of this phenomenon would be the following: The Kushites and Semites were not radically different races, but two branches of the same race which had developed a state of civilization at different periods." Quite apodictically Maspero calls the Kushites "an old branch of the Semitic ethnical group," and such an authority may certainly be trusted. Therefore—no Anti-Semitism without Anti-Kushism.

One thing, I am sure, the reader will now admit, namely that there prevails a great confusion in the terms "Semitic nations" and "Semitic languages" in so far as they are applied to the nations supposed to have descended from Sem. This fact being granted, I will now venture to ask the readers whether it be just and noble to treat certain individuals, both politically and socially, as inferior or worse beings merely because they are supposed to belong to a group of nations, the definition of which is as unsteady as the pole balanced on the nose of an acrobat.

The Anti-Semites will certainly reply to my question that all that has been stated above on the subject of languages they had known for a long time, but that it had nothing to do with the question at issue, just as little as the first patriarch Sem and his children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren have. They are not at all concerned with language and just as little with a mythical ancestor. *Tant mieux*, then we can proceed and put another question: Whereby, if not by language, are the Semites distinguished from the Aryans? Are they perhaps a different race anthropologically? Here, too, it is difficult to substantiate the difference, because science itself is anything but unanimous, both on the classification and the principle of classification of the different races of humanity.

It is precisely here that the confusion becomes comical, more amusing even than at the building of the Tower of Babel. Linné distinguishes four races of men which he classifies according to the Continents; Blumenbach mentions five, classified according to colour; Topinard has three—the principle of classification equally being colour; Huxley has four—principle of classification structure of the body—with eleven subdivisions; Frederick Müller has two—the principle of classification being hair—with

two subdivisions each, which are again divided into several subdivisions; A. Retzius divides mankind into four craniological types; H. Welcker and Boca into five; T. Kollman into six—the principle of classification being the shape of the skull; Pritchard has discovered seven races of men; Bory de St. Vincent fifteen; while Morton, by various subtleties and hair-splitting, has found twenty-two. How are we now going to fit in the different Semites after all these classifications and principles of classification? The black Abyssinians, the dark and white Jews, the hook-nosed and flat-nosed, the fair-haired and the dark-haired, the handsomely developed and big Spanish and the puny, weakly Polish Jews, the lean Arabian and the obese Moroccan Hebrews? I maintain, and substantiate my assertion, that whether on grounds of the shape of the skull, of colour, growth of hair or of geographical settlement, it is practically impossible to establish an exact and strictly scientific classification and separation of the Semites. Later on I shall try to prove that not only the Semites in general but even the Jews themselves cannot be considered as a uniform race or as a branch of a race.

5. *Semites and Nomads*

And thus there is absolutely nothing in language, nor will the body with its forms and shapes of its various parts help us mightily. What remains then?

The soul, the character, the inner being, the Indo-Germans will proudly reply. It was the famous Renan who made an attempt to establish the differences between Semites and Aryans. This he did in his *Histoire Générale et système comparé des langues sémitiques*, published in Paris in 1855—the date is important—a work which was crowned by the Institut de France and placed on the Index by the Roman Curia. In this chapter Renan now draws a general, somewhat daring, picture of the Semitic character and intellectual qualities. In his opinion the nations speaking Semitic languages actually coincide with a definite human group. With regard to the characteristic traits of the whole Semitic race Renan says: The Semites have no sense for science and philosophy, but, on the other hand,

a specific sense, peculiar to themselves, for religion. Their subjectivity is highly developed, and no other race possesses such egotistic passions; they are an inferior race, predisposed by nature to monotheism; they have never had any mythology. The result of their monotheism is their great intolerance. They alone have prophets, they alone invented the idea of revelation. The Semites lack the sense of analysis and the comprehension of plurality in the universe; they absolutely lack the feeling of curiosity, their idea of Divine Omnipotence being such that they are never surprised at anything. They have no sense whatever for variety and nuance, know no other punishment than the penalty of death, are of a serious disposition and lack the gift of laughter; they possess neither plastic arts nor an Epic. They have no comprehension for civilization as we understand it; the type of the Semite is to be sought in the Arabian deserts; they are nomads by nature, and absolute anarchy is therefore a characteristic trait of the race. Other traits of the Semites are military inefficiency, incapacity of any discipline, subordination and personal sacrifice. The Semite knows only duties to himself. In consequence of their simplicity the Semites are incomplete; they have no sense for the abstract, for metaphysics, while their languages are not precise. So far Renan.

In this famous chapter Renan has laid the foundations of a rationalist Anti-Semitism which, while detaching itself from religion, takes into consideration the peculiarities of race alone. All racial Anti-Semites have ever since based themselves on Renan's description and further exploited it for their own purposes, although Renan himself, in consequence of the progress made by Assyriology, felt it his duty to declare that his exposition of the character of the Semitic race was absolutely antiquated. Faithful to his motto, *veritatem dilexi*, he did this with pleasure.

Renan was entirely mistaken in his exposition which may be explained by the fact that at the time of his writing, the great discoveries in the domain of Assyriology had not yet been made. And indeed the Assyrian and Babylonian languages are omitted in his register; they are conspicuous by their absence. It seems that even at that time Renan felt this deficiency, for in his preface he writes:

“All the essential characteristic traits which I have attributed to the Semitic race and to idioms which the Semites have spoken are certainly applicable only to the pure Semites, such as the Terahites, the Aramæans and the Arabs in a narrower sense, but they are only partly true in the case of Phœnicia, Babylonia and Ethiopia. It is, however, clear that in a general description of the Semites I had principally to keep in mind the branches of that family which had been the least influenced by its connections with foreign nations and had best preserved the general traits of the race. I will not attempt to defend myself against the reproach that in my general description I have been swayed too much by my observations concerning the pure nomadic and monotheistic Semites, paying but little heed to the heathen, industrial and trading Semites, if the critics will only agree with me that the first alone have left us any monuments in writing and that they alone represent the Semitic mind in the history of languages.”

Yes, indeed, *tempora mutantur*. It was only in 1849 that F. de Saulcy attempted to prove that Assyrian was a Semitic language. In 1855 Renan evidently did not know this or was still doubtful about it and dared not express an opinion. In his work *Die Semiten in ihrem Verhältniss zu Chamiten und Japhetiten* (“The Semites in their relations to the Hamites and Japhethites”), p. 85, Professor J. G. Müller assures us that even then (in 1872) Renan, together with Gesenius, Lorschach, Winer, Tuch, Runik, Hitzig, Jablonsky, Lassen, Bertheau and Röth, considered Assyrian as an Indo-Germanic language. He has thus erred in good company, but his description of the Semites was nevertheless somewhat hasty. To-day it is a well-established fact that both Assyria and Babylon were Semitic Empires. This certainty also applies to Phœnicia and to the Himyars, and his theory of the inner essence and character of the Semites thus tumbles down like a house of cards. Once, however, Renan’s theory is upset, then the scientific, rationalist Anti-Semitic theory also collapses and Anti-Semitism must go back whence it originated, namely to theology. For as soon as Phœnicians, Ethiopians, Assyrians and Babylonians become known as recognized members of the Semitic group of nations, it is proved that the most civilized and

cultured of the oldest Semitic nations were polytheistic Semites who possessed a rich mythology and an Epic, namely the Nimrod Epic, that they have bequeathed to us the oldest literary monuments, that they were capable of founding great and mighty military empires with discipline and subordination which had lasted for centuries, and that they were devoted to science, while the excavations in Mesopotamia have yielded the proof that art, too, had flourished among them.

6. *The Chaldeans*

In his *History of Babylonia* (p. 5), Fritz Hommel writes as follows: "Everything in Greek Art that can be traced back to Phœnician—Babylonian and Assyrian inspiration and stimulus—I am referring only to the winged figures and to the Ionian order as particular characteristics—becomes more and more better known thanks to the latest archæological investigations; here, too, an almost exclusive Babylonian influence can be proved, much more seldom Egyptian influence, here and there a mixed influence. Thus the history of civilization, of religion and art, confirms the fact that it was Babylonia, and not Egypt, which had contributed most of the stones to that mighty and gigantic structure which we call civilization. It was from Babylon that the stream of culture issued forth, and partly by sea, by the Phœnicians, and partly overland by way of Asia Minor, was carried to the Greeks and the Romans and later on reached Romano-German Europe."

"In astronomy and in mathematics," writes the learned Eduard Meyer, "the Chaldeans were the teachers of the entire Occident." The contract tablets discovered in the library of King Assurbanipal (Sardanapal) are a proof of the then prevailing administration of justice. They prove that Renan was mistaken when he said that the Semite knew only capital punishment. About 3800 B.C. we already find a Semitic population in North Babylonia, and about 2500 B.C. it was the ruling one. The new Sumerian texts, as Hommel says, reveal an absolutely Semitic range of ideas. To be sure, the first inhabitants who peopled and canalized Chaldea were not Semites, for the first civilization was not a

Semitic but a Turanian, although this, too, is being contested. Let us hear what Hommel says. He writes as follows: "That not the Semites, but quite another people of a quite different nature and speaking an entirely different language, had canalized and settled in the marshy lowlands of the Euphrates is to-day a well-established fact which no serious and rational scholar will deny; it was this population which also invented the cuneiform script and other cultural elements."

Now no one could maintain that Hommel was a friend of the Jews. But as he had nothing unpleasant to say against the Semites, he was evidently afraid of being taken for a Jew and felt therefore induced to declare in the Preface to his *Semitic Nations and Languages* that neither was he of Jewish blood nor was he writing under any friendly impulse to the Jews. He even criticized the famous professor and Semitic scholar Chwolson who, in his work *The Semites*, had written in favour of the Jews, because he himself was a Jew. I found it necessary to make the above preliminary remark, lest I be accused of quoting only authorities who are friendly disposed to the Semites. Hommel may therefore be considered as quite trustworthy when he declares: "The already so highly developed civilization and above all the science which we meet in the second pre-Christian millennium could never have been accomplished without the Semites; the foundations alone of the Babylonian-Assyrian civilization were the work of the Sumerians, but the development and consummation were the work of the Semites, although they could not have achieved that civilization without those foundations." That is capital! How does Hommel know that without those foundations the Semites would not have been able to create this civilization? Is Hommel so sure that the Sumerians have actually created that civilization and not borrowed it from another people unknown to us and that the latter again had not borrowed it from another people, and so on? Are we not entitled to suspect the influence of the Biblical theory that humanity is about 6000 years old, or a certain amount of Anti-Semitism? What civilization, I ask, could the Germans, Gauls and Slavs have developed without the preceding Roman civilization, or the Romans

without that of the Greeks, and the Greeks without that of the Phœnicians, and so forth into the deepest night of time ?

7. *The Phœnicians*

Another magnificent Semitic people are the Phœnicians. In their case, too, Anti-Semitism wanted to deny their Semitic blood, and this seemed to be the easier, since according to *Genesis*, chapter 10, the Phœnicians appear to be a branch of the Hamites. But that is not so. The Canaanites are certainly Semites, the Phœnicians being one of their branches. In chapter 19, 18, Isaiah calls Hebrew the language of Canaan. Now the Phœnicians are considered to be the inventors of navigation. Carthage was a Phœnician colony. Hannibal was a Semite. Phœnicians have probably circumnavigated Africa and founded numerous colonies on Cyprus, Rhodes, Crete, Malta, Sicily and Sardinia, on the north coast of Africa and in southern Spain. They have partly invented and partly developed and brought to high perfection the arts of purple dyeing and glass-blowing, of mining, the working of metals and architecture.

To the Semitic Phœnicians the Hellenes owe the knowledge of writing and of the Canaanite alphabet. The Phœnicians, too, awakened the mercantile sense among the Greeks and it was from them that the latter learned how to find the north from the polar star during nightly voyages, and thus to decide the course of their ships. What remains now of the Anti-Semitic assertion that the Semites have no sense whatever for either art, technical invention, municipal organization, politics, navigation and colonization ? Were those Phœnicians a *race inférieure* ?

What a terrible disgrace for scientific racial Anti-Semitism these new discoveries and excavations are ! Renan's theories concerning the character and essence of the Semites are shaky, and he has not a leg to stand on ; all his statements lie on the ground and will probably never again be taken seriously. Anti-Semitism, however, knows no rest and is now busy turning and twisting and explaining away the stony facts of the archæological finds. The Anti-Semites now avail themselves of a stratagem or a dodge which I

will call that of "snatching away." It consists in the assertion that all the good and noble achievements which the Semites had contributed to civilization they had simply borrowed from other non-Semitic nations. But what about the Chaldeans? As matters stand, their services rendered to civilization cannot be denied! Now what do the Anti-Semites do? They try to make us believe that the Chaldeans were not at all Semites, but Indo-Germans, in spite of the fact that they spoke a Semitic language. Now among all the Semites it is the nation of the Chaldeans which is precisely the most closely related to the Hebrews (J. G. Müller, p. 75). The Nimrod Epic and the journey to hell of Istar, although composed in a Semitic language, are supposed to be not the work of the Semites but of their predecessors, the Turanian Sumerians, which have simply been translated by the former. The trend of thought is as follows: The Semites are barbarians not amenable to civilization, nomads incapable of producing any culture, and unable to furnish any contribution to either art, literature, science or politics, and yet we possess a Semitic epic, a Semitic art, a literature, a mythology and a science, well-organized empires and so on? The answer therefore to this question is that these artists, scholars, statesmen and generals and so on were no Semites at all! This explanation, however, is a veritable monster of a *petitio principii*. It will no longer do since Assyriology has proved that the above-mentioned art and literature and the scientific achievements are not the work of the Sumerians, but of the Semites. The Indo-Germans greatly regret the fact that the oldest civilized nations of Babylonia, the Sumerians and Accadians, should have been Turanians and not Indo-Germans, and they are naïve enough to express their regret, so much do they love their own race. They prefer, however, a thousand times to consider the Turanians rather than the Semites as the bearers of this old civilization. Wherever possible therefore they endeavour to deny the merits of the Semites, to snatch them away and to attribute them to the Turanians even if they themselves, as Indo-Germans, derive no benefit from such an explanation. Every subterfuge is good enough, as long as honour, recognition or glory is not granted to the Semites. And

thus the hatred against the little people of the Jews is working havoc even in the scientific domain.

8. *Arabs*

We do not even know at all whence these Semites emigrated. Hommel and Kremer maintain that their original home was Armenia, while according to Sprenger and Schrader it was Arabia, and according to Guidi the lower Euphrates. That the type of the pure Semite was the Arab nomad—the Bedouin—is possible, but not certain. Nor does the population of Arabia entirely consist of Bedouins, but of both Bedouins and urban inhabitants. The latter and not the Bedouins produced the Koran. Islam, among the Bedouins, as we are informed by Palgrave, had always been, and still is, exceedingly superficial and even fragmentary. In 1855, when Renan wrote that description wherein he declared the Arab Bedouin to be the prototype of the Semitic race, Arabic was almost entirely unknown. The great and celebrated travels of Burton, Maltzan, Snook Hugronje, and Palgrave had not yet been undertaken and it was not surprising for people to imagine that the great peninsula was inhabited exclusively by nomadic Bedouins. This, however, is not true. In his article "Arabia," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, W. Gifford Palgrave, the famous traveller in Arabia, declares that the urban inhabitants constitute about six-sevenths of the entire population of Arabia. One-seventh therefore remains for the Bedouins, and yet the Anti-Semites consider them to be the prototypes not only of the Arabs themselves, but of the entire Semitic race. With regard to the assertion made by the Anti-Semites that Bedouins and robbers are about identical, W. Gifford Palgrave writes as follows: "This opinion is quite unjust. By profession and in their usual mode of life the Bedouins are only shepherds and cattle-breeders. Their fights and their plundering of travellers and caravans are only exceptions to the rule and, moreover, are only rarely of a cruel nature."

The infamous vice of pederasty, so frequent among the Indo-Germanic Persians, does not exist among the Semitic Arabs. Greek and Lesbian love are named after

Indo-Germanic countries. Of all the Moslems it is precisely among the Semitic Arabs that the least vices and depravity are to be found. In his grammar of the Oman and Zanzibar dialects, Dr. Reinhardt states that the system of eunuchs and harem depravity are unknown, while, on the contrary, feuds and highway robbery are quite frequent. When Reinhardt calls this a piece of mediævalism he certainly does not think of Arabian mediævalism.

In his description of Arabia, which appeared at Copenhagen in 1772, Karsten Niebuhr writes: "Other European travellers maintain that the Arabs are hypocrites, dissemblers, deceivers and robbers, but I have no reason to complain of them. One meets in Arabia bad people, but here, as in Europe and in other parts of the world, one also comes across upright and honest men." The Arabs, says Niebuhr, are serious, rarely quarrelsome, more cleanly than the Europeans, and in Southern Arabia they are by nature religious, tolerant, hospitable and more polite than the other Moslems.

The Anti-Semites love to minimize the achievements of the Arabs, nay to represent them as something contemptible and of little value. A year after the publication of Renan's frequently mentioned description of the Semites there appeared in Vienna Hammer-Purgstall's great work, *The History of Arabic Literature*, in seven big and bulky volumes. The literature of the Arabs is one of the most important and richest in the whole world, and their language is one of the most magnificent intellectual productions of the human race.

And finally, as to the so badly slandered Islam, that gigantic product of the Semitic genius, it would certainly require a whole book to describe all its merits, its excellence as well as its drawbacks and shortcomings. It will suffice here to quote the opinion of Dr. Otto Pautz who writes as follows in his work *The Teaching of Mohammed on Revelation* (p. 3):

"Indeed it would be tantamount to a denial of Divine rule in History, were we to consider the magnificent progress of Islam, as compared to old-Arabian paganism, and which we cannot ascribe to demoniac influences, as the effect of natural causes which I am quite convinced do

not at all exist in this domain. The purer conception of the idea of God, the establishment of an organized community in the place of cruel tribal feuds destroying one another, the security of property, the regulation of marriage, kind treatment of slaves, charity and compassion towards guests, the distressed and the poor, and finally, the abolition of barbarian customs such as the burying alive of newly born girls—such are the successes upon which Mohammed could look back at the end of his career and activity.”

When learned Anti-Semites, therefore, comparing the Jews to the Arabs and recognizing their close affinity, represent the former as something unfavourable, unprofitable, unwelcome and undesirable, in some sort as an annoyance and a misfortune, they are tremendously mistaken. I congratulate the Jews from the bottom of my heart on their very enviable alleged relationship and affinity with the great, noble, glorious and gifted race of the Arabs.

And do perhaps the most Southern and honest of all the Semites not deserve our admiration? I refer to the Abyssinians who, behind their mountains, have for fifteen centuries victoriously preserved the Christian faith in countless fights.

9. *Race Inférieure*

In conclusion, a short quotation from the work of Professor Hommel who, as we have seen, is not all too favourable to the Jews. In his *Semitic Nations and Languages* he writes: “In conclusion, I ask whether a nation which in antiquity was the only bearer of civilization and, above all, the only bearer of a pure religious idea, namely of monotheism, and which, during the Middle Ages, has continued the Indo-Germanic civilization and saved it for the West of Europe, whether such a nation deserves to be called a *race inférieure*?”

The Semites were already highly civilized at a time when the Indo-Germans were still savages. Babylon is not only the mother-country of the Babylonian-Assyrian, of the later Semitic or the Græco-Roman civilizations, but is also the mother-country of the entire Occidental civilization in general, that is to say of our own.

There are two other civilizations besides the Babylonian

which deserve the name of culture; these are the Indian and the Chinese civilizations. This Babylonian culture extends very far and wide.

In 1886 the Protestant pastor Cerisier translated an extremely hostile English work, hostile to the Catholics, for the author himself, A. Hislop, was a devout and pious Protestant. The book is entitled: *The Two Babylons*. In this learned work of 490 pages, profusely illustrated, the author endeavours to prove that the essential character of the Roman Church, the principal objects of its cult, the festivals and holidays, the doctrine, discipline, rites, ceremonies, priestly hierarchy, orders, and even the cult of the Deiparous Virgin, of the Holy Infant and of the Divine Heart, the processions, the worship of relics, Sacraments, lamps, tapers, signs of the cross, the rosary, purgatory, symbols, and vessels of religious worship had one and all been borrowed from the Babylonian civilization.

10. *Aryan-Semitic Cultural Regulations*

The Anti-Semitic hatred of the Jews which persecutes, pursues and hunts not alone Israel but also its remotest relations, and even its affinities, can only fall back on the assertion that the *Semites themselves had never produced anything*, and that the Babylonian, Phœnician and Arabian civilizations had been borrowed by these Semitic peoples from other nations among whom they had found them. This is easily said. I have already pointed out that the Semitic Babylonians had borrowed many gods from the Sumerians, but it must be remembered that the religion of the Sumerians was only Shamanism. The Semites have made something out of it, have created something, namely the entire gigantic Babylonian civilization. What, for instance, would the Germans say if someone were to address them in the following words:

“You are not worth anything, because your entire *Kultur* and your civilization were only borrowed from the Romans and from Christianity which arose not on German but on Semitic soil. Properly speaking, you are only barbarians and at bottom not much different from your forefathers who actually slaughtered the poor Roman

prisoners and sacrificed them to their cherished gods in due form and according to a prescribed rite. Your chivalrous Romantic poetry, as your countryman Johannes Scherr expresses himself, has simply borrowed from the Arabic poetry in Spain whence it derived its poetical forms. You are therefore *doubly Semitized*. Scherr maintains that the legends of Artus, of the Holy Graal, and of Tristan and Isolde, are of Celtic-Breton origin. Even in the Nibelung-entitled Christian ideas are expressed. As for the Heljand it is entirely a Christian artistic product, and you may call your own only the pagan Edda; this alone is genuinely Germanic."

What would a German answer to such a speech? He would bristle up, and rightly too, and vehemently protest against such a criticism. In the case of the Semites, however, every injustice is permissible. *Adversus hostem aeterna auctoritas.*

The Semites are and remain nomads; such is one of the dogmas of scientific Anti-Semitism. Hence the inferiority of the Semites. Now this goes absolutely beyond the ken of my understanding. What connection is there between Semitism and nomadism? Had all the Semites been nomads and were there no non-nomadic Semites, the connection would have been comprehensible. Had again all the nomads been Semites and were there no non-Semitic nomads, there would also be a connection between the terms and conceptions of nomadism and Semitism. In reality, however, there are large numbers of nomads who are not Semites and large numbers of Semites who are not nomads, and I consequently fail to see the connection. The most civilized Semitic nations were not nomads, at least not in historical times. The prototypes of nomadism are the gypsies who, even in Europe, and in spite of all the endeavours made on the part of the governments and all the advantages offered unto them if they consented to settle down, have still remained nomads. And these gypsies are Indo-Germans, if language be the slightest proof and indication of race, for the gypsy tongue is an Indo-Germanic language, related, and even closely related, to the Hindi spoken to-day. I would also venture to ask whether there has never been a time when the Germans and other nations

who are settled to-day and are pursuing agricultural occupations were nomads? Were not the Turks and the Magyars once nomads? And does not the character of the nomads, the immutability of which such a parade is made of, change in the course of time? Consider what the gentle, peaceful doctrine of Buddha has made of the terribly cruel and predatory nomadic people of the Mongols! A peaceful, gentle people of shepherds. And does any nomad type exist at all as far as character is concerned? And who will venture to perform the trick of bringing the definitions of Mongols, Bedouins, Tuaregs and Eskimos under the same hat? It is precisely the Turanian nomads who founded great, warlike and long-lasting States to which civilization, too, cannot be denied. I will mention here only the Osmanli Empire, the East Turkish Empire of the Grand Mogul, the Mandchus in China, the Magyars in Hungary, the Ural-Altaians in Great Russia. But no! Just because *a fraction of a portion* of the present-day Semites, viz. the *Bedouins*, are nomads, while other Semites had also been nomads before the days of Olim, all Semites *must* be nomads by nature. The fact that the Germans, too, from the beginning of their appearance in Europe, that is to say, since the invasion of the Cimbrians and Teutons, about 100 B.C., until their definite settlement after the migration of nations, had also wandered about, does not in the least disconcert the Anti-Semites. Nor does the fact that at the first opportunity offered unto them the Arabs in Spain, India, Persia and in the Sound had abandoned nomadism and settled down, trouble the Anti-Semites. They have a last place of refuge, a hiding-place left unto them. They say: Whenever the nomadic Semites produce anything it is the result of their interbreeding with races and nations which are neither nomads nor Semites. This is excellent! The "genuine Semites," that is to say the nomads who surely dwell in deserts and in steppes, produce nothing in such habitations and that is what they are first blamed for. Yes, but why? What, after all, could they with the best intentions produce in such a milieu? As soon as they left their deserts they naturally interbred with other nations, particularly in consequence of polygamy, and if the result of such interbreeding has been an efficient and clever progeniture,

I really fail to see why the cleverness and efficiency should not be attributed and placed to the account of the Semitic portion of the intermixture.

A noble Arab lady once married an Arab of an inferior descent. In a squib made at the expense of her husband, Hamyda, that was the lady's name, said: "I am a thoroughbred Arab mare, the offspring of noble mothers, but my husband is a mule; if I give birth to a noble foal, know that it is from me, but should it be an abortion, then know that it has sprung from him." And just as cleverly do the Anti-Semites speak with regard to the interbreeding between Semites and Aryans. Whenever it is really something wonderful, it is attributed to the Aryan and not to the Semitic part. The Visigoths dwelt in Spain until the Arab conquest, and who were the originators of the Moorish culture? The Semitic Arabs or the Germanic Visigoths? I beg my respected readers of the Aryan race constantly to keep in mind and to remember what their respective nations would have been to-day, had they not come into contact with Rome, Byzantium and Christianity. Let them examine and judge from this standpoint—which is the only just and reasonable one—the assertion that the Semite is only capable of borrowing, but not of creating anything himself. What has been said above *eo ipso* refutes, abolishes and gives the lie to one of the strongest arguments of the Anti-Semites in favour of their theory about the inferiority of the Semitic race. This argument is as follows:

The so-called Arab culture is not at all original, but borrowed, as is shown by the example of Spain. Why were the Arabs in Spain able to produce a culture, while they have not achieved anything in the African coast-lands of Tripolis and Tunis and more particularly in Morocco which is separated from Spain only by narrow straits? It is evident, therefore, reply the Anti-Semites, that the Spanish Arabic culture owes its origin to the Christian Germanic (Visigothic) and not to the Semitic nations. At first sight this conclusion seems to be quite plausible, but at a closer investigation it becomes untenable. In the first place there existed also in Northern Africa the Kingdom of the Vandals, and yet, no culture has been developed there even after the Arabs had taken possession of the country.

Secondly, it is well known that at the time of the Arab conquest of Spain the civilization of the Germanic nations was on a very low level there. A comparison between the Arab and the Christian-Germanic civilization of that period will be very much to the disadvantage of the latter. One has only to think of the age of the Merovingians. In his well-known work, *The Conflict between Science and Religion*, J. W. Draper has drawn a very interesting comparison between these two civilizations.

It is therefore as clear as daylight that the merit belongs to the Semitic Arabs and not to the Indo-Germanic Christians. The above reflections show what great advantages for every civilization can be derived from intercourse, commerce, exchange of ideas and mixed marriages. In their arid and mostly sandy peninsula the Arabs could produce but little. Once upon a time the Germans, too, in their forests and provinces, stood on an equally low and perhaps lower level of civilization.

As soon, however, as the Germans came into contact with nations of other civilizations, culture flourished. And such exactly was the case of the Arabs who almost everywhere were the fecundating factor. They were the *Yeng* of the Chinese, in contradistinction to the *Yih* which designates the nations stimulated by the former. The *Burda* therefore sings the famous hymn in praise of Mohammed and which is so pertinent from their point of view: "This is Mohammed, the Lord of this and of the other world, the Lord of men and of jinns, the Lord of the two separate hosts of men, the Arabs and the barbarians." And one of their authors, a presumptuous Indian Moslem, once insolently expressed the following opinion: "Three times the progress of the world's history was lost: once at the battle of Marathon, the second time when Charles Martell defeated the Arabs, and for the third time when Vienna besieged by the Turks was relieved."

It all just depends upon the point of view.

11. *Jews as a Mixed Nation*


It is indeed difficult even to imagine a greater nonsense than that of meting out a different treatment to people of



A French Jew.



A German Jew.



A Rabbi of the Jews of Bokhara.



A Jewish hero of Poland.

TYPES OF JEWS

the same educational standing merely on account of racial differences. The absurdity of the case occupying us here lies in the fact that the grouping of nations in Aryans and Semites is based on a linguistic and philological division, and that it is sheer madness to arrive at the conclusion that linguistic and philological boundaries of the two groups must also coincide anatomically. This is an assertion which has now been proved to be colossal nonsense. The term Aryans is naturally also an exclusively philological term. Professor Max Müller, the greatest and most famous authority on the question of Aryanism, begins his article "Aryan" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* with the words: "Aryan is a *terminus technicus* describing one of the great language-groups extending from India to Europe." Max Müller then goes on to say that it was Frederick Schlegel who was the first to discover the family affinity between these tongues which he designated by the name of Indo-Germanic languages in his work *The Language and Wisdom of the Indians*, which appeared in the year of grace 1808. And just as the term "Semitic" used by Eichhorn is a purely philological one, so the term "Indo-Germanic" employed by Schlegel is exclusively philological. These terms had not been invented before Eichhorn (1780) and Schlegel (1808)—about a century ago the world as yet knew nothing of the difference supposed to exist between Semites and Indo-Germans—and if these two scholars were to contemplate the devastations caused by their respective inventions, they would surely turn in their graves. The language formerly spoken by the Jews was Semitic and their Holy Scriptures are written in two Semitic dialects, viz. Hebrew and Aramaic. On an average, as Jews and Christians maintain, all the Jews descend from Sem, and the conclusion is therefore drawn that only Semitic blood flowed in their veins and that they constituted a separate entity in itself. That such, however, is not the case, that the Jews of to-day are a mixed nation and that they had already been such before the days of Christ, is a fact which has been proved beyond any doubt by Renan, Leroy-Beaulieu, F. von Luschan and many other scholars.

For the Jews, of course, the terms and conceptions of

“ Jewish religion ” and “ Jewish race ” are to-day identical, but they are mightily mistaken in this belief. In spite of all it is certain that soon after their peaceful conquest of Canaan the Jews had at first mixed and interbred with the native aborigines, and it is beyond all doubt that during the Babylonian captivity they married alien women. There would otherwise have been no cause for Ezra and Nehemiah to make such a fuss about mixed marriages and raise such a hue and cry after the alien women when the Jews returned from Babylon to Jerusalem. According to the eighth chapter of the book of Ezra, where the expulsion of the alien women is related, this actually happened. But Ruth was surely a Moabite, that is to say a non-Jewess, and yet she was the great-grandmother of David, the most Jewish of all Jewish Kings !

In the Græco-Roman days Judaism was no longer even a national creed ; it had already made a very happy start to become a universal religion. In his essay against Apion, Flavius Josephus writes as follows :

“ Vast masses have been seized by such an eager desire to emulate our mode and manner of Divine worship, that there is not a single Greek or barbarian city and no nation in whose midst our Sabbath, our fast-days, our candle-service, our dietary laws are not being observed. Palestine in those days was only the chosen and recognized centre of Judaism.” A great number of heathens who had adopted Judaism even underwent the ceremony of circumcision, while an even greater number of Greeks in Alexandria belonged to the Jewish community. Propaganda was being carried on very actively ; it began about 150 B.C., and lasted until about 200 of our era. Helen, queen of Adiabene, and her entire family embraced Judaism, and it is very probable that her subjects had followed her example. In Syria, too, the propaganda bore rich fruit. The princes of the house of Herod were immensely rich, and in the hope of marrying daughters of this royal house, many Eastern princes from Emesis, Cilicia, Comagena and so on came to Jerusalem where they became Jews.

In the year 225 A.D. Dio Cassius wrote that he did not know whence the name “ Jew ” came from, but that designation was also being applied to many other men who,

although belonging to another race, had embraced Jewish institutions. In Rome, too, there were many people of that sort and all attempts to stop their increase proved futile; on the contrary, they only increased their number. In one of the laws which he issued, Emperor Antonius Pius decreed that the Jews had a right to circumcise their sons, but only their own sons, which shows that heathens, too, frequently embraced Judaism.

It was only after the war with Bar-Kochba that Jewry once more drew together and excluded all foreign elements. All propaganda and proselytizing ceased. Proselytes are called "the scab of Israel," but in spite of it, non-Jews constantly converted themselves and penetrated into Judaism. St. John Chrysostom constantly preached to his believers in Antioch exhorting them to give up going to the Synagogues there to take their oaths and to celebrate the Passover with the Jews. It appears that in this city a definite separation between Christians and Jews had not yet been effected at that time.

From the works of Gregory of Tours we further learn that there were very many Jews in the Frankish Kingdom, in Paris, Orleans and Clermont, but never does the author allude to the circumstance that these Jews belonged to an alien race. It is extremely probable that a great number of them were none other than Gauls and Germans who had adopted the Mosaic faith and who had no drop of Semitic blood in their veins. From safe and authoritative historical sources we also know that in Arabia several non-Jewish tribes had converted themselves to Judaism. The Benu-Kinanah, the Kuraiza, the Nadhir and several families of the tribe of Aus were all Jews. In Yemen the sovereign prince of the country was persuaded by Abu-Kaliba to adopt the Jewish faith.

In Abyssinia there are several black tribes speaking Hamitic and not Semitic languages who have embraced Judaism. Very remarkable, too, is the conversion of the Khazars. This Jewish Kingdom lasted from about 740 to 1016 when it was conquered by Russians and Byzantines. It was about the time of Charlemagne that the heathen king of the Khazars, together with his court and his people, adopted Karaite Judaism. The Khazars were a Finno-

Ugrian race, related to the Magyars and the Bulgarians, who dwelt on the banks of the Volga, on the shores of the Caspian Sea and in Astrakhan. There were many Christians and Moslems in this Kingdom; the Jews, who were merchants, interpreters, and physicians of the prince of the Khazars, succeeded in inspiring their ruler Bulan with love for Judaism. This conversion to Judaism of the entire Kingdom of the Khazars is exceedingly important, for it brought an entire non-Semitic people within the fold of Judaism.

The laws promulgated by the Roman, Byzantine, and Frankish emperors mention numerous penalties against Christians who embraced Judaism, which tends to prove that conversions must have been quite frequent. It is therefore simply impossible that the Jews who now live in our midst should represent an unmixed race. Rabbi Jehuda Ben Jecheskel, who lived in the third century of our era, could not make up his mind to marry his son and forced him to remain single long after the latter had attained the marriageable age; he was anxious, he said, to be quite sure that the family of his daughter-in-law was of perfectly pure blood. But even at that time his friend Ulla justly pointed out to him: Are we ourselves sure and certain that we are not descended from those heathens who had violated the virgins of Zion during the siege of Jerusalem? And thus in the third century already the Jews were harbouring a well-founded suspicion that their blood was not free from foreign mixture. The Jews, however, are not only a uniform mixed race which, although it had mixed with one or two nations, has created a new mixed type, but they also greatly differ among themselves in this respect. We have already seen that the terms "Semite" and "Semitic" are exclusively philological terms. If we now assume the Arab Bedouin to be the type of the Semitic race, we shall see that it is precisely between the Bedouin and the Jew that there exists a not insignificant divergence. Almost all the Bedouins are long and narrow-headed; they have a dusky complexion and, what should be particularly stressed, a short, small and slightly aquiline nose, a nose which is just the opposite of what we in this country usually imagine to be a Jewish nose. Dr. Felix von Luschan,

professor at the University of Berlin, delivered a very instructive lecture on the anthropological status of the Jews. Professor Luschan effected comparative measurements of Hebrew and Aramaic skulls and discovered that 50 per cent of them were undeniably brachy-cephalic, 11 per cent blond with genuine Jewish noses, several mixed shapes, and only 5 per cent were dolichocephalic after the Bedouin model. Dr. Luschan therefore arrived at the conclusion that only a small fraction of the Aramæans and Hebrews consists of real Semites. Among the German Jews he discovered 11 per cent fair-headed.

Now we know that the Amorites who dwelt in Syria and who are mentioned in the Bible were a blond-haired people, and there is no doubt that the whole Northern African border was peopled by blond-haired nations whom the *Drang* towards the south of Europe had drawn into that warm district. The Egyptians, too, knew them by the name of the Tamchu, the people of the Northmen or the Nordics. It now appears that those Amorites were a branch of the Tamchu and that in earlier times already they had intermixed with the Jews. There is further another nation which anatomically, and to judge by the construction of their skulls, the colour of their hair and their eyes and particularly the shape of their noses, have been proved to resemble the Jews very greatly. This nation speaks an Indo-European language and its faith is Christian. I am referring to the Armenians. Several tribes in the Caucasus, and particularly the Georgians, strikingly resemble the Jews.

A few years ago when I was travelling from Batum to Tiflis and at the railway stations contemplated the various types of the inhabitants, I was greatly surprised to notice how much the native population resembled the Polish and Russian Jews. Anybody could convince himself of this fact if he only took the trouble to examine an illustrated work on the Caucasus and its population.

At the end of his investigation Professor Luschan arrived at the following conclusion: The modern Jews consist: firstly, of the Aryan Amorites, secondly, of genuine Semites, and thirdly and principally, of the descendants of the old Hittites. Apart from these three most important

elements which constitute modern Jewry, other admixtures which, in the course of a diaspora extending over several thousands of years, were after all quite possible and must certainly have taken place, are not at all taken into consideration. Some maintain that traces also of the Mongolian race have been discovered among the Jews, a circumstance which can easily be explained by emigrations from the Jewish Kingdom of the Khazars or by intermarriages.

12. *Confusion of Races*

Indeed, as soon as one occupies oneself with the race question and the division of races or the enrolment of a people in one of these groups, endeavours to discover principles based on anatomy, language or religion, one encounters more and more trouble, confusion, and inextricable riddles. One meets nothing but dissolving views and empty phantoms. From the statements made by the experts and the scholars whom I have quoted above it clearly results that upon the whole nobody could get a clear notion of a Semitic national group, and that the conception was based on philology and nothing else, and certainly not on anatomy, religion or history. It further results that the hazy and vague term "Semitic nations" does not fit even the Jews themselves, and that it is precisely the Jews who exhibit the greatest similarity to certain Indo-Germanic nations, while they but slightly resemble the supposed genuine Semitic Bedouins. Anatomically, the modern Jews differ considerably even among themselves. The well-known great talents and capacities of the Jews are a further proof of their very considerable intermixture with foreign elements. Professor Lombroso has made the apodictic statement that the degree of the intelligence of a race increases with the intermixture of its blood with foreign elements. The more a race is intermixed with other races, the more intelligent it is, and *vice versa*.

Craniology has also proved, beyond any doubt, the fact that there was no pure Jewish race and that anatomically the Jews differed considerably from all other peoples who speak a Semitic language. Let figures speak. Professor Lombroso says that all measurements and investigations of

among the dolicho-cephalic is 74), while brachy-cephalism with an average index of 80 occurs only among 6 per cent of the population (after Calori).

What do you think about it all, my dear scientific opponents? Professor Lombroso says that the Jews are more Aryans than Semites, while Professor J. G. Müller attempted to show that all Semites are Hamitized Indo-Germans. Have you noticed all the shocking confusions, the comical contradictions which always and everywhere become obvious and evident in these racial doctrines? You get indignant at the suggestion that you, as Aryans, might be of the same race as the Semites and the Jews, you marshal an array of scientific authorities who confirm whatever you are anxious and pleased to believe, viz. that both Egyptians and Chaldeans were Indo-Germans, and you still harbour the hope that one day the Sumerians, too, in spite of their Turanian language, might turn out to be Aryans. Very well, granted that the authorities to whom you appeal are right. Granted, too, since you wish it, that Egyptians and Chaldeans were indeed Aryans, but then you will have to concede me, too, the joy of hailing with Professor Müller all the Semities as Indo-Germans. And where is all this going to land us? Do my honourable opponents not perceive anything yet? Does no new sun dawn for them, shedding a dazzling light upon the entire situation and showing the entire dispute concerning the question of race, no matter whether Indo-Germanic, Semitic, Hamitic, or Turanian, and so forth, to be based upon a bottomless mystification; that in itself the whole question is *ab ovo* senseless and objectless, just because there are no such races, neither Semitic, Hamitic, Aryan or Turanian?

Now a serious word in conclusion. If one is anxious to be an Anti-Semite, and that entirely and thoroughly, openly and honestly, and yet wishes to remain civilized, cultured and educated, there remains only one radical way to do so. One must renounce one's religious creed, namely one of the three Semitic religions, Judaism, Christianity or Islam. When that has been done, then away with the arrangement of weeks, of Sundays and holidays, away with our alphabets, our calendar, our customs and our

ceremonies at births, marriages and deaths, away with the family based on the relations between a man and one or several women. Let us adopt the hair-pencil and pig-tail and become Chinamen. That will be to the purpose and will have some rhyme and reason; that will be a reasonable Anti-Semitism, and the advantages and disadvantages of the exchange could be rationally discussed. There is no other way, for as far as I am aware, neither Hindus nor Parsis accept strangers into their castes or communities. Those, however, who refuse to turn Chinese and yet wish to remain within a circle of culture can as little get rid of Semitism as we can get out of our own skin. The entire Anti-Semitism is therefore downright nonsense, and by Anti-Semitism I mean for the present that Anti-Semitism which, as its name conveys, is directed against all Semites and not alone against the Jews.

13. *There is no Semitic Race*

I venture to think that the authorities whom I have quoted deserve our entire trust and confidence; they are specialists and experts who have made a profound and thorough study of the questions here discussed; they are no dilettantes. Let us now briefly sum up all our data.

There are no Semitic nations. Biblical criticism does not believe in a person named Sem (Shem), supposed to have been the ancestor and founder of the Semitic race. There are only nations speaking cognate languages to which languages about one hundred and twenty years ago a scholar applied the term "Semitic." "Semitic" is a philological expression. The nations speaking Semitic languages widely differ one from the other, and ethnically and anatomically have nothing whatever in common with the Jews and frequently also one with another.

There are no Semitic racial characteristic traits common to all nations speaking a Semitic tongue. The Jews are a mixed race, and have but little similarity with the Arabs who are supposed to represent the purest Semitic type. Physically, the Jews stand much nearer to us than they do


to the Bedouins. The people therefore who speak of the essence of a Semitic race are talking nonsense, and this applies also to those who connect this idea about the Semitic essence with the Jews.

All this follows from the results of the most thorough investigations made by the foremost specialists, linguists, historians, physicians and natural scientists. Whatever their various departments, the respective specialists arrive at the same negative conclusion.

Science has long ago done with racial Anti-Semitism, as I am convinced to have proved from the statements and testimonies of the eminent specialists in diverse departments. Here lie its shattered remains, and I am curious to know whether they will ever be pieced together. Race-hatred is and remains the expression of a personality which has remained on the low degrees of moral development. (G. Reich.) The milder race-hatred will be among a nation or a people, the higher a degree will it occupy in enlightenment, civilization and morality. The nation again which will not harbour any race hatred at all will be entitled to claim a place on the highest plane of spiritual and moral development. (J. Baum.)

I conclude this discussion with a quotation from Friedrich Müller, an utterance which I most heartily approve.

“Race is an empty phrase, an utter swindle.” It will, however, be objected that a difference after all exists between a Jew and a Christian, and even between a baptized Jew and a Christian. Now if difference is not due to either blood, origin or the construction of the skull, then to what is it due? Quite right, there exists indeed a difference and that an important one, and we shall presently investigate the matter. The divergence between ourselves and the Jews is the result of artificial selection and social solidarity. History alone is able to explain this difference. We shall understand it as soon as we become acquainted with the position which, in the course of centuries, the Jews have occupied among the various nations in the world. This position can be defined by one word which is “exclusion,”—sometimes voluntary and sometimes compulsory. The voluntary separation, as nobody will take it into his head



A JEWISH FAMILY IN THE RUINS OF CONSTANTINE'S PALACE
After a painting by Camille Rogier.

to dispute, is founded exclusively on the principles of the Mosaic religion. It was the necessary consequence of the Jewish religion, an exclusively religious question, while the compulsory separation was equally nothing else than the effect of religion, as I hope to prove.

CHAPTER II

ANTI-JUDAISM IN ANTIQUITY

1. *Pre-Hellenic Times*

IN volume 5 of his *History of Israel* (on p. 227), Renan writes as follows :

“Anti-Semitism is not an invention of our own age, it has never been so acute as during the last century which preceded our era, and when an event repeats itself in this manner everywhere and at all times it is certainly worth the trouble of studying it. In Alexandria, in Antioch, in Asia Minor, in Cyrenaica and in Damascus the fight between Jews and non-Jews was permanent. The time of religious hatred had begun and it cannot be denied that the manifestations of hatred had, as a rule, been provoked by Jews. It was the fatal consequence of the introduction of the absolute into religion. The Christians have afterwards carried this evil to the extreme, and from being persecuted at first they became persecutors.”

Thus Renan dates the origin of Anti-Semitism from the time when the Romans became masters of Palestine. This origin could perhaps be put back to an earlier date, the time when the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity, but certainly not earlier. So long as the two Kingdoms of Israel and Judah existed the Jews may have been hated and detested by their neighbours, like any other small nation which stood in the way of the former, but only on political grounds. A real Anti-Semitism, however, or rather Anti-Judaism, did not exist, and certainly did not come into existence before Ezra, together with five assistants, had compiled from memory a new copy of the Holy Scriptures in the place of the old ones which had been burnt. My opponents may point out to me that it is unjust on my part not to make use of the history of the Exodus (or Expulsion?)

of the Jews from Egypt, a story so fertile and easily to be turned to good account for the Anti-Semitic theory. To this I venture to reply that in this respect I will remain firm until they will have proved to me that the Torah which alone describes this Exodus, was known to the Jews in the times of the Judges and the Kings and that passages from it are quoted in the books of the older prophets. Can they further explain how it was possible when the Ark of the Covenant was opened under the reign of Solomon, as we are assured in the book of Kings (I, 8, 9), that the Book of Law was not found in it? Can they also explain how in the days of King Josiah in 623 B.C., 350 years after the Ark of the Covenant had been opened under Solomon, the High Priest Hilkia could say to the scribe Sephan that he had found the Book of the Law in the house of the Lord? How could Hilkia and Sephan know that it was the very same Book of the Law, and why, instead of applying to Jeremiah, did they all go to the prophetess Hulda "in order to speak with her," and why on earth did the latter grow so excited about it? Besides, the Exodus from Egypt took place too quickly to allow me to make use of it here. The journey was effected with great celerity at the rate of over 60 miles an hour, and every Jewish woman had to trail after her about sixty children, a figure which the reader could himself calculate from the text in Exodus. I shall, therefore, as I hope, be forgiven for beginning the history of Anti-Judaism with the moment when we are met by a quite ready Judaism with the Torah or portions of the Torah, because it is only in the Torah that the story of the Exodus is described in detail. It was only under the Persian rule that the separation between Samaritans and Jews became definite, and as, so far as I know, Anti-Semitism has left the Samaritans alone, I shall be permitted to begin with this epoch. Cyrus, like so many great rulers, for instance Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar and Charlemagne, was a protector and well-wisher of the Jews, and therefore Deutero-Isaiah calls him the "anointed of the Lord." After his conquest of Babylon he allowed the Jews to return to Palestine, a permission of which the latter made ample use. The Colony which had returned was very poor, and it is evident that in Babylon the Jews had not

yet acquired the talent of getting rich quickly. It was at this time that at the command of Ezra the shameful expulsion of the alien women whom the Jews had married took place. Under Ezra the Torah was proclaimed, and thus the bigotry of the Jews was called into being. Fanaticism was born, literature declined, and Israel fell into a two-centuries-long sleep (from 400 to 200 B.C.), like a man who had taken too large a dose of opium. The Torah became everything to the Jews; it was, as Renan points out, the narrowest laced shirt in which a living being had ever been compressed. Philosophy, Science, Poetry were stifled, and naturally also trade and commercial enterprise, as every free activity generally. Renan adds: "The aim of the Mosaic law was that of keeping the Jews in the state of a patriarchally governed people, to prevent the accumulation of big fortunes, and to render the development of industry and commerce after the Phœnician system impossible." The Jews have grown rich only since the Christians have compelled them to, and that because they were forbidden to own landed property, and because in consequence of the unpractical (Christian) ideas and notions on interest the direction of financial affairs was forced on the Jews. In 319 Alexander the Great overthrew the Persian Empire, and after his death (323) Palestine was conquered by Ptolemy Lagus, King of Egypt. It was at that time that a Jewish colony was founded at Alexandria which in time reached a highly flourishing state. Palestine became the scene of wars between Egypt and Syria. It was also during that period that proselytism began. In 218 Palestine came for a short time into the possession of the Seleucid King Antiochus III; the country returned to Egypt, but in 198 it was once more acquired by the Seleucid ruler. In 193 it again became an Egyptian province, but only for a short time.

2. *First persecution of the Jews*

From 175 the Hellenization of the whole Eastern Mediterranean had become an accomplished fact. The cultured classes of all nations gladly accepted Greek civilization, language and philosophy. Egypt, Phœnicia, Asia Minor, Syria, partly also Carthage, Armenia and

Assyria gladly and easily, and even enthusiastically, accepted Hellenization, and only the Jews in Palestine, with their Torah in hand, would not hear of Greek civilization. "Certainly not" was their motto. A stiff-necked people indeed! They were anxious to retain their Semitic tongue, and to think in the spirit of their Torah. With the Greek cult of beauty, the cult of the human body and the admiration of the nude were indissolubly connected, and that precisely was an abomination to the Jews. Circumcision, too, made the Jew an object of ridicule among the non-Jews. Thus in Jerusalem itself two parties arose, the Hellenistic and the Orthodox. Firmly and obstinately the latter party clung to their Torah, their language, their customs and their ceremonies; they were the Hassidim, the strictly orthodox, the Pharisees. And now there appeared in the person of King Antiochus a man who for the first time dared to disturb the wasps' nest, to put his foot into it. He took it into his head to bring all his subjects under one law.

He wanted "that all should be one people, and that each should forsake his own laws" (1 *Macc.* 1, 41.—Transl. note), to exterminate Judaism and to compel the Jews to commit actions which they looked upon as idolatrous. At first Antiochus favoured all the liberals, that is the Hellenistic Jews, or what we would call to-day the Reform Jews, many of whom had adopted the heathen faith. Jerusalem became more and more Hellenistic, and for several years not a single Jewish inhabitant is said to have been found in the city, and what is still more remarkable, the Hellenistic party set up a statue of the Olympian Jupiter in the very temple of Jehovah. This was the greatest insult to the religion of Jehovah that could be imagined. The Government now forbade the rite of circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath and all other Jewish laws. All Torah scrolls which could be got hold of were condemned to the flames. Biblical history records numerous instances of persons who died a martyr's death in those days for the sake of their faith.

It was then that the world witnessed the birth of that great ideal, that it was preferable to sacrifice life and property rather than renounce the true faith. The result

was that the old Jewish idea according to which all good deeds and the observance of the Law were rewarded by God here below, was necessarily carried to the grave, and probably under Persian influence there arose the belief, hitherto alien to the Jews, in the resurrection of the body and in an eternal life. Antiochus Epiphanes, like so many other religious persecutors, imagined that he could exterminate the persecuted faith, but he obtained quite the opposite result. It was precisely the persecution which saved this religion. Religions are not to be exterminated by persecution; on the contrary, persecution helps to strengthen religion and to spread it. History furnishes numerous examples which corroborate the truth of this statement. The whole history of the Jews down to the present day, the bloody persecution of the Christians under the Roman Empire and in other countries; the heavy and cruel persecutions which Mohammed and his first followers suffered from the Kureishites, the Parsis in Persia from the Moslems, illustrate this eternal truth. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of religions; a great and eternal truth. The result of the Seleucid persecution was the glorious revolt of the Maccabees; Judas Maccabæus was the soul of rebellion. He saved Judaism and the Torah which without him would have been lost. Anyone who studies the history of these wars and of the struggle of the Jews against the Romans under Titus and Hadrian will, if he be honest, admit that the Jews are one of the most courageous nations on earth. If they have lost this magnificent courage to-day, the loss is the result of historical development. The Maccabees had conquered, and with them the Hassidic tendency came into power. They governed in strict accordance with the principles of the Torah and were therefore cordially hated by their neighbours, for all these neighbouring nations were in favour of the Seleucidæ, and so were also those nations who spoke a Semistic language and whom the Anti-Semites designate as Semites. This splendour, however, was not of long duration. In the year 163 the Syrians led by Lysias defeated the Jewish army of the Maccabees and re-established the Syrian rule. Peace was concluded on the basis of religious liberty.

3. *Religious roots of the Greek persecutions of the Jews*

From what has been said above it follows that these lengthy and cruel wars were waged for no other reason than that of religion, and that in its very cradle already Anti-Semitism bore the mark of religious fanaticism. This is a truth to which I venture to call the particular attention of my Anti-Semitic opponents, politely requesting them to disprove it if they can. In his description of the persecutions under the rule of the Seleucidæ, Renan has expressed a truly ingenious idea. "What the fanatic mostly hates," he wrote, "is liberty; he by far prefers to be persecuted than to be suffered and tolerated, and what he is aiming at is the right to persecute others."

A necessary result of the monotheistic doctrine is that God wants to, and should be adored only in one way, and that all other Gods, except the sole God, are "vanities," "Habalim" in Hebrew, respectively demons, as the Christians translate it.¹ But if the worship of another God is blasphemy and devil-worship it is obvious that such worship must be destroyed and annihilated, and that to help in such a destruction is a deed pleasing unto God. And if a man sometimes loses his life in the execution of such a God-pleasing deed eternal blessing and endless glory are the reward he may expect. Monotheism, the doctrine of exclusive salvation and punishment of error, are necessarily the enemies of religious liberty and tolerance. Their antithesis is the belief that prayers uttered by men, no matter to what supernatural being they are addressed, can *eo ipso* reach only one destination, namely that of the only God, however different the ways and channels leading to Him may be.

In 193 B.C. the Hasmonæan Jonathan succeeded in making the Jewish State once more autonomous. The governmental policy was exceedingly cruel and intolerant, and religious strifes and their concomitant massacres were frequent. The dissatisfactory quarrelsomeness and intolerance of the Palestinian Jews extended also to the Jews in

¹ See the interesting work of T. von Bonniot (1889), *Wunder und Scheinwunder*, wherein the author tries to prove that all heathen gods were actual demons.

Alexandria, who were thoroughly hated by all nations. As early as 110 B.C. Apollonius Molon already blamed the Jews for despising all other religions, for their unsociability and their lack of respect for the gods. A special history of the Jews was concocted among the heathen, among others the great historical work of Posidonius which contains the most senseless calumnies against the Jews dictated by the hatred of the Greeks and which later pagan authors gladly believed in and eagerly repeated. The history of the Hasmonæans down to the Herodian period is an uninterrupted series of intrigues and crimes of all kinds. Sadducees and Pharisees were in a constant state of relentless conflict. Janæus distinguished himself by exceptional cruelty. During the civil war in 87 he besieged the rebels in a small town called Bethome, forced them to surrender and led the captives to Jerusalem. There he ordered eight hundred of them to be crucified, and during their long death agony he had their wives and children slaughtered before the eyes of the martyrs, while he himself sat down to a banquet with his mistresses and gloated over the sufferings of his hapless victims.

And what was the cause of this unheard-of infamy? Another scandal of a religious nature. When Janæus officiated as High Priest during the feast of Tabernacles in 95 B.C. the people, goaded on by the Pharisees, provoked a gigantic scandal. Just at the moment when the High Priest was ascending the steps of the Altar a cry arose on all sides that by the laws laid down in the Torah he was unfit for the Pontificate on the ground of being the descendant of a slave. Lemons were hurled at the head of the worthy. Tableau! Scuffle, fight and massacre followed, and six thousand partisans of the Pharisees remained on the pavement in the Temple yard. This led to a civil war, the principal scandal of which I have related above. And thus it continued until the Romans had established order. In all these eternal fights, strifes and civil wars, the point in question was the opposition of a narrow-minded Judaism to Hellenism for religious reasons. Whole cities were destroyed and flourishing strips of land were laid waste and turned into deserts; the Jews would have no intercourse with the uncircumcised. Under Queen Alexandra

the Pharisees governed and the Sadducees were ousted from all positions.

Now wherein consisted that opposition which prevailed between Pharisees and Sadducees whose activities drenched the whole of Palestine in blood and which finally proved to be one of the causes of the big somersault of the Jewish State? This opposition, too, was rooted in religion. The Pharisees are the strictly law abiding, orthodox champions of Judaism, the representatives of that essence and nature which Israel had adopted since its return from Babylon, the product of the work of Ezra. All the eminent scribes were Pharisees. They believed in an oral law, in a tradition handed down by the fathers in addition to the one fixed in writing. From the Pharisees issued Rabbinism and the Talmud which value tradition much higher than the Scriptures, which is also the case elsewhere. "It is more sinful to teach against the prescriptions of the Scribes than against the Torah itself" was one of the maxims of the Pharisees. They believed in the immortality of the soul, in resurrection and in punishment in the next world, in angels and spirits, and in a destiny ordained and regulated by God which, however, only limited freewill without suspending it altogether. In politics the Pharisees demanded that political questions should be treated not from the political but from the religious point of view. The Pharisees were really a non-political party and only became such when the authorities required of them something which prevented the strict observation of the Law. In every other respect the Pharisees were absolutely indifferent to politics. Solely from religious motives the party of the Pharisees refused on two occasions to take the oath of allegiance to Herod. They were an *ecclesia in ecclesia*, and called themselves in Hebrew, *Perushim* (Aramaic, *Perushin*), whence came the Greek *Pharisaioi*, which means separated. They were separated from all impurity, that is to say from all non-Jews, from the impure heathen, but also from all those who did not strictly observe the laws of purity which means from the Jewish country folk (*Am Haarez*), a word which the enemies of the Jews have frequently translated by Christians. They include the conception of Hassidim, of the Maccabees. The Maccabees were such Hassidim (Pious).

Their successors, however, did not always remain faithful to the party, because as rulers they had the task of governing, and this precisely they thought impossible in accordance with the Pharisaic system. Thus it came to a breach between themselves and Hyrcan. At first the latter had attached himself to the Pharisees, but later on he turned towards the Sadducees ; the Pharisees became opponents of the Hasmonæan princes and the people remained on their side. They wielded and exercised a considerable influence over all communities so that religious acts and rites had to be regulated and directed by their instructions. The result was that in their official capacity the Sadducees were also compelled to take into consideration the wishes of the Pharisees, as otherwise the latter would have stirred up the people against them.

The Sadducees represented the aristocracy, the enlightened and wealthy classes. All the High Priestly families and the aristocratic priests belonged to the party, tracing their descent to Zadock, whose descendants had performed the duties of the priestly service in Jerusalem since the days of Solomon. The Sadducees denied the immortality of the soul, considered only Holy Scripture to be binding but not the traditional law, and thus contradicted the Pharisaic doctrine. They also had different prescriptions with regard to clean and unclean, and ridiculed their opponents on account of the latter's interpretations of the law of purity. The Pharisees retorted by declaring every Sadducee woman who walked in the path of her ancestors as unclean. The Sadducees further denied the existence of angels and spirits and maintained that God did not influence the deeds of men. The Sadducees thus still adhered to the view held by the older Israelite faith, which knew neither resurrection nor reward in the next world, and did not believe in angels and in demons in the sense of the later Jewish religion. One must also add to this a practical sense, and among the educated also a certain amount of enlightenment which is quite comprehensible when one remembers that the Sadducees had to direct political affairs. The unavoidable result of all this was Greek culture, enlightenment, and a weakening of the faith. Under Queen Alexandra the Pharisees again wrested

the political power from the hands of the Sadducees, but generally speaking the latter accommodated themselves to the wishes of the Pharisees in order not to excite the people.

From what has been said it follows that the contrast and opposition between Pharisees and Sadducees lay solely in their respective religious conceptions. After the fall of the Roman Empire Sadduceeism entirely disappeared from the scene, while Phariseeism still continues to exist even to-day in Talmudism and in Rabbinism. Thus here, too, we witness the triumph of orthodoxy over liberalism. Exactly the same thing happened in Islam. In Islam, too, enlightenment suffered a total defeat in its contest with orthodoxy, and in all countries of Islam the conviction now prevails that "Revelation is above Reason." Bravo! It is well known that in 1232 the Synagogue of Montpellier pronounced the sentence of excommunication against all the Jews who dared to read the works of the most eminent and learned Rabbi Maimonides, and four centuries later the great Jew Spinoza was excommunicated by the Synagogue. The Arabian philosophers in the countries of Islam did not fare better. Poor Enlightenment! poor Philosophy! Thou art not permitted to come forward publicly, for otherwise a pack of hounds will at once worry thee to death! Thou art the heirloom of only a small minority which loves thee the more—the more thou art being persecuted. But be comforted, thou wilt conquer in the end! But when? That God alone knows.

A third great Jewish party were the Essenes, and naturally also a religious community.

4. *The Roman period*

In the days of Christ already Jewry was dispersed over almost all lands of the then known world, and that dispersion had begun with the deportation of vast Jewish masses by the Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors. In 140 B.C. already the Sibyl said that all lands and all seas were full of Jews. At the same time the Roman Senate sent out a circular in favour of the Jews to the Kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamum and Cappadocia, and to many provinces, cities and islands in the Mediterranean. In 85,

writes Strabo, the Jews had already come to every town, so that there was no place in the world which did not harbour Jews. Similar statements are made by Josephus and Philo. Schurer, the greatest authority on Jewry and Judaism in the times of Christ, says that in Mesopotamia, Media and Babylonia the Jews were counted not by the thousands but by millions; it was over the whole of Asia Minor and Syria that they were particularly dispersed. Philo estimates the number of the Egyptian Jews at about one million. The Apostle Paul found Synagogues in all the large cities of Greece, and in Rome the Jewish community counted many thousands. Julius Cæsar was a great friend of the Jews, and when he died crowds of Jews wept and lamented several nights before his funeral pyre. In the reign of Nero the Empress Poppæa is said to have become a Jewish proselyte, and it also appears that the Jews of Rome had close relations with the Court. In Gaul and in Spain we also meet Jews, at least under the later Emperors. These Jews were zealous proselytizers and very successful in their efforts, for already during the last years of the Republic a preference for Oriental cults had become fashionable in Rome. The Jewish religion was recognized in the Roman State, and the Jews enjoyed the privilege of an autonomous administration of estates and of a jurisdiction over their own members. They were exempt from military service, and this on religious grounds, because they were not allowed either to carry arms on the Sabbath or to march a distance longer than two thousand yards. They enjoyed the privilege of not appearing before a court of law on the Sabbath. In a sporadic manner the Jews were also persecuted in the Roman Empire. In the year A.D. 19 Tiberius expelled the Jews from Rome because a couple of Jews had extorted large sums from a proselyte named Fulvia under the pretext that the money was destined for the Temple at Jerusalem.

Under Caligula a terrible persecution threatened the whole of Jewry in the Roman Empire, when the Jews refused to render Divine honours to the Emperor. Luckily for the Jews Caligula died before it had come to the worst. Henceforth no new attempt was made to induce the Jews to worship the Emperor, because the Roman ruler had

realized that it would have been quite impossible to compel the Jews and that such an attempt would only have resulted in useless executions. Already in the days of the Seleucidæ and of the Ptolemies many Jewish communities in Syria and Egypt had acquired citizen rights. Julius Cæsar expressly confirmed those rights, and the results were constant frictions between Jews and non-Jews, and this again *on religious grounds*.

Although they enjoyed all rights, like the other citizens, the Jews would at no price share the duty of observing the cult of the national Gods connected with citizenship, as according to the prescriptions of the Torah such an observation was considered to be an abominable crime. All the nations subject to Rome unhesitatingly did homage to the pagan Gods, and nobody prevented them from thinking what they pleased, as the enlightened men of the age actually did. A bow, a courtesy, a handful of incense before the image, and nobody asked for more. Unhesitatingly all the nations of the earth did this, and undoubtedly cracked their jokes about this superstition in private. The Jews, however, and later on also the Christians, said: "No, we prefer to die rather than give in." It can easily be imagined that the pagans were greatly incensed at the lack of patriotism thus manifested, and only thus can the persecutions of the Jews and of the Christians be explained. Exactly the same thing we see in China. The cruel persecutions there and the wars of the Chinese against the Moslems, the recent and cruel massacres, are due to no other reason than that of refusing to pay homage to the very ancient State religion by the two monotheistic faiths. Had Christians and Moslems given in in small things, made their bow to the "idols," taken part in religious processions, here and there spent a coin on the temple and the clergy, and in the case of marriages not stipulated bluntly that all offspring were to be brought up in their own religion, that is other than the State religion, what Chinese mandarin would ever have troubled about the two alien creeds? Just as little as they are worrying about Buddhism and Taoism. Had the Jews and the Christians in the Roman Empire behaved tolerantly and benevolently towards the childish Roman State religion, no one would

ever have troubled them in the exercise of their own religious cult and worship. They did not do it, but preferred to bleed and to die. And why? Because it is written in the Torah that only one unique God should be adored and that "idol worship" was a heinous crime. Those martyrs, however, who sacrificed their lives even under tortures for the sake of their faith are certainly not to be pitied, because they died full of enthusiasm, in the expectation of the endless bliss in store for them. The most fatal hour in human life, the hour of death, was thus made bright for them; it is possible, nay, probable, that the martyrs were in a state of ecstasy when man does not feel at all any physical pain. These martyrs, I repeat, are not to be pitied, but, on the contrary, should be envied. But what about those lukewarm in their faith who have no desire whatever for the palm of martyrdom and who are led to the slaughter with the motto: "Caught together, hanged together," who could no longer renounce their faith because judge or executioner had given them neither time nor opportunity to do it? What is one to think of the suffering of the parents and the near relatives of these martyrs who have themselves remained unbelievers and "idol worshippers"? What terrible suffering and pain for them! And who are the men who have conjured up such a situation? Who are the men who created such a situation and made such terrible massacres possible? Jewish theologians who had wielded their pens more than twenty-five centuries ago!

5. *Religious roots of the persecutions of the Jews by the Romans*

It is to religious reasons, and exclusively religious, that the antipathy which the Jews have always and everywhere met with at the hands of the nations of antiquity are due. Their religious regulations and laws were in flagrant contradiction with their duties as citizens. In spite of this, however, the Jews in antiquity have played a prominent part in the life of the State. Under Ptolemy VI and his wife Cleopatra Jews were at the head of the Government, and the Egyptian military forces were commanded by two

Jews, Onias and Dositheus. Tiberius Alexander, a Jewish convert, was even commander-in-chief of the Roman army. Generally speaking, however, the Romans felt a strong antipathy for the Jews, while in the Hellenistic cities Jews were treated with disfavour.

In two places of his *Parerga* Schopenhauer suggests that the contempt of the nations of antiquity for the Jews may be attributed to the circumstance that because the Jewish religion knew not the doctrine of immortality it must have appeared to the pagans as an inferior religion. And thus even the great Schopenhauer considers Anti-Semitism in antiquity to have been of a religious character. This is rather important, because the Anti-Semites like to quote Schopenhauer as an authority for their assertion that Anti-Semitism had nothing whatever to do with religion. I beg, however, my opponents actually to read Schopenhauer, for then they will discover that he attacks the Jews almost solely on account of their religion. It is true, of course, that Schopenhauer also declares that it is a mistake to consider the Jews merely as a religious sect, and the correct term ought to be "Jewish nation," which indeed proves to be right when one remembers that it was the Jewish religion which made a nation of the Jews. We must also bear in mind that when Schopenhauer wrote his work those important investigations (Wellhausen, Reuss and so forth) had not yet been made in the domain of Biblical Exegesis, nor had the skull measurements of the anthropologists provided the proof that there was no such thing as a Jewish race. Schopenhauer could not have been aware of the fact when he wrote that the majority of the Bible stories had never actually taken place, as Biblical criticism has proved, but had been written centuries later for didactic purposes. Had he known this, he would not have made such severe accusations against the Jewish religion and reproached it with religious massacres, merciless murder and extermination of whole nations, of the rascally trick used against Hemor and his people, the pretence of the Jews that the neighbouring countries were a donation made unto them by their national God, the story of the expulsion of Hagar and so forth.

The conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey once more led

to a terrible carnage, whereby the following remarkable circumstance deserves to be mentioned: The Jewish priests who were busy with their religious sacrifices did not in the least let themselves be inconvenienced by the entry of the Roman soldiers and were struck down while performing their duty. Thus the freedom of the Jewish nation which had lasted about eighty years came to an end. Palestine was placed under the supervision of the Roman Governor of Syria, but a few years later was separated and governed by procurators.

In the year 47 Hyrcan was appointed monarch of the Jews and Antipater procurator of Judea, and this in consequence of a decree issued by Julius Cæsar who, by a decision of the Senate, had five years previously granted the Jews several privileges. In the year 40 B.C. the Parthians invaded Jerusalem, and in spite of their friendship with Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, whose claim to the throne Cæsar had ignored, they plundered and sacked the city thoroughly. Antigonus was King and High Priest by the grace of the Parthians, and in order to render Hyrcan unfit for the office of High Priest he cut the latter's ears off. This splendour, however, did not last long.

In the meantime Herod the Great appeared on the scene and managed to induce Antony and even Octavianus to appoint him King of Judea in a solemn assembly of the Senate.

Three years after his nomination Herod succeeded in overthrowing Antigonus, who was beheaded at the command of Antony. The rule of the Hasmonæan princes thus came to an end and the age of the Herodians began. Herod was King of Judea, but ruled under the sovereignty of Rome as *rex socius*. The Jewish nation detested him horribly because as an Idumæan he was only half a Jew and also on account of his loyal friendship for and attachment to Rome, and his preference for Hellenic culture. It was for these religious reasons that the Pharisees caused him the greatest difficulties as soon as he had ascended the throne. Soon, however, by means of mass massacres, Herod succeeded in reducing the orthodox party to silence, but was forced to grant concessions to his adversaries. Thus he had no human image stamped on his coins, ordered

the actual Temple to be built only by priests, and himself never entered the inner room of the Temple. No images were erected on any building in Jerusalem. One day a rumour had spread among the people that the Imperial trophies hung up in the Temple were in reality statues covered up with arms, and disturbances arose. Herod thereupon ordered the trophies to be taken down and divested in the presence of the most prominent men whom he pacified by exhibiting the empty wooden scaffolding. Finally, however, out of mockery he had an eagle erected on the Temple gates, which deed once more spurred on the Pharisees to renewed hatred, in spite of the many concessions Herod had granted them. This deed, as well as the favours which Herod constantly showed to the Hellenistically inclined Jews and his contempt for the Sanhedrin, led to a conspiracy which was speedily suppressed. When Herod fell ill and rumours had spread that his disease was incurable, two Rabbis goaded on the people to tear down the objectionable eagle from the Temple gate in accordance with the second commandment. This deed, pleasing to God, was accomplished amidst a monstrous row, but the old lion Herod was not quite dead yet, and ordered the ringleaders to be burnt alive. Scarcely had Herod expired and his son Archelaus succeeded him on the throne when an uproar arose in Jerusalem, the Pharisaic party being anxious to revenge the execution of the two Rabbis. The Jews even sent a deputation to Rome with the urgent request that henceforth no Herodian be appointed ruler of Palestine. The Emperor Augustus, however, was not influenced by it. Herod the Great died in the year 4 B.C. and his kingdom was divided into three districts. Philip received one district and reigned until 4 A.D., Antipas received the second district and reigned from 4 B.C. to A.D. 39, while the third district which became Judea proper was given to Archelaus, but in the year A.D. 6 already a Roman procurator was appointed over it. Herod Antipas reigned as Tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa from 4 B.C. to A.D. 39. The rule over the Jews gave the Romans no end of trouble. Howsoever accommodating the latter tried to be, the Jews always demanded more and more concessions which, on account of public

peace and order, it was found difficult to concede unto them. The Imperial cult was claimed and unhesitatingly performed by all the populations in the provinces of the Roman Empire, but the Jews alone were exempted from it (except under the reign of the Emperor Caligula).

Under the Roman rule the coins stamped in the Jewish country bore no human image ; this was a concession made to the Jews, because the representation of any human likeness was against their religion. The Roman troops were in the habit of entering Jerusalem without carrying the banner with the Imperial effigy, and this too was done out of consideration for the Jewish religion. When Pilate once made an attempt to abolish this custom a revolt was threatened and he finally saw himself compelled once more to remove the Imperial effigies. Pilate tried to resort to force. He bade the Jews who had assailed him for five days with their complaints to foregather in the arena where they were massacred by Roman soldiers. He had hoped to carry out his will by sheer force, but the Jews bared their necks and declared that they would rather die than consent to such a sacrilege. As Pilate after all did not wish it to come to a general massacre he gave in and the Imperial effigies were removed.

A similar incident occurred when Pilate prepared to employ the Temple treasures for the construction of a useful aqueduct which, by the way, he actually did construct in spite of Jewish opposition. The Jews also carried the point with Pilate and obtained the removal of the holy shields which bore only the name and not even the likeness of the Emperor, and which Pilate had hung up in Jerusalem.

The great persecution of the Jews in Alexandria perpetrated in the year A.D. 38 was also due to religious motives. When Caligula decreed that his statue be erected in the Temple of Jerusalem, the Jews, flying into a violent passion, grew raving mad, and then already Palestine would have witnessed bloody revolts had not Petronius, the then Governor of Syria, wisely delayed the erection of the statue and had not Caligula died at the right moment. Immediately after his accession the new Emperor Claudius made a present of Judea and Samaria to Herod Agrippa, in

addition to those districts which the latter had already previously received, so that the whole of Palestine, to the extent which it had attained under Herod the Great, was once more united in the hands of a prince of the house of Herod. Agrippa followed the policy which had once been that of Alexander, namely that of meeting the party of the Pharisees half-way as far as it was possible. He scrupulously observed the laws of Judaism, wherefore the Talmud also highly praises him. When, on one occasion, young men had set up a statue of the Emperor in the Jewish Synagogue of the Phœnician town of Dora, Agrippa induced the Governor of Syria to punish the culprits for this horrible abomination. When again his daughter Drusila became engaged to Epiphanes, the son of King Antiochus of Commagena, the latter had to promise to submit to the rite of circumcision. Thus this sly fox lived to enjoy a great triumph. In the year A.D. 41 he read the portion of the Torah on the feast of Tabernacles, and coming to the sentence "Thou shalt not put any stranger as King over thee" he burst into crocodile's tears, but the people enthusiastically shouted: "Have no fear, Agrippa, thou art our brother."

After the death of Agrippa the rule of the Roman procurators was instituted and lasted from A.D. 44 to 65. Under Cuspius Fadus, the first procurator, a scandal broke out, because the procurator had requested that the high-priestly sumptuous vestment should once more be kept in Roman custody. He had also suppressed the revolt which a religious dreamer named Theudas who pretended to be a prophet had raised, spurring on the people to a holy war against Rome. Cumanus, the third procurator, also had to suppress a revolt, because a Roman soldier of the section of troops which for the sake of safety was placed in the outer court of the Temple, had insulted the Jews by an indecent gesture during the Passah-festival. According to Josephus, this scandal is supposed to have cost the lives of twenty thousand men. At the same time a Roman soldier tore up a Torah scroll, using scornful and mocking language. Urged by the Jews, Cumanus ordered the execution of the soldier. Further disturbances arose in consequence of the assassination in a Samaritan village of two Galilean Jews who were on a pilgrimage to the festival at Jerusalem.

The next procurator was Felix, who married the beautiful Jewish Queen Drusila to the great annoyance and anger of the orthodox Jews. The exasperation increased when under the next procurator, Festus, the equality of Jews and Syrians in Cæsarea was abolished and the Greeks were declared to be masters of the city.

Agrippa, who had obtained a tiny kingdom in the Lebanon and also the superintendence over the Temple in Jerusalem and the right of appointing the High Priests, usually resided in the palace of the Hasmonæans whenever he was in residence in Jerusalem. Here he had constructed a small tower whence he had a view over the Temple, and in his leisure hours he could watch the Divine service. This excited the anger of the pious priests who found the King's attitude exceedingly indecent and they raised a high wall to shut out the view. Agrippa addressed himself to his friend, the procurator Festus, who was willing to help him, but the Jews sent a deputation to Rome to the Empress Poppæa, thanks to whose intervention the wall remained.

6. *The downfall of the Jewish State*

In the year 66 the ever-memorable revolution at last broke out; the cause again was naturally of a religious character. To wit, the procurator Florus had robbed the Temple treasure of seventeen talents. A great tumult arose on account of this sacrilege, and in order to mock the procurator a few Jews collected charitable donations for the poor Florus in small baskets. A short time afterwards the daily sacrifice in the Temple for the Emperor was stopped, thanks to the manœuvres of the son of the High Priest Ananias. Thus the revolt of the Jews against Rome had been openly declared. The end of this revolution is well known. Jerusalem was besieged and the Temple burnt down, although Titus is said to have done his utmost to spare the magnificent building. It is worthy of notice that Titus was anxious to bring about a reconciliation, and this out of love for his Jewish mistress Berenice. Titus turned cruel only when he saw that the Jews refused all peaceful negotiations. Before the eyes of the inhabitants of the city he daily crucified five hundred Jews under the

most exquisite tortures. This cruelty, however, only increased the fury of the besieged. Famine, despair and madness reigned supreme in Jerusalem, which became like a cage of wild beasts. Had the Jews surrendered in time, the people might have been spared endless woe and suffering, but the zealots would hear of no surrender; they refused to yield, because the Temple was indestructible. The majority of the Jews were convinced that the city enjoyed the special protection of God and that it could never be taken. Foolish prophets were running about announcing that a miracle was soon going to happen and that salvation would come. The trust in God was so unshakable among the besieged that many of them who had an opportunity of escaping nevertheless remained in the city in order to witness the miracle which God was about to work for their salvation.

It was on August 8th, 70, that the Romans succeeded in setting the Temple gates on fire. When the Jews perceived the flames they at first could not trust their own eyes, because in their delusion they had believed the Temple to be proof against everything. A terrible howl of fury resounded and a flow of imprecations and curses filled the air when the lambent flames began to fork. On August 10th a new fight took place. A section of the troops had been left behind to prevent the Temple being again set on fire, to watch the still glimmering fire and to prevent its spread. The Jews threw themselves upon this section and a terrible fight ensued. The Jews precipitated themselves into the Temple yard and the soldiers followed them. The fury of the Roman soldiers had also reached the boiling point; one of them seized a torch and lifted up by one of his comrades threw the burning torch through one of the windows into the Temple. A volley of flame and smoke issued. Titus was at that moment asleep in his tent when the news was brought to him of the burning of the Temple. Josephus relates that a downright struggle took place between Titus and his soldiers. By voice and gesture the former commanded his soldiers to extinguish the fire at once, but in the terrible tumult no one could be heard. Carried away by the stream of his own soldiers, Titus penetrated into the Temple. The flames had not yet reached the Holy of Holies

and he could see it with his own eyes. He gave orders to clear the inner room, and commanded the Centurio Libralis to put down anybody who disobeyed his command. The riotous soldiers left the Temple, but too late! A Roman soldier had already set the Holy of Holies on fire, and from all sides flames began to leap up, so that no one could withstand the smoke. Titus retired, and Jerusalem and the Holy Temple were soon a mass of smoking ruins.

The Roman soldiers massacred everything that fell into their hands. In the year 71 Titus held his famous triumphal entry into Rome.

Behind the triumphal chariot were carried the Torah scrolls "of the great culprit" of the entire misfortune, as Renan expresses himself. It was the Torah alone which had made the Jews what they now were, the Torah alone which had raised the wall which separated the Jews from all other nations and which was responsible for the antipathy of Greeks and Romans towards the Jews; the Torah alone had spurred on the Jews to reject with disdain on every occasion the tolerant government and the uncircumcised pagans. The independence of the Jewish nation soon became a thing of the past. Jerusalem was razed to the ground and a considerable portion of the population was either massacred or led away into captivity.

Under Trajan the Jews once more made several attempts to revolt, and the fiercest insurrection arose under Hadrian between the years 132 and 135. Once more the cause was of a religious nature. In the place of the demolished city of Jerusalem Hadrian had built a new city called *Ælia Capitolina*, and commanded that a pagan temple be erected on the spot where once the Jewish temple had stood. He is also said to have issued a decree against the rite of circumcision. The leader of this terrible revolt which had broken out in consequence of the great insult which the religious feeling of the Jews had experienced was Bar-Kochba, who gave himself out as the long-awaited Messiah. As the Christians would not acknowledge his claim, he raged against them in the most cruel manner. The revolt was quelled by the Romans, whereby the whole of Judea was turned into a desert; fifty fortresses and nine hundred and eighty-five villages were demolished and half a million

men are said to have fallen. A great number of the inhabitants were sold as slaves.

Jerusalem was now changed into a Roman colony by the name of *Ælia Capitolina*, all the Jews were expelled and heathen colonists were settled in their stead. The image of a swine was put up at the southern gate of the city, while on the spot where the Jewish temple had once stood a temple of Jupiter was erected where a statue of Hadrian is said to have stood. A temple of Venus was built on the spot of the Holy Sepulchre. Jerusalem had become a pagan city. As the decree against the rite of circumcision was still in existence, the Jews once more made an attempt at an insurrection under the reign of Antoninus Pius. The Romans had the alternative of either permitting this religious rite or of exterminating the whole Jewish nation. Wisely they preferred the first alternative and allowed the exercise of the rite of circumcision.

7. *Romans and Jews*

The opinions expressed in Greek and Roman literature with regard to the Jews are very unfavourable and show a deep contempt for this people. The educated saw in the Jewish religion a barbaric superstition, and partly out of ignorance the most ridiculous and mischievous fables were circulated with regard to the Jews and their history. Thus the origin of the name of Judah was derived from Mount Ida in Crete, and it was asserted that the Jews had come from that place; certain ceremonies observed at the feast of Tabernacles gave rise to the suggestion that the Jews worshipped Bacchus. Tacitus describes the Jewish cult as absurd and disgusting. The most mischievous calumnies came from Alexandria where Manetho had compiled a veritable novel about the exodus of the Jews from Egypt. According to this author, one of the kings of Egypt had expelled a number of lepers. Thereupon Moses, an Egyptian Prince of Heliopolis, whose real name was Osarsiph, placed himself at the head of these lepers, induced them to renounce the Gods of Egypt and to accept a new religion which he had invented. Under his leadership they took possession of Jerusalem and its

environs. The reason why the Jews are paying Divine homage to an ass's head is attributed to the alleged fact that when they were in the desert a herd of wild asses had made known to them the way to springs and fountains. The prohibition to eat pork is explained by the fact that these animals are subject to scab, precisely the disease on account of which the Jews had been expelled from Egypt. The unleavened bread was a proof of the theft of corn committed by the Jews at the moment of the exodus, while the celebration of the Sabbath showed their inclination to laziness. Four things in particular were responsible for the Jews becoming the most popular target of ridicule among the educated people of the time. They were :

1. The rite of circumcision.
2. The strict observance of the Sabbath.
3. The abstention from eating pork.
4. The adoration of God without images.

I venture to call the attention of my Anti-Semitic opponents to the fact that the above four points exclusively belong to the domain of religion, and that in the entire Greek and Roman literature which is hostile to the Jews there is not a single accusation, a single joke with reference to usury, exploitation and the draining of the substance of people belonging to another religion, or of dishonest conduct in financial matters. Thus the hatred and ridicule of antiquity are directed against the laws and ordinances of that religion which even the Christians and the Moslems consider to have been the only true one until the time of Christ. But that which most vehemently enraged and irritated the Græco-Roman world against the Jews was that impenetrable wall of separation which the latter had raised between themselves and the non-Jews, and this they had done only because their Law had compelled them to. While Roman world dominion and Greek culture had levelled the Roman and Greek worlds and abolished the barriers which separated the nations, the Jews alone refused to be assimilated and thus had laid themselves open to the suspicion of hating all non-Jews. Tacitus accuses them of hating all mankind, while Juvenal says that they showed the way only to their own co-religionists and led

only the circumcised to the springs. In Alexandria people believed that the Jews took an oath not to be well disposed to any stranger. Tacitus says that the first thing which Jewish proselytes learn is that of despising the Gods, or renouncing their native country, of treating with contempt their parents, brothers and sisters. In a word, the principal feeling which the Jews of the then world aroused was one of deepest contempt; it was thus exclusively the effect of their religion.

It is therefore somewhat surprising that in spite of all this the despised religion should have spread to such an extent in the Roman Empire. The remarkable success of Jewish propaganda is to be attributed to the fact that the belief in the local Gods had long ago disappeared from among the educated classes of the time, while the rigorous monotheism and the Jewish pure conception of the Divinity were sympathetic to many educated people. The Jewish religion furthermore aimed at a more moral and pious life in a much higher degree than did the native religions, a circumstance which was certainly calculated to attract the best people of the time, and finally, it was the fashion of the day to adopt the secret cults of the East. In Greece this fashion had already started in the fifth century B.C., and from the third century onwards we meet a predilection for the Phrygian cult of Sabazius prevailing all over the country. In Rome this predilection appears already in the second century B.C., and in the year 43 B.C. the triumviri themselves had erected temples of Serapis and Isis. The Persian cult of Mithra had spread widely over almost all the provinces of the Roman Empire.

8. *Jewish proselytes*

Jewish propaganda was also being carried on very zealously. According to *Matthew* 23, 15 Christ tells the Pharisees that they "Compassed sea and land to make one proselyte." Besides, very little was required of these proselytes. We learn from Philo that among the Hellenistic Jews the descent from Abraham was of secondary importance, the pure conception of the Divinity being the essential. There were even heathen who, while remaining

faithful to the pagan religion, nevertheless observed a few ordinances of Judaism. The proselytes were not even asked to observe the rite of circumcision, and in addition to the adoration of God the Sibylline oracle demanded merely a bath of purification.

When King Izades wished to embrace Judaism, a Jew named Ananias dissuaded him from circumcision, remarking that even without the rite of circumcision one could serve God and be saved. The rite of circumcision naturally involved the obligatory observance of the entire Jewish law. Thus we see that everywhere where Jewish communities existed they found God-fearing followers among the heathen. The latter adhered to the Jewish manner of adoring God, and observed a few ordinances of Judaism, but they were not circumcised, and thereby they distinguished themselves from the proselytes proper who were bound to observe the entire Jewish law on account of circumcision.

Thus, I think, a proof has been furnished that in their relations with the nations of antiquity the Jews had never been guided by any considerations except those of religion, and that the hatred and antipathy which they met with at the hands of Greeks and Romans were exclusively the result of their conduct towards non-Jews, a conduct dictated to them by their religion.

9. *Jewish Fanaticism*

Intolerance and fanaticism, in addition to the doctrine of their being a chosen race, and the expectation of a Messiah who was to unite all nations under the sceptre of a scion of the house of David, such is the essence of the history of the Jews since their return from Babylonian captivity; such are the causes which led to the downfall of the Jewish State. I imagine, however, what the Anti-Semites will reply to all this. They will point out that it is precisely this intolerance, this fanaticism, and this exclusiveness which are the essentials of Judaism, and that all that has been said above is another proof of their wickedness and inferiority, that it is just these dogmas and doctrines, this conduct towards non-Jews, for which the whole nation

must be held responsible and on account of which it deserves to be abominated. The Anti-Semites would be right if it could not be proved that these characteristics and this megalomania, these proud doctrines with their concomitants, the special election of the people, the culpability of errors, exclusive salvation and the expectation of the Messiah, belong only to modern Judaism and not to the faith of Israel in prophetic times, and that it was in a comparatively later period that the nation of Israel had been inoculated with these doctrines, customs and usages, as the most recent Biblical criticism maintains.

The God of Israel has a proper name, Jahve. At first he was only the national God of Israel ; a God by the side of other Gods, namely, by the side of the Gods of the alien nations. The antithesis of God in old Israel were the Gods of the alien nations whose existence as Gods was fully admitted, and who were not considered to be idols or non-Gods, "futilities" or perhaps demons. No one doubted the existence of Kemosh as actual God of the Moabites, of Baal as actual God of the Sidonians, of Baal-Zebub as the actual God of Ekron. Those Gods had given their lands to their respective peoples and protected them. Such was the old Israelite conception as is evident from the Book of Judges, chapter 2. In theory the old-Israelite was a polytheist who did not at all doubt the fact that in a strange land he was himself subject to the influence of the local Gods who wielded more influence in their respective countries than his own God and who were therefore entitled to claim homage from him. Compare the Second Book of Kings, chapter 3, where the author ascribes the defeat which the Jews had suffered in the war against the Moabite King Mesha to the wrath of the local God Kemosh. Compare the reproach which David made to Saul when he said that by expelling him from Israel he forced him to serve other Gods, and his prayer that "his blood may fall on the earth not far from the countenance of God." Solomon allowed his Moabite wife to worship her own God Kemosh. Elijah, the blood-thirsty persecutor of the Baal religion in Israel, lived at Sarepta in the home of a follower of the Baal religion, and partook of her food, while Naaman took with him some earth from the land of

Israel so that he might worship Jahve in his own country. Solomon not only allowed his numerous heathen wives to worship their own national gods but even himself courteously took part in their worship. The horrible exterminations of entire nations at Divine command for the explicit purpose of exterminating idol worship so that Israel might not be contaminated, are stories dating from much later times; they are written down with a view to implanting in the Jews the loathing of idol worship. For the civilization of Israel in pre-prophetic times I refer the reader to the seventh book of the first volume of Dr. Bernhard Stade's *History of the People of Israel*.

From what has been said above it follows that it would be wrong to think that the Jews have been fanatic zealots from the first moment of their appearance in history.

Anti-Semitism began after the Torah and the books of the Prophets had been written down. It did not exist in the times of the Judges and the Kings. Nor does the history of the last two centuries B.C. and of the first century A.D. know of any Anti-Semitism on the part of the Greeks and Romans against any other so-called Semitic nations, that is to say of nations who spoke Semitic languages. Many of them must have existed and actually did exist in the Roman Empire, which is quite comprehensible since all the nations in the Empire had been merged in Hellenism and dissolved in the Roman world monarchy. Thus there was no actual Anti-Semitism at all in the Græco-Roman world, but merely an Anti-Judaism which again had nothing whatever to do with the supposed Jewish race, but, on the contrary, had everything to do with the Jewish religion. This becomes as clear as daylight from the fact that the Græco-Roman antipathy manifested against the Jews also extended to the thousands of Jewish proselytes of non-Jewish descent. To the Anti-Semites who are interested in the position which the Jews occupied in the ancient world, I venture to recommend a thorough study of a work by Theodor Reinach entitled *Textes d'auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, published in Paris in 1895, and covering 374 pages. In this work will be found all the passages from the works of Greek and Roman authors which treat of Judaism. A good many of them are

of a spiteful and odious nature. The readers should no longer repeat the following well-known assertion: "The Jews were as antipathetic to the Greeks and the Romans as they are to us moderns; their religion was absolutely indifferent to the former, and yet a violent Anti-Semitism prevailed among them; Anti-Semitism is consequently not at all a religious question and cannot be anything but a question of race."

I am convinced that I have now abundantly proved in this chapter the absolute falseness of the foregoing assertion. Its fallacy lies in the fact that it erroneously assumes the necessary existence of a religious consciousness and of a religious feeling in persons who are Anti-Semitically affected, in order to explain the phenomenon of Anti-Semitism, if it is to be treated as a religious question. But it is precisely this supposition which is false. An Anti-Semitic antipathy may be due merely to the characteristic traits and actions of the so-called Semite, and when these traits and actions are rooted in the religion of the person who has provoked it, such an Anti-Semitism is a religious phenomenon. The antipathy is also due to religion, even when the person harbouring it has no religion at all, and is not conscious of the origin of his antipathy and of the cause whence it has emanated. Thus the history of Anti-Semitism in antiquity teaches us that Anti-Semitism was entirely based upon and rooted in religion and in nothing else.

CHAPTER III

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ANTI-JUDAISM

1. *The Roman Church*

WE shall now consider the attitude adopted towards the Jews by Christianity, and first of all by the Roman Church. In my statements I am following the work of Pater Constant entitled: *Les Juifs devant l'Eglise et l'histoire*. Pater Constant was a doctor of Theology and Canonical Law and a priest of the Dominican Order, that Order which, as is well known, occupied itself with the Jews more assiduously than did other orders. The book has been approved by the Church authorities, and from the Catholic standpoint there could be no objection to my utilizing it. The author's trend of thought is briefly as follows :

“In ancient Rome the Jews enjoyed many liberties and rights, and the Jewish religion was recognized by the State. Quite different, however, is the state of affairs when it is a question of nations who have been enlightened by the light of the Gospel.”

If the Jew was harmless for the Roman State, he is a danger for the Christian State. While there is nothing in the Jew that could have endangered the Roman State, everything that is inherent in him directly attacks the Christian State. The latter has to fear everything from the Jew. No Christian lawgiver has ever thought of depriving the Jew of the Bible, and only against the Talmud have steps been taken.

The Dominican regrets that in their persecutions against the Talmud the Christian potentates did not meet with the success which their zeal had deserved. And since the Jew constitutes a conspicuous danger for the Christian State, it is incumbent both upon the Church and the Christian

government to observe his movements and doings and to control them. Two means serve this purpose : the ghetto, and the yellow Jew-badge on his dress.

The Dominican Monk Ferraris sums up the Papal decrees with regard to the ghetto in the following words : “ All the Jews had to live in one place to which only one entrance led and which was also the only exit. The aim was to prevent Jews and Christians from living together. Every newly arrived Jew had to put up in the ghetto and his co-religionists were obliged to receive him. The Jew, however, had no right to acquire landed property and not even the land upon which the Jewish dwelling stood. The possession of landed property in the Middle Ages bestowed certain social rights of suzerainty and of subordination. Now by excluding the Jews from the possession of landed property, the Church was anxious to prevent Christians from becoming subordinate to a Jew. In the ghetto itself the Jew was free ; he could leave it for the whole day, but was obliged to return to it in the evening when the bells were chiming the Ave Maria. A Christian gate-keeper opened and locked the gates of the ghetto. Thus alone the Christian State was always able to know the number and identity of its Jews and to control them exactly, and thus the Jew always remained under the impression of fear ‘ which alone turned him into a moral being and made it possible for the Christians to tolerate him.’ ”

With regard to the Jew-badge, Pater Constant writes : “ How was it otherwise possible not to lose sight of the odd companion whom the compassionate hospitality of the Church had imposed upon the Christian ? Ever since the great betrayal at Mount Calvary the spirit of the Iscariot had infested the Jewish race. In the heart of every Jew there flows a traitor’s blood. They showed their gratitude to the princes of Spain by calling in the Arabs of Africa.”


With regard to the private and family life of the Jews it must be pointed out that the Church does not impinge the right which God has granted to every man, that of founding a family. The Jews are allowed to marry among themselves according to Jewish law.

No Jewish child can be baptized against the will of its parents if it has not yet attained the age of seven. Should,

however, either the father or the mother wish it, the child could be baptized. A Jewish child which has attained the age of seven can be baptized even against the will of its parents. A Jewish child validly baptized against the will of its parents must not be rendered to the latter.

The Church will not allow a Christian to be in the service of a Jew. In the first place the Church forbids a Christian woman to be the wet-nurse of a Jewish child. The reason for this prohibition given by Pater Constant, who was a doctor of two faculties and wrote in 1897, is the following : listen to it and be amazed ; I am translating literally :

“ The body of the Christian, so religion teaches us, is the temple of the Holy Ghost. The same religion also teaches us that the body which has not been washed and cleansed in baptism remains the abode of the devil. To establish those intimate relations which exist in the case of nursing between the body of a Christian woman and a Jewish child, appeared to the Church to be an outrage, that of bringing the devil into contact with the Holy Ghost. A further reason which induced the Church to forbid a Christian wet-nurse to enter the service of Jews was the apprehension lest her participation in Jewish domestic religious ceremonies shake her faith, and lest also her attendance at the ceremony of circumcision offend her modesty and chastity. The Church was also afraid lest the wet-nurse be given an opportunity of listening to blasphemies of the altar sacraments, to insults hurled against the Cross and the holy objects of the Christians. Moreover, the blasphemous, cynical and infamous talmudical writings—which demolish all sound morality—might easily fall into the hands of the Christian wet-nurse. (Can one imagine a Christian wet-nurse in the Middle Ages able to read and understand Hebrew ?) It is therefore the duty of the Inquisitor to proceed against the Jews whenever they are in possession of talmudical or other Jewish writings which have been condemned by the Church or whenever they are making fun of the Holy Host, of the Cross, or other religious objects. The Church further feared the danger of a Christian wet-nurse being seduced by the Jewish paterfamilias, and this the more so because in the opinion of the Church such a deed was calculated to



THE GHETTO IN BELGRADE
After an oil-painting, reproduced from the *Jüdisches Lexikon*.

increase the sin of unchastity, to wit, of adultery, in addition to that of sacrilege. Christian law is decidedly opposed to a Christian entering the service of a Jew on account of the former thus socially becoming a subordinate of the Jew. The Christian should have authority over the Jew and not the Jew over the Christian. It is this that St. Paul wished to express in his Epistle to the Galatians when, with reference to the history of Sarah and Hagar, he wrote: "The son of the maid shall not share the inheritance of the free woman."

A Christian working for a Jew for daily wages must not eat with the Jew; this prohibition was calculated to make it clear that the fact of a Christian working for a Jew did not stamp the former as a servant of the latter, and in spite of the work, the superiority of the Christian had in no way been diminished. Christians were forbidden to render the slightest service to Jewish families in their preparations for the celebration of the Sabbath or other festivals, even if such services were only to require a few moments. Christians were not allowed to pay any homage or deference to Jews or to address them as *Dominus*, that is, Sir. The Christian was not only forbidden to eat with the Jews, but also to play with them, and much less to dance with them.

In Strasbourg the Jews were allowed to pass only certain hours outside the ghetto. In Augsburg they were obliged to pay a florin for every hour passed in the city outside the ghetto, in Bremen a ducate. In several cities they were not allowed to leave the ghetto at all during the Christian festivals; they were even forbidden to visit houses of ill-fame. Nor were they allowed to go near a nunnery and to converse with a nun. There follow now a number of accusations raised against the Jews. "They compel Christian wet-nurses on the day on which they are celebrating the Holy Communion to throw their milk into the water-closets; they buy sacred objects from thieves, like crosses, chalices and so forth, which they again re-sell to Christians after having soiled and befouled them, and they are selling to Christians bones of asses, dogs and swine as relics."

Pater Constant points out that a Christian monarch had

the right to keep away from his people which had adopted the Catholic religion everything that was calculated to shake their faith, and at the first sign of hostility or aggressiveness he could expel all the Jews and infidels from whom such aggressiveness emanated. The reason for this was that the Church alone was in possession of religious truth. Everything that contradicted this fact, everything that claimed the name of religion, while it did not agree with the Church, was nothing but mere religious error. Therefore the famous Consalvi was right when he said that in its essence the Catholic Church was intolerant. In every Christian State the collectivity of the Jews deserved to be expelled when they slandered the Christian faith, and particularly when the shedding of Christian blood was added to this slander. In the opinion of the Church the Jews could also be expelled from the country whenever they stirred up insurrections or endangered the Christian population in one way or another. But even without insurrections, whenever the Jews became so numerous in a Christian State that the population seemed to be at their mercy, they could be expelled. "The Church always takes up its standpoint on the firmly established fact that the Jew as such, and just because he is a Jew, is predisposed to treason."

"It was not without reason," writes Pater Constant, "that in the most solemn moment of its liturgy, at the foot of the bleeding cross of its Lord, in the hour when the Church offers to Heaven this blood for all humanity, when none is excluded from its prayers, in that hour which of all hours is that of compassion, it was for that reason that the Church thought it fit to pray for the forgiveness of the Jews only by adding the epithet which justice commanded, namely, 'perfidious.' Let us also pray for the perfidious Jews."

The Jews could be expelled from the country if they refused to observe and to obey the laws, or if their wealth gave rise to the suspicion that it constituted a danger for the Christians whom the Jews had robbed of their money. Thus the Jews were expelled from Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella. A Christian prince, whenever he had juridical presumptions—which are tantamount to proofs—that the

possessions usurped by the suspected person had either wholly or partly been acquired in a fraudulent way, has a right to confiscate the fortune of the person in question. He may confiscate the whole fortune if it is entirely due to fraudulent means, but otherwise only part of it, in proportion to the fraud. "In practice, however," says Pater Constant, "these laws were mitigated because the Jews had been received in Christian society merely out of compassion, whereby the aim of the Church which accepted them was that of being useful to them by facilitating their entry into the fold of the Catholic faith, and not that of making it possible unto them to harm the children of the Church with their Jewish perfidy. St. Louis, the most just of all rulers, at one stroke, confiscated one-third of the Jewish collective fortune."

There follows now a number of rules calculated to injure even the commerce of the Jews.

A Jew was not permitted to instruct a Christian in any science or art; he was not allowed to occupy a post of honour or a public office calculated to bring him into contact or relationship with Christians, nor to obtain the doctor degree at a Catholic University. Jewish physicians were not allowed to attend sick Christians, because, remarks Pater Constant, the Church thought of the danger to which Christian confidence would be exposed by Jewish perfidy. Nothing would any longer be safe in the family, for intimacy produces lamentable opportunities. It was a Jewish physician who stole little Simon, the famous martyr of Trient.

The Jews were further forbidden to exercise the profession of dispensing chemists on account of the opportunity thus offered to them of practising witchcraft. Only on a journey were the Jews permitted to eat and to drink with the Christians, to pass the night together or to put up at the same inn.

"The Jews in the service of Christians live not like domestic slaves but like civil bondmen," writes Pope Benedict XIV. "What," remarks Pater Constant, "would this Pope have said had he seen that a fourth of all the magistrates of the most Christian nation, the eldest daughter of the Church, consisted of Jews?" "A magistrate," says

St. Thomas, " must possess such a love of justice, that he should, so to say, become the very incarnation of this justice." " How could one expect," remarks Pater Constant, " such a justice from the perfidious Jews whom the Church has officially, solemnly and consciously stamped as perfidious ? "

The Jews were debarred from the military profession. They were allowed to exercise only the professions of bankers, goldsmiths, jewellers, dealers in old clothes, pedlars and printers.

The Jews were subject to the Inquisition in the following cases.

1. When they denied those truths of their own religion in which the Christians themselves were obliged to believe.

2. When they invoked demons and sacrificed unto them. Constant remarks that the Jewish Kabbala owed its origin to the intimate relations existing between the Rabbis and the devil, that this doctrine furthered the teaching of the devil, and that the close relations existing between Judaism and Freemasonry are due to it.

3. When they impart this doctrine to Christians.

4. When they utter blasphemous words against the Christian faith.

5. When they induce a Christian to apostatize.

6. When they prevent an unbaptized person from adopting the Catholic faith.

Every week a magister was commissioned to preach theology in the synagogues. It was further decreed that Jewish children of both sexes had to attend Catholic religious instruction. The first article of the tacit agreement between Israel begging for land and water and the Church which granted her these gifts was as follows :

The Church may, and indeed will, employ and make use of all the means considered by the Church as useful and calculated to convert Israel to the Catholic faith. The Church has strictly forbidden the Jews to have their fires lit by Christians on the Sabbath, and the Christians to attend Jewish ceremonies or sermons and particularly the ceremony of circumcision.

Pater Constant concludes his work with a discussion of the so-called ritual murder.

I have thus completed the summary of a work written in 1897, that is on the eve of the twentieth century, in Paris, the *ville lumière*, by the learned Dominican, doctor of theology and canonical law, on the laws and ordinances laid down by the Church with regard to the relations between Jews and Christians, a work approved by the ecclesiastical superiors of the author. From my description both Jews and Christians will gather how the Roman Church had treated the Jews when it possessed the power to do so, and how, if it again had the power, it would even to-day proceed against the Jews.

2. *The Papacy*

It is remarkable that of all the agents of the Church the one who treated Israel most humanely was the Head of the Church, to wit, the Pope, and this at all times, a fact which Jewish historians, too, have gratefully and repeatedly pointed out. Pope Gregory the Great decreed that Jews should never be forced to accept baptism and that gentleness and love alone should be the means employed to induce the Jews to convert themselves. This decree became to a certain extent the programme followed by all his neighbours in their treatment of the Jews. Again and again the Popes raised their voices whenever Christians tried to use violence and to compel the Jews to accept baptism. Innocent III repeated this decree and on this occasion he could already refer to five of his predecessors in office, namely, Popes Calixtus, Eugen, Alexander, Clement and Celestin. He forbade the persecution of the Jews and stressed their right to freedom of conscience and to the free exercise of their cult. The reasons given for this decree are remarkable. "The Jews," wrote Pope Innocent III, "are the living witnesses of the truth of Christianity. The Christian must not exterminate the Jews, for by doing so he would himself lose the knowledge of the Divine Law." Later on, Pope Gregory IX repeated this decree. It may be asserted that the Jews have been treated by the Popes even much more leniently than the Protestants. Pater Constant remarks: "The Jewish Synagogue is not in error on every point as is the temple of the Protestants

which on account of its protest alone is wrong on every point." Popes Alexander II and Alexander III also protected the Jews, and the latter even commended the princes and bishops who had offered shelter and protection to the Jews when they were being persecuted. Popes Clement V and Clement VI also offered the Jews their protection. When the Jews were being accused of having caused the Black Death by poisoning the wells, Pope Clement VI pointed out that such an accusation must be unfounded since Jews just as well as Christians are being carried off by the plague. Mention must also be made of the fact that not less than five Popes, namely, Innocent IV (1247 and 1253), Gregory X (1272), Martin V (1422), Paul III (1540), and Clement XIV (the latter when he was still Cardinal Ganganelli, 1759), had expressly declared the blood-accusation to be a calumny.

When the Popes settled in Avignon, crowds of Jews wandered to this city where they found shelter and protection against the cruel persecutions to which they were exposed in all the countries of Christendom. When the Jews were expelled from Spain, Pope Alexander received a great number of them in his lands. In grateful acknowledgment of these facts the Grand Sanhedrin, which foregathered in Paris in 1807, officially registered the expression of gratitude of Jewry for the shelter and protection frequently offered to the Jews by many Popes and high ecclesiastical dignitaries.

Of what little help the protection of the Popes has been to the Jews will be evident from the chapter dealing with their persecutions. This protection could indeed not be effective, so long as the Popes placed the Jews under laws of exception for the well-known religious motives, and so long as in the prayer recited on Good Friday the Church retained the expression of "perfidious Jews"; so long as the Church accused the Jews of obstinate delusion and stubbornness and represented them as a people cursed by God for the crime of deicide.

Although the Christians of the Middle Ages were strictly forbidden by Papal decrees to ill-treat Jews, to convert them and baptize their children by force, the legal consequence of which, according to canonical law, was the

forcible removal of the child from the paternal home, it was nevertheless self-evident that in view of the teaching of the Church with regard to the Jews, the vast majority of the Christians of those dark days did not consider such a proceeding as a particularly heavy sin. Let us imagine a devout Christian mediæval knight in whose power a Jewish child accidentally found itself. He is tempted to baptize this child and thus wrest it from its parents for ever. At the same time, however, he is also aware of the fact that such an action was strictly forbidden by the Pope and that he was liable to be punished for it. What would, in the opinion of the reader, have been the outcome of the struggle in the breast of the knight? In one hundred, perhaps ninety-nine cases, the knight would have argued as follows: "As matters stand this Jewish child has come into my power. It is not an accident, but a Divine indication. If I baptize this child, our Holy Church gains a believer, Heaven has one more Saint, and I will save a soul which will now belong to God. It is impossible that God will condemn me to eternal punishment for bringing Him in this manner the soul of a child. His parents, to be sure, will die of grief, but what do I care for the grief of deicides and enemies of our Church. Of course, I am committing a sin in disobeying an express command of the Pope, but I am convinced that this sin at least will be easily forgiven unto me. Therefore let us baptize this child in God's name, for it is quite impossible that I should one day be thrown into hell because I had brought the Church and God a human soul, even if I did it in an unlawful way."

History teaches us that although the Popes were anxious to protect the Jews, they were not in a position to carry out their protection effectively, and so long as the Church was powerful, the Jews were, in spite of all, cruelly persecuted on theological grounds. The saving word, to wit, that "the Jews are human beings and therefore children of God like ourselves; that the good and honest Jew is as pleasing to God as the Christian, particularly the good Christian," this word the Papacy has never uttered and indeed dared not utter. Were the Church to declare to-day that unbaptized persons who are faithfully following the laws of their own religion will come to bliss in equal proportion with

baptized people, no missionary could soon be found ready to risk life and health, court suffering, hardship, privations, insults, even torture and most painful death, in order to gain for the Church unbelieving heathen souls. For it is not earthly fame or honour, but an indomitable craving to save human souls from the claws of the devils and an everlasting future death that drives the heroic Christian missionaries into the lands of the unbelievers, and these pioneers and champions of faith were the real founders of the great power and splendour of the Roman Church. That saving word has been spoken not by the Church, but by modern un-Christian enlightenment, for it was the latter which declared the Jews to be equals of the Christians and emancipated them.

The attitude taken up by the Roman Church towards the Jews has at least rhyme, reason and logic. There is quite another kind of Anti-Semitism in it, different from racial Anti-Semitism which, as has already been proved, is based upon the entirely wrong conception that there existed in the world anything like a Jewish race. With their skull measurements anthropologists have mathematically proved the fallacy of such an assertion and it is impossible to imagine a logically proved Anti-Semitism outside the Church. The efforts of the Anti-Semites coincide with the laws and ordinances which the mediæval Church, so long as it had the power, had carried out against the Jews.

3. The Orthodox Church

With regard to the schismatic, to wit, the orthodox Church, there is but little doubt that its conception of Judaism and its desires concerning the mode and manner of the treatment of Jews by Christians are identical with those of the Roman Church. By far the greatest and most powerful of all schismatic churches is, or at least was, as is well known, the Orthodox Church. While in all European States the Roman Church has now ceased to mix in politics and its influence on government and legislation, as compared to that which it wielded in the Middle Ages, has declined very considerably, the Orthodox Church in Russia until 1917 had retained its unbroken power.

Until the Bolshevnik Revolution of 1917 more than half the number of Jews in the world lived in Russia, where they inhabited the districts in which they were to be found long before the Russian conquest. Their civil status had been regulated anew in 1882 by laws promulgated by Count Ignatieff. In these laws it was stated that within the pale of their settlement the Jews were henceforth not allowed to reside in localities outside towns and boroughs. Excepted from this rule were the already existing Jewish colonies, Jews occupying themselves with agriculture, and certain privileged persons. They were not allowed to acquire landed property, nor to trade on Christian Sundays and holidays, and were bound to close their business on these days. This did not look so very bad at first sight. But let us consider the matter how it worked in practice, and the subsequent legal enactments in virtue of the Ignatieff laws. First of all, nearly 15,000 foreign Jews who were not Russian subjects, but citizens of foreign countries, were expelled. Furthermore, all the Jews within the pale of settlement who were not residing in towns and boroughs but in villages were expelled from their respective places of residence and crowded into the towns. The Jews residing outside the pale of settlement were ordered to leave their places of residence and emigrate into the pale of settlement. Thus in January, 1892, in a cold of 32 degrees, 2000 Jews were ordered to leave Moscow. On this occasion little children died of cold, and a woman who had given birth to a child four days previously and was surrounded by six children had to be left behind half dead in a carriage. Among the so-called privileged Jews who enjoyed the right of residing also outside the pale of settlement were counted the so-called "skilled labourers." Frequently, however, the authorities refused to acknowledge this qualification in order to prevent the unhappy victims from leaving the pale of settlement. In many instances the privileged Jews were not permitted to have their children with them. According to the Russian law a Jewish child which had attained the age of fourteen could adopt the orthodox faith even against the will of its parents. A great number of Jews were further forbidden to engage in certain honest businesses. When the Government bought

the Libau railway line, all the Jewish railway officials were dismissed. A Jewish railway engineer, Koirenski, who had served the railway company for twenty-six years, was placed before the alternative of either converting himself or sending in his resignation. He committed suicide. Thus all Jews were gradually crowded out of the situations they had occupied with the railway and steamship companies. The number of the Jews permitted to enter high schools and Universities was limited in a cruel manner. Add to this a number of government taxes which Jews alone were bound to pay. Jewesses not belonging to the privileged category were not permitted to leave the pale of settlement, but, on the other hand, Jewish prostitutes were allowed to circulate all over the Empire. Persecuted and hunted all over Russia, this unhappy people were from all sides pushed and pressed into the pale of settlement, but even there they were constantly being penned in into always narrower and narrower spaces, that is in towns and boroughs. There, too, they were forbidden to acquire landed property or to rent an estate; they were not permitted to change their respective places of residence, were expelled from the villages, turned out of the country, squeezed together more and more in the towns where they suffocated and stifled each other. The practice of their religion was rendered difficult to them, their schools were closed, and, wherever feasible, they were forbidden to enter the high schools; they were debarred from a number of honest occupations and professions and only a few business branches remained open to them to which they were permitted to devote themselves. All these restrictions naturally resulted in a terrible competitive struggle among the Jews, a constant struggle for daily bread. Their misery and distress, as may be easily conceived, became terrific.

A famous Russian statesman, after listening to a description of the misery prevailing among these Jews, is said to have replied: "What does it matter? A third of them will emigrate, a third turn Christians, and a third will die."

4. *The Protestant Church*

With regard to the Protestant Church, the believers in its fold prefer to be guided by the teaching of Luther as expounded in his work *Of the Jews and their Lies*, which appeared in Wittenberg in 1543. In this work Luther called the Jews "liars and bloodhounds, poisonous otters, spiteful serpents, children of Satan," and all this because they refused to acknowledge the christological interpretation of Holy Scripture. He advised the Christians to reduce the Jewish synagogues to ashes, "for the greater glory of our Lord and Christendom," to demolish their houses and to drive the Jews under a roof or into a stable like so many gypsies. All prayer books and copies of the Talmud, nay, even the Holy Scripture of the Old Testament should be taken away from the Jews, and they should even be forbidden to pray and pronounce the name of God under penalty of death. Their Rabbis should be forbidden to teach. The authorities should forbid the Jews to travel and should cut off the roads; the Jews should stay at home. Not only should usury be forbidden unto the Jews but all their ready money should be taken away. This money, advised Luther, should be used to constitute a fund for the purpose of supporting Jews who would embrace Christianity. The strong Jews and Jewesses should be forced by the authorities into compulsory service, urged to handle the axe, spade, rock and distaff, and made to earn their bread in the sweat of their brow and not consume it in laziness, in feasting and pomp. The Christians should harbour no weakly feeling of compassion for the Jews.

Luther further appealed to the Emperor and to the princes to expel the Jews from the country without further ado and to drive them back into their homeland.

Supposing, however, that the princes did not feel inclined to commit such a folly, he admonished the parsons and primary teachers to instil in their communities a venomous hatred of the Jews. Had he wielded any power over the Jews, Luther declared, he would have assembled their scholars and eminent men and "under the threat of tearing their tongues out of their throats, forced upon

them the proof that Christianity taught one God and not three."

Luther actually set on the robber-knights against the Jews. He had heard that a wealthy Jew, the rich Michael, was travelling through Germany with twelve horses. If the princes were not inclined to cut off the road to him and to his co-religionists, he hoped that the cavalry would gather against them, because the Christians will have learned from his booklet how depraved the Jewish people were.

Even shortly before his death Luther admonished his audience in a sermon to expel the Jews :

"In addition to this you are still harbouring in your midst the Jews who are causing great harm. Although I am afraid that the Jewish blood has now become serous and intractable, I advise you positively to insist on their converting themselves, for otherwise we will not suffer their presence in the country. Now it is a fact that the Jews only blaspheme and revile our Lord every day—therefore you shall not suffer them in the country but expel them. If they had the power to kill us all they would have gladly done so, and indeed they often do it, in particular those who pretend to be physicians. They, too, know the medicine which is known in Germany when poison is administered to someone wherefrom he must die in an hour, nay, in ten or even twenty years—this art they, too, know. This, as a child of the country, I was anxious to tell you ; if the Jews refuse to be converted we must neither tolerate nor suffer them in our midst."

If we now compare the attitude of Luther and of the Protestant Church in the Middle Ages towards the Jews with that of the Roman Church, it becomes strikingly evident that the latter behaved towards this unfortunate people comparatively more humanely and tolerantly than did the Protestant Church. Nothing is more unjust than the assertion that strict Protestantism is more enlightened, progressive and tolerant than the Roman Church.

Protestantism in itself is not a bit more tolerant and enlightened than the Roman and Greek Churches. Protestantism, however, has *laid the foundations* on which liberty of thought and enlightenment could develop ; and indeed

the most progressive scholars in the domains of Biblical Exegesis, comparative religion and many other branches are Protestants. To be sure, they are Protestants whom their own co-religionists in the Middle Ages would have burned on the stake, beheaded, skinned alive, broken on the wheel and quartered.

5. *The Church Fathers*

I should like to put a question to the Anti-Semites who are never growing tired of repeating that boundless covetousness and the habit of ruining and impoverishing the Christians by excessive usury are innate in the Jews. How is it that the Church Fathers have never raised such accusations against the Jews during the first centuries of our era? Those who doubt my words I would refer to the Library of the Church Fathers in eighty volumes, entitled: *Selections from the best Patristic works in the German Language*, edited by Dr. Valentin Thalhofer and published by Joseph Kösel in Kempten. The index of names and subjects alone fills two volumes.

Turning to the Index at the word "Jews," we find five pages enumerating the passages from the works of these fifty-five *Church Fathers* which treat of the Jews. Here is a list of the cross-references: The sacrifices and religious practices of the Jews are now valueless; tractates dealing with their rejection which had been prophesied by Isaiah; reports of their participation in the persecution of Christians; proofs of their hostility towards Christians; reports of their situation at the advent of Christ; they knew neither the Father nor the Son; complaints at their disbelief in Christ; their false opinions concerning the Messiah; reports on their sects; the duration of their sojourn in Egypt; their relations to the Egyptians; their robbery committed against the latter; they are exculpated on the ground of having committed this robbery in order to get pay for their work done in Egypt; reports on the exodus from Egypt; on the passage through the Red Sea; the passage across the desert; a happy victory; the entry into Palestine; the origin of the quails; the chronology and history of the Jews as a proof of Divine providence; the

tribulations of the Jews under the respective reigns of eight Roman Emperors; the antipathy of the philosopher Celsus; their descent from Abraham; their nature as a chosen race which adores neither heaven nor the angels; their guardian angel; the difference between their circumcision and that of other nations; why Christ had just been sent to them; their final conversion to Christianity; their impatience and their envy; their sinfulness and culpability; their tribulations are a proof of the existence of Hell; their dispersion is the furtherer of Christianity; how and to what extent the devil is their father; their nature as the spawn of the viper; the duty of the Christians to pray for them; the prohibition to convert them by force, and so on.

The list is at an end and I have omitted but little.

On the other hand, I have found no mention whatever of the Jews in the section entitled: "Usury, avarice, cupidity, and the taking of interest" in the register of the above-mentioned work in eighty volumes, although there is a question of a covetous hermit and of monks and of the usury of the clerics. If this list be correct and the eighty volumes of the work of fifty-five Church Fathers—which, by the way, I have not read entirely, as I have more interesting work to do—do not contain anything else concerning the Jews except what is mentioned in the register, it becomes clear that the Church Fathers knew as little of Jewish usury and extortion as of the famous blood-ritual, for had they known of these accusations, they would, beyond any doubt, have mentioned them. On the other hand, the Jews are reproached with gluttony; a reproach which no man to-day would dream of making. Have the Jews mended their ways in this respect or is the notorious decrease of gluttony among them to be attributed to the fact that they got incurable indigestion during the mediæval persecutions? To-day it is the turn of the Jews to reproach the Christians with gluttony, and the saying: "He gorges himself like a Goy," is a standing expression among the Jews. I wish them both a good appetite. But if the Jews were gluttons in days of yore but are no longer to-day, they must have changed their character, and if to-day they are practising usury on a very large scale, while they had practised none at all in the first centuries of our era, they

must have changed for the worst, but no reasonable man will assert that the practice of usury and extortion of money are inherent in them. On the contrary, every reasonable man will be bound to admit that they had learnt the art and learnt it well. Now who were their masters ?

In the pile of books before me, written either in favour of or against the Jews, there is also a small pamphlet which appeared at Munster in 1894 under the title : "The views and doctrines of the Church Fathers concerning the Jews, called to the minds of the Christians by H. K. Lenz." On page 11 of the table of contents I find the words : "business with Jews," and in brackets the word "usury." Overjoyed at having at last come across information concerning the Jewish practice of usury in the first millennium, I studied the chapter with particular attention and discovered *only two* statements concerning Jewish usury. One was a quotation from a poem of the Syrian Abbot Isaac of Antioch and the other from a letter of St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, who died in 368 of our era. The other passages quoted by Herr Lenz deal indeed with the money of the Jews, but contain not a word about their practice of usury. Whether Isaac of Antioch is to be counted among the Church Fathers I do not know, but anyhow he is not a star of the first magnitude. The greatest Fathers and the most hostile to the Jews are silent both with regard to Jewish practice of usury and the supposed blood ritual, just as the decree issued by Ferdinand the Catholic banishing the Jews from Spain contains no mention whatever of either blood ritual or usury. All the accusations raised against the Jews during the first millennium, A.D., have an *exclusively religious* background, a fact of which I would particularly remind the enemies of the Jews.

Anyone who will take the trouble of running through the works of the Church Fathers, and of ferreting out all the passages dealing with the Jews, will be bound to admit that these passages contain no other accusations against the Jews except such as refer to—deicide, unbelief and stubbornness. This remark, however, applies not only to the works of the Church Fathers but also to those of the lay historians of the first Christian millennium. I can confidently make this assertion, because I have perused the

greatest part of Anti-Semitic pamphlets. Even the oft-mentioned *Anti-Semitic Catechism*, which has most carefully collected all the opinions and judgments unfavourable to the Jews, in the chapter entitled: "Opinions of famous men concerning the Jews," quotes, after the hostile judgments of four Roman authors, those of three Moslems. Then the compiler makes a giant stride, for he begins with opinions expressed in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries. Why, I ask, does he omit to quote the opinions expressed from the days of Vespasian to the twelfth century? Why not include any quotations from the numerous anti-Jewish writings of the Church Fathers, of St. Chrysostom or Agobard? The answer to these questions is quite obvious. Material he might have found in abundance, but all these passages refer only to religion, and religion, in the opinion of the Anti-Semites, has nothing whatever to do with the whole question. That is the reason why the compiler of the *Catechism* passes over in silence all the opinions hostile to the Jews expressed during the first millennium and is obliged to take a leap into the twelfth century, because there only he comes across accusations which have nothing whatever to do with religion. The first hostile opinion accusing the Jews of the practice of usury and quoted in the *Catechism* was expressed by Peter Schwarz in the year 1477. I maintain, however, apodictically and categorically, that all the opinions hostile to the Jews expressed during the first millennium are exclusively of a religious nature. The accusations, as I have said, are deicide and obstinate disbelief.

6. *Deicide*

Deicide! A terrible word. For two thousand years this accusation has weighed upon the Jews, and like a curse it hunts the unhappy nation across all the lands of Christendom. What a stream of Jewish blood has flown ever since the accusation was raised for the first time, what suffering has it brought in its wake to the Jews. From a people chosen by God the Jews have become children of Satan in the opinion of the Christians; they are accursed, and all-yearly, on Good Friday, mention is made of their

crime of deicide and they are called "perfidious Jews." Genuflexion is omitted on this occasion, in memory of the fact that the Jews had scoffed at the Saviour by making mock genuflexions.

This famous prayer runs as follows :

"Oremus et pro perfidis Judæis : ut Deus Dominus noster auferat velamen de cordibus eorum ; ut et ipsi agnoscant Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum.

"Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui etiam judaicam perfidiam a tua misericordia non repellis, &c."

(In English) :

"Let us also pray for the perfidious Jews ; may the Lord our God remove the veil from their hearts so that they, too, may acknowledge Jesus Christ our Lord.

"Almighty Eternal God, Thou who dost not exclude from Thy compassion even the perfidious Jews, listen to our prayers which we offer on behalf of this deluded people, so that they see and recognize the light of Thy truth which is Christ and may be rescued from their darkness by the same Jesus Christ our Lord. . . ."

Now I venture to ask what impression these words are likely to produce on a Jew ? Personally I think that a Jew, if he be very noble and generous, will reply : "You call us 'perfidious Jews' in your annual solemn service, but we shall prove to you by our deeds and conduct how much you are mistaken and what a great injustice you are doing us." Other Jews, however, and I am afraid they are the majority, will say : "Very well, you call us 'perfidious,' all right, you shall be right, we shall be towards you as perfidious as possible."

It must further be pointed out that according to the plain text of the Gospels the Roman soldiers alone "bowed their knees to the Saviour and mocked him" (see Matt. 27, 27-32 ; Mark 15, 16-21 ; John 19, 2), while there is not a word in the Gospels concerning the mock-genuflexions of the Jews.

I suppose that even from the Christian point of view it might be objected that apart from the very long period which has since elapsed—nineteen centuries are a long time,

only a fraction of the Jewish nation had plotted against the Saviour and obtained his condemnation from Pilate, and that even if the Jews did cry then: "Let his blood fall upon us and on our children," this shout could not have been uttered by the entire nation. It was a sheer physical impossibility, considering the lack of space either in front or inside the palace for the entire shouting nation. It is further more evident from Matt. 27, 20, and from Mark 15, 11, that the multitude had been influenced and spurred on by the High Priests and the Scribes when it clamoured for the execution of Christ. Now the Torah itself says that Jehovah visits the sins of the fathers even unto the fourth generation, and in chapter 18 the Prophet Ezekiel writes that the word of Jehovah came unto him and said: "that the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; and only the soul that sinneth shall die." According to these two Divine statements, therefore, the modern Jews must have long ago become guiltless, the more so since Christ himself on the Cross prayed to God to forgive them. In their defence the Jews, too, have not omitted to point out that if Christ was destined to die on the Cross then they, that is to say those of their ancestors who had succeeded in bringing about the crucifixion, had been the mandatories of God, and had they not crucified the Saviour, the work of salvation could not have been accomplished and the Christians would have been deprived of all the blessing of redemption. There would not have been any triumphant Church in Heaven to-day. The Jews also refer to the fact that according to the Christian doctrine, the Jews are expected to convert themselves *in the end of time*, and if they did this to-day this prophecy could no longer be fulfilled. Were all the Jews to convert themselves to-day, the end of the world would become imminent, an eventuality of which no one would be pleased to hear. Thus both the crime of deicide imputed to the Jews and the stubbornness of a portion of the nation were predestined in the plan of salvation and therefore necessary, and the Jews are, therefore, not responsible. These excuses, however, as history teaches us, have not helped the Jews in the least. The Christians evidently proceed from the standpoint that the

very fact of the Jews rejecting conversion shows that they approved the deicide once committed by their ancestors. This, of course, cannot be applied to those Jews who had neither received nor could have received any instruction in the Christian doctrines, and in order that there should be no Jews who persisted in their superstition out of ignorance, the Jews were compelled all through the Middle Ages regularly to attend Christian religious instruction.

This was evidently done in order to give the Jews an opportunity of acquainting themselves with the teaching of the Christian Church, because the teachers of that Church were firmly persuaded that their doctrines were so convincing that every honest thinking and feeling man was bound to accept them as soon as he got acquainted with them, and that the Jew who, in spite of proper instruction, still persisted in his disbelief was no longer persevering in a guiltless but in a punishable error on account of his wickedness and stubbornness. To be sure, no converted Jew has ever been reproached with being a descendant of the deicides ; on the contrary, when there was cause enough to believe in the sincerity of their conversion, the converts were received with open arms into the Christian community. From this it can be inferred that subjectively the Christians were offended with the Jews only on account of their unbelief and their stiff-necked stubbornness, or objectively on account of the latter differing from their own theological views. As for deicide, the Jews were reproached with it indirectly, to wit, in so far as they sanctioned it, so to speak, by their own stubbornness.

7. *Stubborn Disbelief*

The proper arena of the discussion between Christians and Jews was of course the question of the Messiahship of Jesus Christ. The Christian preachers proceeded from the right standpoint that they must first teach and persuade the blind, stubborn and stiff-necked Jews that Christ has in fact been the Messiah predicted and announced in the Jewish sacred writings, for once the deluded people have grasped this point, Christianity will have gained its cause as to the rest.

The Jews, however, possessing as they did the sacred writings of the Old Testament, could not, in spite of the "loving" instruction and Christian teaching, grasp it so easily. They were evidently terribly hardened, so that the light found no entry into their hearts. In their wicked hardness of heart they constantly opposed to their loving Christian teachers the arguments which I will briefly enumerate. It is impossible, said those blind people, that the Messiah should already have appeared, since a great number of Messianic prophecies have not yet been fulfilled in Christ and in his time. These prophecies were :

1. The ingathering of the ten tribes and their common subordination to a King, a scion of the house of David. Cogent proof, Ezekiel 37.

2. Gog and Magog and their defeat. Ezekiel 38 and 39, and Zechariah 14.

3. The cleavage of the Mount of Olives. Zechariah 14.

4. The division and drying up of the River Mizrajim and of the Pherath at the time of the ingathering of the dispersed from the four corners of the earth. Isaiah 11.

5. The flow of living water from the Temple in Jerusalem. Ezekiel 47 and Zechariah 14.

6. Ten men out of all languages of the nations shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, we will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you. Zechariah 8.

7. The remainder of the nations shall go up to Jerusalem, and there pray before the Lord. Zechariah 8.

8. The nations will appear in Jerusalem on festivals and new moons and there pray before the Lord.

9. The extermination of the idols and their remembrance, of the false prophets, and of the spirit of impurity upon earth. Zechariah 13, Joshua 2, and Psalm 97.

10. The absolute sway of the Jewish faith and of the Jewish religion all over the world. Isaiah 45, 52 and 66, Zechariah 9 and 14.

11. One Kingdom only will exist in the world, namely, the Kingdom of the Israelites who are called the Holy Ones of God. Numeri 24, Isaiah 49 and 60, Daniel 7.

12. Eternal peace and rest will reign all over the world after the war of Gog and Magog. Isaiah 2, Micah 4, Hosea 2, Zachariah 9.

13. Peace in the land of Israel, even between wild and domestic animals; the wolf shall dwell with the lamb. Isaiah 11 and 65, Ezekiel 34, and Hosea 2.

14. Sinlessness of Israel. Isaiah 60, Deuteronomy 30, Jeremiah 3 and 50, Ezekiel 36, Zephaniah 3.

15. Cessation of the sufferings, grief and trouble in the land of Israel. Isaiah 65.

16. The Lord will once more show his love for Israel and the gifts of prophecy and wisdom will once more flourish in Israel. Ezekiel 37, 39, 43; Joel 2 and 5; Isaiah 11; Jeremiah 31.

17. Return of the prophet Elijah. Malachi 4.

18. Construction of the future temple after the plan of Ezekiel, Chapters 40-45.

19. Resurrection of the Dead. Deuteronomy 32, Isaiah 26, Daniel 12.

20. Distribution of the land among the twelve tribes. Ezekiel 47.

These prophecies, say the wicked and incredulous Jews, have not yet been fulfilled, and the Messiah cannot appear before they have been fulfilled (cf. Daniel 2 and 7, and Isaiah 60, 62 and 63).

By way of refuting the Christian doctrine, the Jews maintained that these predictions had not been fulfilled in Christ, but that later Christian authors had invented circumstances in the life of Christ for the purpose of making his biography coincide with the various prophecies. In short, the Jews remained as stubborn as possible. The best way therefore was that of rendering their lives as unpleasant as possible. The remedy was radical, for thanks to persecutions, the Jews frequently converted themselves to Christianity by the hundred, and even by the thousand; outwardly, of course, while very few only were persuaded to do so by means of sermons and instruction.

8. *Gradual Detachment*

It can easily be imagined what an avalanche of furious hatred must, in the course of time, have accumulated in the hearts of the Jews in consequence of the numerous persecutions, chicaneries, specific laws, and encroachments on their rights. It is, however, beyond all doubt that the hatred was not so intense at the beginning, but has continually increased in the course of time. Renan says that the first Christian generation was certainly thoroughly Jewish; it never dreamed of placing itself outside the Jewish nation, but considered itself as the representative of true Judaism, differing from the other Jews solely by its belief that the Messiah had already appeared in the person of Christ. These Jewish Christians never thought of abolishing the Law, but practised the rite of circumcision, observed the dietary laws, visited the Temple and celebrated the Jewish festivals. The Apocalypse of John is enthusiastic about the Jewish nation, while the Epistle of Clement Romanus is entirely orthodox Jewish. This is equally the case with other Christian writings of the time, such as the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, of Pastor Hermas and others. It was only under the reign of Marcus Aurelius that the definite breach seems to have been effected. In the time of John Chrysostom the Christians of Antioch were in the habit of visiting the synagogue on many occasions; they took their oaths there on the Holy Scriptures and celebrated the Passover together with the Jews. Biblical critics are now convinced that it was the Apostle Paul and his party who had made Christianity what it is to-day by managing to effect an abolition of the rite of circumcision and of the Jewish ceremonial laws. It was only then that Christianity ceased to be a Jewish sect.

The decrees of the Council of Illiberis forbade the Christians to have intercourse with the Jews, to contract marriages with them or to let their crops be blessed by Jews. The Council of Vannes forbade the Christian clergy to attend at Jewish banquets, which shows that a friendly intercourse must have existed between the Christians and the Jews in those days. "Even under Henry the Saint," says W. Roscher, "a ducal chaplain could embrace Judaism

without incurring any penalty other than that of "a learned refutation." Nothing is more incorrect than to imagine that the breach between Judaism and Christianity had taken place suddenly. It has been accomplished very gradually. Such, however, is the opinion of liberal and not of orthodox science.

St. Paul was for young Christianity what Omar was later for Islam. The soil for the spread of Christianity had been well prepared by the indifference and the tolerance of the numerous Græco-Jewish communities in Alexandria, in Syria and in Asia Minor, and also by the disgust which the educated Greeks and Romans felt for degenerate paganism. It was on such a soil that St. Paul appeared. He declared the observance of the Jewish religious prescriptions and in particular of the rite of circumcision as abolished.

Add to this that many Jews of little faith looked upon the destruction of the Temple as the end of the Jewish nation and thus lost faith in their religion.

Emperor Vespasian had changed the former temple tax into a sort of capitation tax which weighed so heavily on the Jews so that many of them, in order to evade the tax, renounced their faith and even made themselves an artificial foreskin. It seems that the whole order of the Essenes and all the disciples of John the Baptist embraced Christianity in those days. Thus we see that already in the Apostolic times two great parties were struggling for supremacy: the *Jewish-Christians* and the *Pagan-Christians*. The former were closely connected with Judaism, rigorously observed the Jewish Law, remembering the words of Christ that "He had not come to abolish the Law but to fulfill it, and that sooner would Heaven and earth disappear than one jot of the Law be abolished," while the latter considered the law of Moses as abolished. Mention should also be made here of the hypothesis emitted by C. F. Bauer, the founder of the Tübingen School, who says that the magician Simon Magus mentioned in Apostolic times was probably none other than St. Paul. The Pagan-Christians seem to have been in favour of yielding to and complying with the demands of pagan Rome, while the Jewish-Christians were against it.

9. *Jews and Parsis*

St. Augustine says that "the Jewish nation is like Cain, upon whose forehead the Lord had set a mark lest any finding him should kill him, and that they have been dispersed among the nations so that they may serve as a witness for the truth of the Scriptures which had foretold salvation through Christ." The Jewish nation is evidently destined to bear witness to the Messiah. Bossuet writes as follows: "God has found a way, which is a unique example in the world, of preserving the Jews outside their country and in their annihilation, and this for a longer time than the nations who had defeated them. No trace now exists of the ancient Assyrians, the ancient Medes, the ancient Persians, the ancient Greeks and Romans. Their traces have been lost, and they have been merged in the other nations. The Jews alone who had been a prey of the nations once so famous in history have outlived them." In his pamphlet *Judaism as a Proof of Christianity* the abbé Bauer writes as follows:

"From the fall of the Assyrian and Median Empires down to the ruin of Carthage, from the fall of Rome, Babylon and Ninive, down to the disappearance of the Visigoths, the Lombards and the Huns, all the dead nations confirm the same law in their equal rise, decay and disappearance. One nation, only one, ever since peoples are making history and history is dissolving nations, I say one nation alone, has given and is giving to-day before our own eyes an incomprehensible and categorical *démenti* to this universal law. This is the Jewish nation. Unique among all the peoples of the universe, the Jewish nation has lost its political independence but preserved its sacred and religious elements and even its physiognomy. This is a fact which no one could gainsay, a fact which the common herd rarely mention, which amazes the thinker and is a riddle to the historian, and which the Christian alone, illuminated by a light coming not from man but from above, can call by its true name; this fact is called a *miracle*."

To this theory which has again and again been dished up

for centuries I reply : *Sancta Simplicitas*. Is it possible to write such nonsense, to be so ignorant ? Or is it perhaps done for the purpose of mystifying the reader ? Pray, study history first ! Only when a man has mastered and is acquainted with all the events of history, with all the laws of nature and all their actual or only possible concatenations, in other words, were he to possess superhuman knowledge, which is, of course, impossible, only then and then alone could he say of a certain phenomenon : This is a miracle. In the present case, however, the words of Goethe ought to be applied : “ Of a miracle there is no trace.”

There is a second nation which had once existed as a great power for centuries, which was defeated, lost its existence as a State, was dispersed all over the world, and yet has preserved until to-day its creed, its nationality and its customs, in spite of its dispersion. This nation, as every educated man ought to know, are the *Parsis*.

Legend relates that at the very moment when in A.D. 570 Amina was giving birth in Mecca to the Prophet Mohammed, the sacred fire of the Magi suddenly went out after having burned for over one thousand years. In Ctesiphon the sea Sawa flowed down from beneath, while the palace of Chosroes Anurshivan was so shaken by an earthquake that fourteen of its battlements were smashed. In his dream the High Priest (Mobed) of the Persian Magi saw a foreign people, riding on camels and Arabian horses, cross the Tigris and overrun the plains of Persia. In his famous work *Iddhar ul Hake*, Hadji Rahmet Ullah writes that Chosroes had sent Abdul Masih to the seer Satih and asked him to explain these signs and miracles. Satih, who was then on the point of death, is said to have given the following answers to the Shah's questions :

“ When the recital (of the confession of faith) will have become frequent, when the man with the staff (Mohammed) will appear, when the sea of Sawa will have dried up and the fire of Persia gone out, then Babylon will no longer be a dwelling-place for the Persians nor Damascus a place of rest for Satih ; Kings and Queens equal in number to the smashed battlements will rule ; what must happen will happen.” Having spoken these words Satih died. When Chosroes was informed of this prophecy he is said to have

exclaimed: "Until fourteen Kings and Queens will have ruled there is still a long time!" But ten Kings succeeded each other in four years, while the others ruled until the Caliphate of Othman, under whose reign Jezdedjerd, the last Persian King, died. Shahrabanu, a daughter of this unfortunate Shah, was in the harem of Hussein, the grandson of Mohammed. The Moslems see therein a fulfilment of the prophecy announced in the forty-fifth Psalm: "Kings' daughters are among thy honourable (beloved) women." (v. 9.)

In 628 Mohammed wrote letters to the Negus of Abyssinia, to Heraclius, the Byzantine Emperor, and to Chosroes Parviz, King of Persia, wherein he summoned them to embrace Islam. The Shah of Persia tore up the letter, was rude to Abdullah Ben Hudaqah, the messenger who had brought him the Prophet's Epistle, and left the letter unanswered. When Mohammed heard this he is supposed to have exclaimed: "May God destroy his kingdom!" The Shah instructed his viceroy to send out a few discreet fellows to lie in wait for Mohammed, to seize him and bring him before his throne. The plan, however, failed.

The details which will now follow are for the most part taken from the works *Les Parsis* by Ménéant (Paris, 1898) and *History of the Parsis* by Dosabhai Framji Karaka (London, 1884).

In 641 the Arabs were victorious in the battle of Nehavend; Persia was conquered, the dynasty of the Sassanidæ came to an end, and the prophecies were fulfilled.

Thirty thousand Persians remained on the battlefield, while eighty thousand perished in a moat. The victor offered the vanquished the choice of either accepting Islam or emigrating. It is not known whether and how many Persians then died the martyr's death. In his history Karaka mentions only one martyr of the creed of Zoroaster. In 1702, at Broatsh, Nawab Ahmed Bey had given him the alternative of either becoming a Moslem or being beheaded. He preferred the latter and died heroically.

Persia became a province of the Empire of the Caliphs, and in Persia's fate the Mohammedans see a just punishment

of Heaven. Signs, wonders and prophecies, they maintain, had foretold, announced and confirmed the advent of their Prophet and his Divine message. Mohammed had invited the Shah of Persia to accept Islam and had guaranteed him, if he did so, his throne and his power, but the Shah had remained obstinate and obdurate in spite of signs, wonders and prophecies.

Thus the calamity had happened. A great many Persians were forced to embrace Islam, while many more preferred to emigrate, to abandon everything but remain faithful to their ancestral creed. They wandered out to India, first to Sanyan, whence they spread over various districts in India. A small portion only of the population which had clung to their religion remained in Persia, in the provinces of Fars and Khorasan, where they were subjected to all sorts of ill-treatment by the Moslems.

The Parsi women in Persia are well-known for their perfectly chaste life, and the men for their morality, wherefore they are preferred for work in the gardens of the Shah.

Under Nadir-Shah the unhappy people were once more placed before the alternative of either converting themselves to Islam or dying. A great many of them were massacred, while others chose conversion; their dwellings were destroyed.

In 1494 the Afghan Aga-Mohammed Khan of cursed memory conquered the city of Kirman where many Parsis lived. History records that the victor had brought before him thirty-five thousand pairs of human eyes on dishes. In the small village of Bam, Luftalikhan was taken prisoner and brought before Aga-Mohammed who tore his captive's eyes out with his own hand before putting him to death. As late as 1810 Sir H. Rottinger saw a pyramid of six hundred skulls which had at the time been erected in honour of Aga-Mohammed, the victor. The books of the Parsis were naturally condemned to the flames. The unhappy community thus led a miserable existence until 1854, when the Parsis in Bombay decided to come to the aid of the members of their own race and creed in Persia by diplomatic assistance. They founded for that purpose the Persian Zoroastrian Amelioration Fund, a society which

strongly resembles the Alliance Israélite. Thanks to the efforts of the committee, which was also being supported in England, Shah Nasreddin relieved the Parsis in Persia from the oppressive Jazia tax which they had hitherto been compelled to pay as unbelievers.

Thanks to their industry and their efficiency, the Parsis in India in time reached a high grade of education and culture. From 1872 to 1881 the Parsi population in India increased by 10 per cent. They have made themselves masters of a considerable portion of Indian commerce. Out of the 9584 beggars in Bombay, according to the census of 1881, six only were Parsis. These Aryans show a great disinclination for agriculture and particularly for military service, although in previous centuries the Persians were known to be devoted to agriculture and to be warlike. From peasants they gradually became townspeople and merchants, considering themselves, and rightly, too, as the most educated and progressive people in the whole Indian Empire. Of all Indians they come nearest to the Europeans, although they have adopted some of the Indian customs. Among them, too, as among the Jews and elsewhere, there are two great sects, the orthodox and the reformed. The Parsis are moderate, drink little and abhor drunkenness, but, on the other hand, they know no asceticism. In India, too, the Parsi women distinguish themselves by their chastity. Girls of loose habits do not exist among them. To marry is a duty among them, and monogamy is a rule. They have founded many schools and have always paid the greatest attention to education and culture. Almost every Parsi speaks English.

At the beginning of the present century the Parsi was to a certain extent still dependent upon the European for his commerce, but to-day he is the latter's equal. They are further distinguished for their great charity and also for their loyalty to England. Some of them have already been raised to the English nobility—one of them, Sir Dinsha Manakji, was created a baronet in 1890. The district over which they are scattered is very wide. Their business houses are to be found not only all over the Indian Empire but also in South Arabia, namely, in Aden, in Ceylon and Singapore, on the coast of Mozambique, in Zanzibar,

Madagascar, and since 1853 also in China, in Canton, Makoo-Hongkong and even in Australia.

That the Parsis, too, had had to suffer from commercial jealousy is evident from a work by Mandelslo, who had made their acquaintance towards the end of the seventeenth century, and who, among other things, writes as follows about them: "They lack frankness, candour and honesty, and one must take great care when doing business with them: there is scarcely a merchandise which they do not adulterate, and in every deal they try to cheat and outwit their opponents. This the Dutch and the English know quite well from experience, wherefore they employ such people who are able to discover the tricks and dodges of their own co-racials. There is no affair they do not meddle with and no goods in which they do not deal."

The Parsis were the first to introduce distillery in India. More than two centuries have elapsed since Mandelslo's travels. Thanks to English liberty, to their education, study and labour, the Parsis have risen from a small, uneducated, despised little nation scattered all over the Indian Empire to the high grade of civilization on which they find themselves to-day. They have become the most honest merchants in India, evidently because, as a result of their education, they have realized that in commerce, too, honesty and uprightness are more advantageous than dishonesty, for the merchant frequently requires credit which is more willingly granted to an honest than to a dishonest man. The Parsis, like the Jews, have their Holy Scriptures, the Zend Avesta and the Vendidad, written in the Zend language which only a very few Parsis understand. They have faithfully preserved their customs and usages at births, marriages, deaths and burials, and have never been merged in the other nations.

From the above description the reader will have gathered what an extraordinarily great similarity there exists between these two nations, the Jews and the Parsis. A good many of the details from the history of the Parsis which I have enumerated find their counterpart in the history of the Jews. Nay, there is even a striking physical resemblance between them. Just as in some parts of Europe, in Poland, Hungary and Galicia, and particularly in the small villages,

one is obliged to have recourse to the village Jew in almost everything, so one has to address oneself to the Parsi in India and partly in South Arabia. The Parsi there is what the Jew is among ourselves. As I know from experience and as during my travels in India I have repeatedly had the opportunity to notice, the Parsi keeps a small inn with rooms to let and sells to the European all that the latter requires. The Parsis, too, are dispersed all over the world and possess no country, their own having been taken from them. Like the Jews, the Parsis have had to suffer terribly from their conquerors; like the Jews, they have clung to their ancestral creed; and like the Jews, who adopted the languages of the nations in whose midst they dwelt (Spanish, German), the Parsis, too, have adopted the Guzerati language. The Jews have their Rabbis and the Parsis have their Panchayet. Like the Jews, the Parsis, too, are known for their charity and their thirst for education and expect everything from progress and civilization to which again, like the Jews, they owe their equal citizen rights, and finally, as in the case of the Jews, the concepts of nationality and religion coincide among the Parsis.

The gypsies, too, are a nation which is supposed to have been dispersed all over the world on account of a sin once committed by their ancestors, and they, too, have preserved their customs, language and usages which constitute the principal elements of nationality.

Even the Armenians represent a very ancient nation and once had a powerful State which has been destroyed. They are dispersed among all the nations, but have kept their language and their alphabet, their customs and habits, their religion and their nationality, in spite of terrible persecutions. It would be easy to quote many more similar parallels, but what has been said ought to suffice to reduce for ever to silence the absurd statements made by Bossuet and by so many others.

10. *Byzantium*

Let us now consider the history of Anti-Semitism from the time when Christianity had attained power, that is from the reign of Constantine. Long before his conversion

Constantine had intended in the first place to put an end to religious persecution in his Empire. In 312 he issued the Edict of Toleration of Milan, according to which everyone could freely and openly profess any religion without being molested. This toleration extended also to the Jews who enjoyed equal rights with the Christians. Soon, however, all this was changed, namely, the nearer Constantine was drawing to Christianity. This is remarkable indeed if we remember that Anti-Semitism, as the Anti-Semites maintain, has nothing whatever to do with religion. In 320 already, at the Church Synod of Elvira, Hosius, bishop of Cordova, forbade the Christians to hold any intercourse with Jews. Judaism is defined as a pernicious, indeed a godless sect, and an Imperial decree forbids the Jews to make proselytes and threatens to punish the intended converts. The Jews are forbidden to punish any of their co-religionists who had embraced Christianity and are threatened with the penalty of death by fire for insulting Jewish apostates. In 325 the first Council of Nicæa took place. It decreed that the Easter shall no longer be celebrated at the same time as the Jewish Passover. Constantine renewed Hadrian's decree which prohibited Jews from residing in Jerusalem. Only on the anniversary of the destruction of Jerusalem were Jewish pilgrims permitted to pray at the wall of Solomon's Temple. A new law forbade the Jews to circumcise their slaves; should they, however, do it, the slave was to become free.

Graetz writes: "The first word spoken by Christianity on the first day when it attained power expressed a hostile attitude towards the Jews. It is from this attitude that emanated the decrees of Constantine and of his successors which laid the foundations of the succeeding centuries."

Under the reign of Constantius the Jews fared even worse; Jewish teachers of the Law were exiled and many of them wandered out to Babylon. For marriages contracted between Jews and Christians and for the circumcision of a Christian slave Constantius decreed the penalty of death. He forbade the acceptance of a heathen slave into Judaism. In consequence of these specific laws the Jews attempted a new insurrection which failed. Constantius finally decreed that the possessions of a Christian

who had joined the "blasphemous" Jewish communities were to be confiscated.

Under Julian the Apostate who wanted to re-establish the old classical paganism and showed an extraordinarily hostile attitude towards Christianity the Jews once more fared well, although Anti-Semitism is supposed to have nothing whatever to do with religion. On every occasion Julian showed his preference for Judaism, was an admirer of Jewish charity and Jewish care for the poor wherefore there were no beggars among the Jews. In these days the Christians of Edessa are said to have massacred all the Jews in the city, while the latter destroyed churches in Judea and in the neighbouring lands. The Jews were also said to have threatened the Christians to cause them as much harm as they themselves had suffered from the Christian Emperors. It was under Hadrian that occurred the attempt, which ultimately failed, to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem.

The Christians attributed the frustration of the design by alleged natural phenomena to a miracle, while Julian and the Jews pretended that the Christians had caused it by underground incendiary fires kindled by them. The reader himself may decide as to which of these two versions was the more probable. In any case, as Theodore Roth says, it is rather remarkable that in spite of this miracle, the Jews nevertheless persisted in their obduracy.

Scarcely had the Emperor Julian the Apostate closed his eyes than the persecutions of the Jews again began. Towards the end of the fourth century appeared two Church-fathers who were very ill-disposed to the Jews. They were John Chrysostom of Antioch and St. Ambrose of Milan. The first wrote six discourses against the Jews wherein he called their synagogues "infamous theatres," "dens of robbers" and so forth. Ambrose uttered rather unpleasant words about the Jews.

With Emperor Theodosius II, as Graetz expressed himself, the real Middle Ages begin for the Jews.

Bishop Cyril expelled the Jews from Alexandria on account of a fight between Christians and Jews. In the city of Magona, on the island of Minorca, Bishop Severus burned down the synagogue and attempted to convert the Jews to Christianity by force. In Spain Bishop Osius

convened a Church assembly at Illiberis at which, under the penalty of excommunication, Christians were prohibited from having any intercourse with Jews, from contracting marriages with them and from having their crops blessed by Jews. These prohibitions clearly show that hitherto the relations between Christians and Jews had been of a friendly nature, that marriages were being contracted between them, that Christians even asked the Jews to bless their crops, and that it was the clergy who had disturbed this friendly intelligence for the sake of Christian orthodoxy. Many Jews of Magona who had remained faithful to their religion fled to the desert where they died a miserable death.

When Emperor Theodosius decreed that all the synagogues taken from the Jews should be restituted unto them, it was Simon Stylites who induced the Emperor to annul the decree. At the end of this Emperor's rule Jews were no longer admitted to any State offices or military dignities. The Emperor also appropriated unto himself the Patriarchal tax, to the great annoyance of Jewry. In a letter against Raphinus II, St. Jerome wrote at that time as follows: "If it is required to despise the individuals and the people, I detest the Jews with an unutterable hatred because even to-day they are cursing our Lord in their synagogues." St. Augustine, too, was anything but friendly disposed to the Jews.

In Byzantium the Jews were stigmatized as deicides. "In spite of all this, however," writes Grætz, "they were not killed, but tolerated with a view to dishonouring and degrading them, rendering them miserable and causing them to pine away so that they would serve as a warning of their deicidal deed."

When the Emperor Zeno was informed that in the course of a scuffle in the arena the party of the Green ones had among other things massacred many Jews and thrown their corpses into the flames, he remarked: "The Green party deserves punishment only because it has burned the dead Jews alone and not the living ones." The same party of the Green ones destroyed a synagogue at Daphne and massacred all the worshippers assembled there (507).

A great enemy of the Jews was the mighty Emperor

Justinian. He is the author of the law that no credence should be given to the evidence of Jewish witnesses who deposed against Christians. The evidence of the Samaritans should have no validity at all. He also forbade the latter to make any will concerning their property. Justinian further forbade the Jews to hold Divine Service on their Passover whenever this festival happened to coincide with the Christian Easter, so as not to give the impression as if Christians were celebrating the Jewish Passover. He also compelled the Jewish communities to avail themselves of a Greek or Latin translation of the Holy Scriptures in their Sabbath readings in the Synagogue, and forbade the Haggadic interpretation of Holy Writ. It is clear that by these decrees the Emperor pursued the aim of conversion and that his Anti-Semitism originated in religion. The Jews were also forbidden to recite in their synagogues the confession of Divine Unity, because this confession contained a contradiction to and a denial of the Trinity. For similar reasons the Jews were not permitted to recite the verse "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord Zebaoth" nor to read in public or to interpret on the Sabbath certain chapters from the Book of the Prophet Isaiah. In the city of Borion in Mauretania Justinian forced the Jews to accept baptism and turned their synagogue into a church.

In Cæsarea the Jews, on the other hand, massacred their opponents and destroyed the church.

In Antioch the Jews fell upon their Christian neighbours, killed them and threw them into the flames, just as the Christians had formerly done unto the Jews. Emperor Phocas sent his governor, Bonosus, to restore peace, in which he soon succeeded. It is clear that the Jews in the Byzantine Empire could have but little sympathy for the Christians.

When under the reign of Emperor Heraclius a war had broken out with Persia, and Chosroes II, King of Persia, had sent his general, Sharbarza, to Palestine and the latter had succeeded in storming Jerusalem, the Jews sided with the Persians, massacred ninety thousand Christians, destroyed Christian sanctuaries and reduced churches and cloisters to ashes. Grætz remarks on this as follows: "At a time when religion had dimmed reason and dried

up hearts, no humane feeling was to be met with in any religious party. Religious zeal and vindictiveness had fanaticized the Jews and made them anxious to remove from the Holy City all objects of desecration." In Tyre the Jews fell upon the Christians on Easter night and terrible fights arose with or without bloodshed. Grætz relates that every time the Christians at Tyre received news of the destruction of a church they killed one hundred of their captive Jews and threw their heads over the wall.

In 628 Judea became a Byzantine province. When Heraclius entered Jerusalem the monks, as we are informed by Grætz and the Patriarch Modestus, demanded of him the extermination of all the Jews in Palestine. At first Heraclius refused to grant this request, but he was finally induced to order a hunt of Jews all over Palestine and to massacre all those who could be caught. Heraclius thereupon renewed the edicts of Hadrian and of Constantine which forbade the Jews to enter Jerusalem and its outskirts. The Emperor is said to have been informed by astrologers that the Byzantine Empire would be destroyed by a circumcised nation, and as the astrologer had not expressed himself more clearly, Heraclius believed that the threatened destruction would be effected by the Jews. He therefore issued an order to massacre all the Jews except those who had accepted baptism. According to a legend, he is supposed to have written a letter to the Frankish King Dagobert and to have advised him to massacre all the Jews who refused to be converted to Christianity. In 641 the Jews even made an attempt to storm the Church of St. Sophia.

Baptism was their only means of salvation, and yet the Anti-Semites maintain that Anti-Semitism has nothing whatever to do with religion.

II. *After the Migration of Nations*

Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, also most ardently wished the conversion of the Jews. He forbade the Jews to build new synagogues or to decorate the old ones. For the rest, however, he was just towards the Jews. Grætz remarks: "The circumstance that in spite of the general

barbarism and demoralization which prevailed in those days, political and ecclesiastical literature accused the Italian Jews of no other crime than that of obduracy and unbelief, throws a favourable light upon the latter."

Cassiadorius, who lived in those days, styled the Jews "scorpions and lions, wild asses, stags and unicorns." Pope Gregory I forbade the Christians to convert the Jews by violent means, for they ought to be won over to the faith of the Church only by gentleness and persuasion. He prohibited the Christians from molesting the Jews, and only forbade the latter to acquire and possess Christian slaves. In the Frankish kingdom Christians and Jews at first lived in the best intelligence, and it was the Council of Vannes (465) which forbade Christian ecclesiastics to attend Jewish banquets because Jews invited by Christians refused to partake of all dishes on account of their religious prescriptions. The Council of Agdes (506) renewed this prohibition. Little heed, however, was being paid to either of these decrees, which circumstance, in any case, seems to speak in favour of the excellence of Jewish culinary art in those days. At the direction of Bishop Evitus the Council of Ephaone (517) extended this prohibitive decree also to the laity, forbidding them to attend festivals given by Jews, while the Council of Orleans (533) only forbade them to contract marriages with Jews.

The fourth Council of Orleans (538 and 545) forbade the Jews to appear in the streets and in the public squares during the "Holy Week." Bishop Evitus gave the Jews of Clermont the choice between baptism and emigration.

The Council of Mâcon enacted that no Jew shall be "either a judge or a tax-collector," so that the Christian population should not give the impression of being subservient to Jews. King Chilperic forced his Jewish subjects to accept baptism but contented himself with a feigned conversion. Under King Guntram, too, the Jews were forcibly converted. In 629 King Dagobert decreed that all the Jews were to become Christians or be treated as enemies.

In order to be left in peace by the Christians, the Jews of Spain invented a fable and pretended that they had come to the country long before the death of Christ and that

they were therefore not guilty of the Saviour's death. In the Kingdom of the Visigoths, too, the Jews fared badly.

King Reccared, who had exchanged the Aryan faith for the Catholic at the Council of Toledo (589), forbade the Jews to contract marriages with Christians, to acquire Christian slaves or to hold official posts; children issued from mixed marriages were to be baptized. Isidore of Seville wrote two books against the Jews. The Council of Toledo confirmed the decrees hostile to the Jews and enacted that none but Catholics were permitted to reside in Visigothic Spain. Graetz says that the clergy was delighted with these decrees because, "thanks to the piety of the King, the obstinate unbelief of the Jews would be broken."

By command of the Visigothic King Chintilla the Jews were forced to swear faithfully to observe the Catholic religion and to reject the Jewish faith. The forcibly converted Jews, however, secretly adhered to their ancestral faith. Under the reign of King Receswinth they were again forbidden to possess Christian slaves, to hold public posts, or give evidence against Christians. They were also forced to sign a document wherein they solemnly renounced their faith. Graetz relates that in 654 Toledo, the chief city of the Jews, had to sign the following declaration for King Receswinth:

Under the reign of King Chintilla the Jews had already promised to cling to the Catholic faith, but their unbelief and the inherited error of their ancestors had prevented them from acknowledging Christ as their Lord. Now, however, they voluntarily promised for themselves, their wives and their children, no longer to have anything to do with the customs and usages of Jewry. They promised no longer to have any damnable intercourse with unbaptized Jews, no longer to marry relatives (cousins), not to take Jewish wives, not to retain Jewish marriage customs, not to practise the rite of circumcision, nor celebrate Passover, Sabbath and other Jewish festivals; not to observe the Jewish dietary laws, in a word, not to practise anything which Jewish statutes and precepts and their abominable customs prescribed. They promised to believe and profess Christianity with sincere devotion according

to the Gospels and the Apostolic traditions, and to observe the prescriptions of the Church without either ruse or pretence. One thing only it was impossible for them to accomplish, namely, to eat pork ; they could not overcome their repugnance for it, but they promised to eat everything that had been cooked together with pork. Those among them who will have been found guilty of acting contrary to the promises given shall meet at their own hands or the hands of their sons with death by fire or stoning. All this they promised on oath in the name of the Trinity. The King, however, was at liberty to pardon the transgressors, in which case, however, the latter were to be treated as slaves.

King Ervig made a speech before the Church council of Toledo which contained the following passage :

“ With tears streaming from my eyes I implore this honourable assembly to manifest its zeal so that the land might be freed from the scab of degeneracy. Arise ! Arise ! I call unto you. Untie the knot of the guilty, improve the shameful conduct of the transgressors, gird yourselves with the girdle of zeal, lighten the burden and, what is more, extirpate by its roots the plague of the Jews who are again becoming obdurate in their madness. Examine the laws recently promulgated by Our Majesty against the apostasy of the Jews. For we must beware of discarding the ecclesiastical laws which have been promulgated with anathema against errors, lest we participate in the guilt of the Jews. We shall be particularly guilty if we fail to follow that law by which our glorious predecessor Sisebut has adjured all his successors not to permit Christian slaves to serve or be subjected to Jews and who had uttered a curse against the King who abolished this law.”

Ervig informed the Jews that if they, their children and the members of their families, did not within twelve months offer themselves for baptism their property would be confiscated, they would receive one hundred lashes and their heads and foreheads would be skinned. Women who let their children be circumcised would have their noses cut off.

Under Egica, Ervig's successor and son-in-law, the Spanish Jews fared even worse. At first the King tried to employ mildness, but subsequently he forbade the Jews to

possess land and horses, to be seafarers or to trade with Christians. In their despair the Jews conspired with the Moslems in Africa to overthrow the Visigothic Kingdom. The secret was betrayed and all the Jews of Spain were declared to be slaves, given away as presents to lords or distributed in the country. Children of seven were wrested from their parents and handed over to Christians to be educated. King Witzia, Egica's son, is said to have annulled these laws and to have recalled the Jews, but it was too late. The last hour had sounded for the Visigothic Kingdom. In 711 the Arabs under Tarik conquered the Kingdom after the death of the last King Roderick.

And now I ask my readers, how can one wonder at the Jews having saluted the Arabs with joy, hailed them and opened to them the gates of the cities when the latter assailed the Visigothic Kingdom?

In the Byzantine Empire Leo the Isaurian was a zealous persecutor of heretics and Jews, and in 723 he issued a decree forcing the Jews to undergo baptism. A great many of them emigrated.

In the Frankish Kingdom, on the contrary, under Charlemagne and the Emperor Ludwig, the position of the Jews was favourable until Bishop Agobard began to persecute them. The latter forbade the Christians to have any connections with Jews, "because it was unworthy of the sons of light to contaminate themselves by associating with the children of darkness"; it was unworthy, too, of the impeccable and spotless Church, which must prepare for the embraces of the heavenly bridegroom, to dishonour itself by any connection with the polluted, shrivelled and repudiated Synagogue. Agobard continued to write and to preach in this strain with a view to effecting a complete separation between Christians and Jews in their social life. It is from this time that dates his Synodical letter, composed from two books, entitled: "Of Jewish Superstition," and which is teeming with accusations against and insults to the Jews. This baiting letter, too, exclusively revolves on religious ground. This circumstance, however, did not prevent an ecclesiastic and noble at that time publicly to embrace Judaism.

In Lyons a new enemy of the Jews arose in the person

of Bishop Amolo, as is shown by his circulars. Grætz says : " So far did the mania of persecution of the French clergy go that from Palm-Sunday to the second day of Easter every bishop of Béziers exhorted the Christians of the city in passionate sermons to wreak vengeance on the Jews for the Crucifixion of Christ. On these occasions the fanaticized mob was wont to throw stones at the Jews."

In Toulouse the counts of the city enjoyed the right of boxing the ears of the president of the Jewish community on Good Friday. On one of these occasions the unfortunate president is said to have collapsed and died. In the latter half of the ninth century Ansegisus, Archbishop of Sens, expelled the Jews from the city. Charles the Simple presented all the estates and vineyards of the Jews as a gift to the Church of Narbonne. Boso, King of Burgundy, made a handsome present to the Church by presenting it with all the Jews in the country.

In Byzantium, Leo the Philosopher decreed that all the Jews were to live after Christian regulations ; heretics were to be punished by death. When Otto the Great built a church at Magdeburg he assigned to it all the revenues received from Jews and other merchants. Otto II made a gift of all the Jews of Merseburg to the bishop of that city. Henry II, too, persecuted the Jews.

12. *The Crusades*

With the Crusades began a time of the most terrible persecutions of the Jews. It would be extraordinarily remarkable, nay, even inexplicable, were the Anti-Semites right when they maintain that Anti-Semitism had absolutely nothing whatever to do with religion. Hosts of Crusaders, many of them the scum of French, English, Lothringian and Flemish countries, started, as Grætz says, their work of murdering and plundering with the Jews for want of Mohammedans. Thousands of the former were massacred. If it be true that universal history is the judgment of humanity, the Jews may triumphantly point to the result of the Crusades. The successes of the Crusades were transitory, and in the end the Church brilliantly lost the game.

In Rouen the Crusaders drove all the Jews into a church and at the point of the sword offered them the choice between death and baptism. At the news of the approaching Crusaders the Jews of Trèves killed their own children with their knives. Jewish maidens attached heavy stones to their garments and precipitated themselves into the waters of the Moselle. In Spiers the Crusaders dragged ten Jews into a church and offered them the choice between death and baptism. The Jews chose the first alternative and died as martyrs.

In Worms the Crusaders killed a number of Jews who courageously succumbed under the blows of their tormentors and died with the confession of faith on their lips: "The Lord our God is One." Only a few accepted baptism, the majority preferring death by their own hands. Women slaughtered their children to save them from baptism. And here I must add that Bishop Allebrandus—it will redound to his everlasting honour—used all his power and his influence to protect the Jews against the fury of the fanatical hordes. The bishop even offered the Jews shelter in his own palace, but finding it impossible to protect them to the end, he informed them that he was unable to do it any longer if they refused to submit to baptism. The Jews asked for a short time to consult, while outside the pious pilgrims were storming and raging. Nothing stirred for some time and the bishop gave orders to open the doors. In the room occupied by the fugitives all the Jews were swimming in their own blood; they had mutually taken their lives. On the whole eight hundred Jews perished in Worms.


In Mayence the massacre had a merry sequel. The Crusaders pulled down the gates of the episcopal residence whither the Jews had fled for shelter. Thirteen hundred corpses were carried away from the palace, while the bishop kept the treasures of the victims. Only a few of the Jews apostatized, or rather converted themselves. Two men and two girls—Urijah and Isaac with his daughters—who had accepted baptism out of fear and weakness, were driven by conscience to commit a terrible deed. Isaac slaughtered his two daughters in his house and set it on fire; thereupon he and Urijah went to

the Synagogue, set it on fire, and both perished in the flames.

In Cologne, too, the persecution of the Jews raged furiously. Mar-Isaac voluntarily chose the martyr's death. He refused to save himself, but preferred to remain at home engaged in prayer until the Crusaders dragged him into the church. When the Crucifix was held up to him he spat on it and was massacred. Here the following fact deserves to be mentioned. Hermann IV, the noble and worthy Bishop of Cologne, did his utmost to save the Jews and partly succeeded in his efforts.

In Neuss all the Jews who had sought refuge in the town were slaughtered. In Wevelinghoven Jewish fugitives from Cologne were murdered by the Crusaders. Graetz relates that Samuel ben Iechiel killed his handsome, strong son in the water, whither he had escaped. He pronounced a benediction, to which the lad answered Amen, while the onlookers pronounced the words: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is One," and threw themselves into the water. Thereupon the old man handed his knife to Menahem, the beadle of the Synagogue, and was killed by the latter. A Jew named Isaac Halevi, who had been tortured by the Crusaders and baptized while he was unconscious, drowned himself in the Rhine. In the village of Altenahr all the Jews killed each other; the last survivor mounted a tower and threw himself down. In Sinzig the Jews were massacred in the Synagogue, and equally they perished in Mörs. Many took their own lives, others were forcibly baptized. Jews were also butchered at Ratisbon. On the whole, twelve thousand Jews perished in the seven cities on the Rhine. In Bohemia the Jews were stripped of all their possessions and only just enough was left to them to keep body and soul together.

When the Crusaders under Godfrey of Bouillon captured Jerusalem they indulged in terrible carnage and massacre. All the Jews were driven into the Synagogue, which was set on fire, and the victims perished in the flames. I would advise the Anti-Semites to study the history of the conquest of Jerusalem and of Palestine by the Semitic and unbaptized Caliph Omar and the conquest of the country by the Indo-Germanic and baptized Godfrey of Bouillon and compare



A MEDIEVAL GHETTO SET ON FIRE BY A HOSTILE MOB
From a painting by Robert Fleury, 1848.

the respective conducts of the Indo-Germanic and the Semitic conquerors.

During the second Crusade the following principle was expressed :

“ If it be a good deed to kill miscreant Moslems, it could not be a sin to massacre unbelieving Jews.”

Peter of Clugny then wrote as follows :

“ Of what use is it for us to go forth to seek the enemies of Christendom in distant lands, if the blasphemous Jews, much worse than the Saracens, are allowed to deride with impunity Christ and the Sacrament in our own midst. The Saracen, after all, believes, like ourselves, that Christ was born of a Virgin, and yet he is accursed because he denies Christ’s incarnation, how much more accursed then are the Jews who deny and deride everything ? Still—I do not ask you to slay these accursed beings, for it is written in Scripture : ‘ Thou shalt not kill.’ God does not desire you to exterminate the Jews entirely, but like the fratricide Cain, they shall be preserved for more fearful torments, for greater ignominy, for a life worse than death ; they are dependent on us in misery, are sighing, are filled with dread and are fugitive, and must remain so till they convert themselves. Do not kill them, but punish them in a manner appropriate to their baseness.”

Many Jews were killed at Wurzburg. Three Jews who refused baptism suffered the martyr’s death. In Carenton, where they offered resistance, they were all massacred. And now the German Emperor stepped forward as the protector of the Jews who became his *Leibknechte*, but for this protection they naturally had to pay pretty heavily. It was at that time that a persecution of the Jews occurred at Blois, memorable for the circumstance that it was for the first time that the accusation of ritual murder was levelled against the Jews who were charged with using Christian blood for their Passover. Count Theobald then ordered that all the Jews to a soul should suffer death on the stake. They were all dragged upon a platform, and when the stake was kindled the priest summoned them to embrace Christianity. But the Jews remained adamant, and thirty-four men and seventeen women died in the flames, singing the words : “ Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is One.”

In 1191 Philip Augustus ordered about one hundred Jews to be burnt alive.

In 1189 the Jews were expelled from England. In Canterbury many Jews were killed, while others took their own lives in order to evade baptism; most of the Jewish houses were set on fire and the Synagogue was destroyed. In 1190 the Jews of Stamford were maltreated. In York the Jews resolved to choose voluntary death. They burned all their valuables, set their houses on fire and then killed each other. Joceus, the head of the community, killed his wife with his own hand, and five hundred Jews are said to have perished; none remained in York. On the following day the Crusaders murdered fifty-seven Jews at St. Edmunds. A community of proselytes counting twenty families suffered death by fire.

Under Henry IV a Jewish lunatic killed a Christian girl in the presence of a crowd of people. He was naturally put to death, and rightly, too, but this was not enough for the outraged Christians. His mother, sister and uncles were offered the choice between baptism and death. The sister turned Christian, but the mother suffered all torments and was buried alive, while the brothers were broken on the wheel and their corpses were exhibited in public. Similar horrors occurred at Spiers and at Vienna. In 1190 Pope Innocent III decreed that Jews were not to be converted by force nor be plundered, molested or killed without a proper judgment. He further forbade disturbing them during their festivals by whipping them and throwing stones at them. Their places of burial should be respected, and their dead not be disinterred and reviled. It was a very nice time indeed when such commands had to be enjoined by the highest ecclesiastical authority, but it only proves that such infamous deeds were on the order of the day. In his brief Innocent III wrote that the Jews must not be exterminated, but spared in order that they might one day prove the truth of the prophecy which foretold their conversion to Christianity. During the Crusade against the Albigenses, in the year 1200, about two hundred Jews were killed, while others were burnt alive for having made utterances insulting to the Church.

In 1210 King John Lackland imprisoned all the Jews in

his kingdom in order to extort money from them. In 1212 many Jews were slain by the Crusaders at Toledo. The Paris Synod of the same year decreed that not only should no Christian nurse suckle a Jewish child, but that no Christian midwife should be permitted to assist a Jewess in childbirth. The reason given for this ordinance was that of Christians employed in Jewish houses being likely to acquire a preference for Judaism.

The Fourth Lateran Council under Pope Innocent III decreed that every Jewish father of a family should pay an annual tribute of six silver pennies at the Easter festival. The Council further enforced the wearing of a distinctive badge, the "Jew Badge"—the men on their hats and the women on their veils.

Professor Graetz writes: "The deepest humiliation to which the Jews of Europe were subjected for six centuries dates from November 30th, 1215. The Jews gradually grew accustomed to their humble situation, lost their self-respect and self-esteem, neglected their manly carriage and courage, became more and more despicable, just as their enemies desired them to become."

In 1217 the Countess of Montmorency, the wife of Simon de Montfort, seized and imprisoned all the Jews of Toulouse with their wives and children and offered them the choice between death and baptism, but her extreme measures were never carried out. All children under six years of age she forcibly baptized. These children were never given back to their parents. Thus the hostile ordinances against the Jews, the chicaneries and baiting, on the ground of alleged child-murders and desecration of hosts, continually increased.

In 1235 as many as thirty-four Jews were murdered at Fulda by Crusaders and citizens of the community; the Jews being suspected of the murder of five young sons of a miller.

When Pope Gregory IX had given an order for a new Crusade in 1236, the Crusaders suddenly fell upon several Jewish communities in Aquitania, trampled down many of them under their horses' hoofs, never sparing either children or pregnant women, and leaving their corpses unburied to be devoured by wild beasts, burned down the

houses of the Jews and took away all their possessions. Over three thousand victims perished, and more than five hundred accepted baptism. In 1241 a fight between Jews and Christians arose at Frankfort, and a hundred and eighty Jews lost their lives on this occasion. In 1243 several Jews were tortured and broken on the wheel at Kissingen (in Bavaria), probably on the ground of the alleged use of Christian blood for the Passover. In 1246 the Church Convocation of Béziers stipulated that no Christians be allowed to employ Jewish doctors. When Louis IX of France undertook his crusade he procured himself the necessary funds by confiscating the property and collective fortune of the Jews. The saintly King altogether harassed and molested the Jews wherever he could.

In his law, Codex, Alfonso X of Spain declared that in spite of their denying Christ, the Jews were being tolerated in all Christian countries merely in order to remind everybody of the fact that they were descendants of the tribe which had once crucified Christ. The law condemned to death all the Christians who had converted themselves to Judaism, while the Jews were not permitted to hold any public post in Spain on account of the monstrous crime they had committed against Jesus. In 1279 a Church Convention at Ofen enacted several laws hostile to the Jews.

In 1283 the Christians massacred many Jews in Mayence, and a rumour spread alleging that the Jews had slain a child and drawn off its blood. The same event occurred at Brückenhausen. In Melrichstadt a portion of the Jewish community was burnt. At the same time the Jews of Munich were accused of having bought a Christian child from an old woman and slain it. A tumult arose, the Jews fled to the Synagogue which the Christians set on fire, and a hundred and eighty persons were burnt. Similar excesses occurred at Oberwesel and at Boppard. In 1288 thirteen Jews, accused of having slain a Christian child, were condemned to death at Troyes; among the victims were women and children, all of whom died stoically with the Jewish confession on their lips.

In consequence of the circulation of counterfeit coins, all the Jews in England were sent to prison in 1278, and

two hundred and ninety-three of them were hanged. On the charge of crucifying a Christian child, many Jews in London (Northampton) were arrested in 1279; a number of them were torn asunder by wild horses and their corpses were hanged on the gallows. In 1290 all the Jews were expelled from England. A captain of a vessel upon which a number of Jews had embarked in the Thames to be conveyed to the sea, led his vessel to a sandbank where he made his passengers descend. When the tide began to rise the captain and his crew re-embarked, leaving the Jews behind. To the desperate cry of the Jews he replied with derisive taunts: "Ye had better invoke Moses who had led your ancestors through the Red Sea to bring ye on dry land." The unfortunate Jews were all drowned.

In 1298 Jew-baiting once more occurred in Germany. At Röttingen the Jews were charged with the crime of having "insulted the Host by pounding it to crumbs in a mortar." Led by a certain Rindfleisch, the rabble massacred the Jews; the Jewish community of Wurzburg was entirely annihilated, and in Nuremberg all the Jews were slain. Many parents, afraid lest their children did not remain faithful to their creed, threw them into the flames with their own hands.

Would the Anti-Semites, who are always asserting that Anti-Semitism had nothing whatever to do with religion, kindly explain how it happens that in all these persecutions the Jews were able to save themselves by accepting baptism and that thousands of them had actually saved their lives in that way?

From Franconia and Bavaria the bloody persecutions spread to Austria where more than one hundred and forty communities were destroyed and one hundred thousand Jews lost their lives. Gottfried of Ensmingen says that Rindfleisch had caused the death of not less than one hundred thousand Jews.

Philip IV (le Bel) of France confiscated the possessions of the Jews and expelled them from the country (1306). His motive, however, was pure rapacity and not religion. To his coachman he made a present of a synagogue in Paris. Under Louis X (1315) many Jews, harassed by the Crusaders and threatened with forcible conversion, mutually slew

each other. In Toulouse the majority of the community was slain. On the whole, one hundred and twenty communities were annihilated in France and in Northern Spain by the crusaders of the so-called "The Shepherds'" crusade.

13. *Later Middle-Ages*

In 1321 one hundred and sixty Jews, men, women and children, were slain at Chinon on the charge of having poisoned the wells with a hideous mixture of human blood, urine, plants and a "Host." A fire was kindled in a pit, into which were thrown men, women and children, all of whom perished in the flames. . . . Mothers threw their children in first so as to save them from forcible baptism. Five thousand victims are said to have been burnt on that occasion.

In 1328 a terrible massacre of the Jews occurred at Estalla. The rabble, led by a certain Pedro Olligoyen, fell upon the Jews shouting: "Death to the Jews or conversion." Almost all the Jews in the town perished. The massacres were repeated in many other towns of Navarre, where six thousand Jews perished.

From 1336 to 1337 the slaughter of the Jews once more raged in Germany. A specially organized band known as that of the "Jew-Slayers" (or leather arms) pursued the aim of revenging upon the Jews the death of Christ on the Cross. As a result of an alleged desecrated Host, the Jews were slaughtered at Deggendorf in 1337. In the year 1348 Europe was decimated by the devastating plague known as "The Black Death." About twenty-five million men and women are supposed to have died in consequence. The Christian population naturally accused the Jews of being responsible for the universal catastrophe by poisoning the wells. Neither Mongols nor Mohammedans would ever have thought of raising such an accusation. Persecutions of Jews took place in France, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and many other countries. Terrible massacres occurred at Worms, Strasbourg, Oppenheim, Frankfort, Mayence, Cologne, Vienna, Augsburg, Magdeburg and Brussels; an everlasting stain upon the Middle Ages.

Innumerable Jews voluntarily chose death on these

occasions. In the sixties of the fourteenth century, during the wars waged in Castile under Don Pedro, the Jews were also subjected to unspeakable suffering. In 1389 a bloody persecution of the Jews occurred at Prague on the charge that a few Jewish children had insulted a priest on his way to a dying person. Again the same old story. The Jews were offered the choice between death and baptism; many were massacred, while some died by their own hands. A terrible slaughter occurred in Spain during the last decade of the fourteenth century. The result was that a number of Jews embraced Christianity. These New-Christians were called Marranos (Damned). To all appearance they professed Christianity which, of course, they hated in their hearts. In 1391 a terrible carnage again occurred at Seville, and only a few remained of the rich community which had consisted of nearly thirty thousand souls. Four thousand Jews perished, while most of the others accepted baptism. Most of the twenty-three synagogues in Seville were destroyed and others were turned into churches. From Seville the persecution spread to the neighbouring cities and villages, to Carmona and Ecija, where not a single Jew remained. Seventy Jewish communities were visited by this persecution. In Valencia two hundred and fifty Jews were slain and only the Jewish community of Murviedro escaped. The furious persecution reached the island of Majorca, and three hundred victims fell in Palma. Now came the turn of the Jewish community of Barcelona where two hundred and fifty Jews met the fate of martyrs, many took their own lives, while eleven thousand were converted. Then came the turn of the Jewish communities of Burgos and Lerida. A great many of the hunted Jews fled to Portugal. It was at that time that the second expulsion of the Jews from France took place. From 1411 to 1414 the Jews in Spain were subjected to terrible sufferings. They were ordered to reside in specially indicated quarters, ghettos, wear a specific garb, and were not allowed to clip their beards. Great misery prevailed among the Jews; children died on their mothers' laps of hunger and cold. The Synagogue in Salamanca was turned into a church by the name of "The True Cross." A number of egregious laws followed. On

the whole, twenty thousand Jews were forcibly converted to Christianity in Castile and in Spain. It was about this time that the Christian war against the Talmud and its concomitant writings began.

Never, perhaps, since the existence of the world have men offered with a greater heroism such a passive resistance to the rage and the frenzy of their dear fellow-men than did the Jews during the terrible persecutions of the fourteenth century. With very few exceptions they disdained to save property, family and life by renouncing their faith.

In 1415 Pope Benedict XIII issued a bull hostile to the Jews which, however, contained one point in their favour. They were not to be forcibly converted, tyrannized or slain, which clearly proves that such crimes were on the order of the day.

During the Hussite wars the Jews were being accused by the Catholics of having secretly supplied the Hussites with money and arms. By the command of Archduke Albert of Austria all Jews were seized and imprisoned in 1420. Three Christian children went on the ice which broke and they were drowned, but it was sedulously bruited that the Jews had slain them for ritual purposes. The possessions of the Jews were confiscated, three hundred Jews were burnt alive in Vienna, while many heroic souls preferred suicide to baptism. Archduke Albert issued an order forbidding Jews henceforth to reside in Austria. A great many Jews accepted baptism, among them being a youth who became a favourite of Duke Frederick, afterwards Emperor of Germany, and lived at his court. The youth, however, soon repented of his apostasy, and all the efforts of the Duke to dissuade the lad from returning to his ancestral faith proved of no avail. He even sent dignitaries of the Church to persuade the boy to cling to the Christian religion. All this proved of no avail and the last argument of theology, namely, the stake, was resorted to, and the youth was promptly burnt alive. He died with a Hebrew song on his lips. In the meantime the army of Crusaders sent out against the Hussites vented their fury upon the Jews.

All this, however, does not trouble the Anti-Semites

in the least, and they continue to assert that Anti-Semitism had nothing whatever to do with religion. I wish them luck and do not grudge them their joy.

In 1435 a new persecution of the Jews took place on the island of Majorca, whereby a great number of men, women and children, embraced Christianity under torture. From the gallows the Jews were marched off in solemn procession to the church and baptized; then a Te Deum was sung, which put an end to the Jewish Community of Palma. And so the merry-go-round continued.

Particularly hostile to the Jews was the monk Capistrano, thanks to whose activity forty-three Jews were burnt at the stake in 1453 on the charge of an alleged ritual murder. At this time Poland was ruled by Casimir IV, an enlightened Prince who was friendly disposed to the Jews. Among other laws he decreed that a Christian who had brought the charge of ritual murder against an individual Jew was obliged to prove his accusation by native and trustworthy witnesses, both Jewish and Christian. If the Jew was found guilty, he alone was to suffer the penalty without dragging in his co-religionists. Should, however, the Christian accuser not succeed in proving his accusation, he was himself to pay the penalty of death.

In 1453 the Byzantine Empire was conquered by the Turks, and a number of Jews who had fled from Spain are said to have lent assistance to the Turkish army on this occasion, just as they had rendered all possible assistance unto the Arabs in their conquest of the Visigothic Kingdom in Spain. No reasonable man could blame the Jews for their action after the treatment which had been meted out to them. In the Turkish Empire the Jews fared splendidly. They had already obtained permission to build a synagogue in Zion, when the Pope issued a bull wherein he forbade all Christian shipowners to convey the Jews to Palestine.

In 1467 a new carnage of the Marranos, that is of the Jews who had been forcibly converted to Christianity, occurred at Toledo, at which 1600 buildings were reduced to ashes and 4000 neo-Christians perished in the flames. And now came the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic, eternally accursed, as far as the Jews are concerned. A rumour

spread alleging that the Jews of the small community of Sepulveda had tortured and crucified a Christian child. New carnages and slaughters were the result. During the Easter week of 1475 occurred the famous case of Trient. The Jews were charged with having tortured, slain and thrown into the water, a three years old child. Under torture the Jews confessed everything they were required to say. They were burnt alive; the Jewish surgeon Tobias took his own life, while four persons became Christians and were consequently pardoned. The result of this event were Jew hunts in Ratisbon and in other localities, and a number of charges of ritual murder.


In 1478 the Bishop of Passau ordered the execution of a number of Jews on the charge of the desecration of the Host.

14. *The Inquisition*

Terribly did the Spanish Inquisition proceed against Marranos and Jews. In a suburb of Seville a special platform had been erected for the burning of Jews and heretics known as the "el Quemadero scene of conflagration." Scarcely had the Inquisition against the Jews been established, when the burning began. Graetz writes: "For three centuries Europe witnessed the terrible spectacle of the smoke of carbonized innocent victims ascending to the sky." Such a public burning was called an "auto-do-fe," that is an "act of faith."

Twenty-three Marranos were burnt in Aracena and in less than one year two hundred and eighty Marranos met the same fate at Seville. The reason was that while outwardly and apparently they were leading a Christian life, they professed Judaism in secret. Many of the victims died steadfastly and never even attempted to deny the fact that in their hearts they had always remained faithful to their ancestral creed.

All the citizens of the country were bound by order of the Inquisition to indicate, within three days, the names of all persons whom they knew to be guilty of Jewish heresy or of a relapse into Judaism. According to Graetz the signs which helped to detect the said crimes were the following: "When baptized Jews still entertained the



E. Moyses

HERETICS AND JEWS BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL OF THE
INQUISITION IN 1481

hope in a Messiah, when they considered the law of Moses as effective for salvation as was Jesus, when they had celebrated the Sabbath or any other Jewish festival, when they had practised the rite of circumcision on their children or observed the dietary laws. When someone had put on a cleaner shirt on a Sabbath, spread a tablecloth on his table, abstained from kindling a fire, had walked without shoes on the Day of Atonement or begged someone for forgiveness, when a father had laid his hands on the heads of his children without making the sign of the Cross, when someone had turned his face to the wall during prayer or moved his head ; when he had spoken a benediction over a cup of wine and offered it round to the guests at his table to taste.

“ The strongest ground for suspicion and a reason for accusation was of course the omission of usages instituted by the Church. When a New-Christian after reciting the Psalms had omitted to add at the conclusion the words : ‘ Glory to the Father, the Son,’ and so forth, or when he had partaken of meat during Lent ; when a woman had omitted to present herself in the church forty days after her delivery, or when parents had given a Jewish name to one of their children. Even actions of an innocent character, but which happened also to be Jewish customs, were considered as signs of heresy. When someone had either received gifts from a Jewish table on the Feast of Tabernacles or sent out such gifts ; when a new-born babe was bathed in water wherein gold or grains of corn had been placed, or when a dying person had turned his face to the wall at the moment of drawing his last breath.”

Particularly dire was the distress of the Jews when Thomas de Torquemada was appointed General Inquisitor. Forty Marranos were burnt on the stake, and among them the Canon Pedro Fernandez de Alcantete who, although born in the Christian faith, had embraced Judaism. Heavy and painful penances were inflicted upon several Marranos, and many of them were not allowed to appear in public, either during one year or perpetually, other than wearing a penitential shirt. It was of a reddish brown colour, with a cross painted at the back. Penitents were exhibited in public.

In 1487 twenty-three Marranos were burnt alive, and among them one canon. The next year more victims fell in Toledo ; on one occasion twenty men and seven women. The bones of dead Marranos who, it was believed, had died as secret followers of Judaism, were exhumed and burnt. The remains of one hundred Marranos were thus burnt on one day in Toledo. During the thirteen years of Torquemada's rule as Grand Inquisitor, from 1485 to 1498, at least 2000 Marranos were burnt alive and more than 17,000 were outlawed. On the charge of the alleged crucifixion of a child, seventy Marranos were burnt in Ovila in the course of one week, some of them who had managed to escape in time, only in effigy. Secret sympathies and connections naturally existed between Jews and Marranos.

In 1492 the famous expulsion of all the Jews from Spain took place. The reason assigned for this expulsion was the dangerous and outrageous crimes committed by the Jews against the Christian faith. The Edict of Ferdinand and Isabella which had decreed the expulsion of the Jews accused them of no other crime than that of remaining faithful to their own faith and of encouraging the Marranos, members of their own race, to do likewise. And thus religious reasons alone were the cause of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain. How does the Anti-Semitic assertion now sound when it maintains that Anti-Semitism had nothing whatever to do with religion ? In the course of the last four years preceding the expulsion of the Jews, over forty men and over twenty women were burnt at Toledo, and among them were one secular priest and two monks. One Marrano woman loudly proclaimed on the stake that she wanted to die as a faithful follower of the Law of Moses which was the only truth. Her last word was *Adonai*. Very many Jews were naturally baptized by force, while three hundred thousand left the country. Most cruelly did the Genoese sailors treat the fugitives who had entrusted their lives to them and threw many Jews into the sea.

One captain of a vessel tried to violate the daughter of a Jewish fugitive ; the mother herself threw the girl into the sea and then followed her with her remaining daughters.

Very cruelly, too, were the fugitive Jews treated by the Portuguese King John II. He sold many Jews into slavery, while children between the ages of three and ten were wrested from their parents and transported to the Lost Islands (the Island of St. Thomas), there to be brought up in the Christian faith. One mother, from whom seven children had been wrested, flung herself at the feet of the King and entreated him to restore to her at least the youngest. The King directed his servants to drag her away, "like a bitch from whom her young were being wrested."

Under King Emmanuel the Jews were forbidden to hold Divine Service publicly, and their synagogues were closed. In 1497 the King gave an order to kidnap all Jewish children who had not yet passed the age of fourteen and to baptize them by force. Terrible was the despair of the parents. Once more the well-known scenes of sorrow repeated themselves. The agonized parents slew their children and then took their own lives. Thousands of Portuguese Jews outwardly became Christians, while many died the martyr's death, and among them was Simon Maimi. In 1498 Charles VIII expelled the Jews from Provence.

In Turkey the Jews had happy days. Spanish Marranos manufactured canons, fire and powder for the Turks and taught them the art of war. In this manner the Turks were enabled to arm themselves against the Christians. Emperor Maximilian expelled the Jews from Upper Austria, and under his reign many cases of Jew-baiting occurred. In 1499 the Jews were expelled from Nuremberg, but were hospitably received in Poland.

It was at the beginning of the sixteenth century that the famous fight concerning the Talmud took place between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn. In the meantime the Reformation came. Luther, who had at first been favourably disposed towards the Jews, soon changed his opinion, but there is hardly a subject on which Luther had not changed his views. One has only to compare what he wrote at the outset of his career about the Catholic Church and the Papacy with the words which he hurled against them towards the end of his life.

In 1506 a new carnage of Jews occurred in Portugal and lasted several days. Between five and six hundred Marranos lost their lives. Pregnant women were thrown from the windows on the pikes of the mob below, and the embryo was hurled into a distance. Between two and four thousand Marranos are said to have perished. Persecutions of Jews also took place in Italy, in the district of Milan. In 1532 the Jew Molcho, who had become a Christian, but had again apostatized, was condemned to be burnt alive as a heretic. Molcho was gagged, and when the hangman's assistants prepared to throw him into the flames a messenger arrived from the Emperor, removed the condemned man's gag and promised him pardon if he would return within the pale of the Church. Molcho, however, replied that he had for a long time been longing for the martyr's death and was happy to ascend as a sacrifice on the altar of the Lord. He was only sorry to have been a Christian in his youth and hoped that his soul would ascend to God.

In the meantime the Inquisition was raging in Lisbon under the Judge Juan de Mello. De Mello had himself drawn up for the King a report of the scene at the funeral pyre and described it in the following words :

“The glorious procession consisted of one hundred condemned, headed by the secular judge and accompanied by the clergy of two dioceses. Arrived at the place of execution, the hymn ‘Veni Creator Spiritus’ was sung. Thereupon a monk mounted the pulpit, but his sermon was short, the work awaiting us requiring much time. The names of the condemned were called over, first of those who had been sentenced to banishment and terms of imprisonment, then of those condemned to perpetual jail, and at last the names of those who had been sentenced to death. There were twenty of them. Seven women and twelve men were bound to the stake and burnt alive, and only one woman who had made a convincingly repentant confession was pardoned.”

De Mello, the inhuman judge of heretics, remarked that on the day of the human burnt-offering the sky was full of splendour in contra-distinction to the preceding stormy days, as if Heaven itself was graciously smiling upon the bloody tribunal. He added that a number of such sinners

were still lying in the jails and would soon be dragged to another funeral pyre. The King was worthy of his servants ; he rejoiced in the death of the sinners.

One circumstance alone produced a deep impression upon the callous Mello. In sight of the stake the victims neither uttered a sound nor shed a tear, but calmly bade each other farewell, parents to their children, wives to their husbands, brothers to brothers, as if expecting soon to meet again. Fathers gave their children their blessing in the supreme hour, and married couples kissed one another farewell.

15. *Modern Times*

In the year 1550 all the Jews were expelled from Genoa, and in 1553 new accusations were raised against the Talmud, copies of which were burnt by hundreds and thousands. In 1555 Paul IV issued a bull wherein the Canonical legal restrictions of the Jews were re-established. The ghettos, the law which forbade Jews to employ Christian nurses, to have communion with Christians, to eat and drink with them, were renewed. The Jews were ordered to wear green caps, the Jewesses a veil of a similar colour. Jews were not to be addressed with the word "signor," and Jewish physicians were forbidden to attend Christian patients. The religious vexations naturally constituted a concomitant of these laws. In 1556 twenty-four Portuguese Marranos were burnt at Ancona ; they died with the words "The Lord our God is One" on their lips. In 1559 Hebrew books were burnt *en masse*. A fire broke out at Prague in 1559 and many Jews, including feeble women, were thrown into the flames and their possessions were plundered. In the same year the Jews were expelled from Lower Austria and Görz, and in 1561 from Prague. In 1570 the Jews were expelled from the Papal territory and most of them emigrated to Turkey and Poland. In the latter country the enthusiasm for Judaism became so great that many Christians embraced the creed of Israel. Catherine Zelazewska, the widow of a councillor, embraced Judaism, was naturally burnt at Cracow, but joyfully suffered the martyr's death. In 1603 Fra Diego de la Asumçao, a Franciscan monk of ancient Christian descent, embraced

Judaism. He was kept in jail for two years and then burnt at Lisbon in the presence of the Viceroy.

It was about this time that numerous Jews emigrated to Holland, which country became a haven whither they could flee from persecution. In Germany, on the other hand, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Jews were still treated like vile and infamous creatures who deserved no pity; mud was being thrown at them and their beards set on fire. There were only three or four important Jewish communities in Germany in those days, viz. Frankfort, with about two thousand Jews; Worms, with fourteen hundred; Prague, with ten thousand, and Vienna with three thousand souls. All these communities had constantly to suffer from all sorts of vexations. They were not permitted to employ Christians as domestic servants or nurses and were compelled to wear the distinctive Jewish badge and a specific headgear. This was particularly the case in Frankfort where they were obliged to have specific sign-boards on their houses with odd names and signs, as for instance: "To the leek, to the ass, to the green or white shield, Rothschild"—and so forth.

In 1614 the Jews were again expelled from Frankfort and all their possessions were confiscated. Not less hard were the vexations and tribulations of the Jews of Worms. Vienna discovered a way how to use the Jews as a financial source for the war. Wealthy Jews were appointed court Jews, and it can easily be surmised what price they had to pay for this honour. At the capture of Prague by the Protestants and later on by Wallenstein the Jews met with little unpleasantness.

In Poland the Jews had thoroughly deteriorated and sunk into the deepest state of demoralization. They were on the side of the nobility and the clergy and oppressed the poor people—namely, the Cossacks—in the most cruel manner. This led to bloody carnages of Jews. A certain Zinwii Bogdan Chmielnicki placed himself at the head of the Cossacks and goaded on the whole Ukraine to a fanatical war against Poland. He made an alliance for that purpose with the Tartars who were commanded by Tugaibey. Chmielnicki defeated the Poles, put them to flight, plundered the country east of the Dnieper between Kiev and Poltava

and massacred the Jews *en masse*. Several thousands of Jews lost their lives in those days. Many Jews formally embraced Greek—orthodox Christianity, while others surrendered to the Tartars, who sold them as slaves to Turkey where they were released by the Turkish Jews.

On this occasion a terrible carnage took place at Tulchyn in 1648. The Poles, after having robbed the Jews of all their possessions, offered them the choice between death and baptism, but none would apostatize. In the presence of the Polish nobles about fifteen hundred Jews were tortured and died for their faith. Equally steadfast in death were the Jews of Homel where about fifteen hundred men, women and children suffered the martyr's death. Similar carnages took place in other localities of Poland where some communities were utterly annihilated. This persecution affected not only the Jews, but also the Catholics.

In Spain, in the meantime, the religious persecution raged furiously and magnificently at the beginning of the seventeenth century. In 1632 Philip IV celebrated a big *auto-da-fé* in the presence of the court and the foreign ambassadors, the reason for it being the alleged insult to the image of Jesus. Even at Lima, in Peru, sixty-three Jews were condemned by the Inquisition, and seventeen Marranos were burnt alive, and among them a physician, Francisco Maldonad da Silva, who had not only publicly embraced Judaism, but even preached it.

In Mexico, too, both a Marrano and a Christian noble of the name of Don Lope de Vera y Alarcon de San Clemente, suffered the martyr's death. The latter was twenty years of age when he embraced Judaism. He was thrown into jail, renounced his noble name and called himself Judah the Believer. Neither the supplications of his parents nor the persuasions of the clergy were of any avail. He languished in jail several years and was burnt on July 25th, 1644. In the midst of the flames he loudly recited the words of the Psalmist: "Into Thine hand, O Lord, I commend my Spirit." In a letter to a certain countess, the Inquisitor Moscoso is supposed to have made the following remark: "Never has such a yearning for the martyr's death, such a confidence in and conviction of eternal bliss been witnessed

as in the case of Lope." Equally steadfast in death was the young Marrano Isaac de Castro Tartas at Lisbon in 1647. He seems to have been decided to suffer the martyr's death for the glorification of his faith. He, too, called out from amidst the flames: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is One."

In 1654 ten Marranos were burnt in Cuenca and twelve in Granada.

Famous is the great *auto-da-fé* which took place in Madrid on June 30th, 1680. Sixteen masters and their assistants are said to have worked for several weeks erecting boxes, seats and stands for the court, the nobility, the clergy and the people. Four weeks previously the date fixed for the merry festival had been announced all over the city. Graetz describes the scene as follows:

At last the day (Sunday, June 30th, 1680) so eagerly awaited and longed for by the population of Madrid and the spectators who had poured into the city from abroad arrived. Such a large number of victims of the Inquisition had not been seen together for a long time: One hundred and eighteen persons of both sexes and of all ages. Seventy or more 'Judaisers' the various tribunals had furnished; the other victims were so-called witches, men who had more than one wife, a married priest and similar criminals."

"I had not the courage to witness the execution of so many martyrs," wrote the Marquise de Villars to her husband. "I have been told that it was a terrible spectacle. The cruelty shown at the execution of the martyrs is indescribable." "I did not go to the *auto-da-fé*," wrote another French lady, "the sight of the condemned being led to the place of execution had already made me suffer. But you must not imagine that such a cruel example had in any way affected the Jews. There are still many of them in Madrid."

In 1682 three Jewish martyrs were again burnt alive at Lisbon.

At the siege of Vienna by the Turks the Jews were suspected of secretly supporting the former. In Hungarian Brody the population massacred a small Jewish community for this reason, and persecutions took place at Padua on the same charge. It is noteworthy that at the same time

three Christians embraced Judaism at Amsterdam. But the light of the age of enlightenment had already dawned and before this light that of the stake paled. Jew-hatred continued, however, and it continues until to-day. But wherever it appears it bears the character of arbitrariness and no longer that of legality.

16. *A Martyr People*

In his *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, Lecky writes as follows :

“Certainly the heroism of the defenders of every other creed fades into insignificance before this martyr people, who for thirteen centuries confronted all the evils that the fiercest fanaticism could devise, enduring obloquy and spoliation and the violation of the dearest ties, and the infliction of the most hideous sufferings, rather than abandon their faith. For these were no ascetic monks, dead to all the hopes and passions of life, but were men who appreciated intensely the worldly advantages they relinquished, and whose affections had become the more lively on account of the narrow circle in which they were confined. Enthusiasm and the strange phenomena of ecstasy, which had exercised so large an influence in the history of persecution, which have nerved so many martyrs with superhuman courage, and have deadened or destroyed the anguish of so many fearful tortures, were here almost unknown. Persecution came to the Jewish nation in its most horrible forms, yet surrounded by every circumstance of petty annoyance that could destroy its grandeur, and it continued for centuries their abiding portion. But above all this the genius of that wonderful people rose supreme. While those around them were grovelling in the darkness of besotted ignorance ; while juggling miracles and lying relics were the themes on which almost all Europe was expatiating ; while the intellect of Christendom, enthralled by countless superstitions, had sunk into a deadly torpor, in which all love of enquiry and all search for truth were abandoned, the Jews were still pursuing the path of knowledge, amassing learning, and stimulating progress with the same unflinching constancy that they manifested in

their faith. They were the most skilful physicians, the ablest financiers, and among the most profound philosophers ; while they were only second to the Moors in the cultivation of natural science. They were also the chief interpreters to Western Europe of Arabian learning. But their most important service, and that with which we are now most especially concerned, was in sustaining commercial activity. For centuries they were almost its only representatives.”¹

History records but few measures which have caused such terrible misery, afflictions and distress, so that an old historian can hardly be accused of exaggeration when he compares the sufferings of the Spanish Jews to the horrors which their ancestors had witnessed and suffered at the destruction of Jerusalem. Within three short months all the Spanish Jews who had not converted themselves to Christianity were compelled, under pain of death, to abandon the Spanish soil. Although they had been allowed to sell and dispose of their property, they were forbidden to carry away gold and silver from Spain, and this measure rendered them a helpless prey to the rapacity of their tormentors. Numerous Jews who had fallen into the hands of the pirates swarming round the coast were robbed of their possessions and sold into slavery ; innumerable Jews died of hunger and pestilence, were tortured with unspeakable cruelty by African savages or cast back by storms to the Spanish coast. Tender women were driven from luxurious homes amidst the orange-groves of Seville and Granada, children just weaned from their mothers' breasts, hoary old men, the sick and the infirm, perished by thousands. About eighty thousand men, trusting to the promise of the King, had fled to Portugal, but here, too, the hatred of the Spaniards pursued them. A mission was organized. Spanish priests lashed the Portuguese into fury, and the King was prevailed upon to issue an edict which threw that of Isabella into the shade. All grown-up Jews were banished from Portugal, but all the children who had not yet attained the age of fourteen were wrested from their parents in order to be brought up as Christians.

¹ Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, Vol. II, pp. 279-281.

Now indeed the cup of bitterness was full to the brim. The joyful resoluteness and serene fortitude, with which the fugitives had borne so many and such grievous afflictions, subsided and gave way to the wildest paroxysm of despair. Heartrending cries of pain filled the country. Women hurled their children into deep wells or tore them limb from limb rather than resign them to the Christians. And when, childless and with broken hearts, they finally left the shores of Portugal, they found that the departure of the vessels had purposely been delayed, and as the time allotted for their own departure had expired, they were sold into slavery or forcibly baptized. Thanks to the gracious and merciful intervention of Rome, the majority of them finally regained their liberty, but their children had been wrested from them for ever. A shout of joy filled the peninsula and proclaimed to the world that the triumph of Spain was complete.

“All these laws,” writes Herder, “which consider the Jew to be worse than cattle, which do not trust him one step and daily, nay, hourly, call him dishonourable, prove the continued barbarism of the State which tolerates such laws bequeathed to us by the barbarous ages. Montesquieu is right when he says that by its violent and ugly conduct towards the Jewish nation of Europe, the former barbarism had contributed to the corruption and perversion of the character of the Jewish race which, according to history, cannot be denied. It is therefore the duty of the Europeans to atone for the guilt of their forebears and to render once more worthy of honour those who had become dishonourable through the faults of the former.

17. *Abyssinia*

Even the Abyssinian Church took it into its head during the latter half of the last century to persecute the Jews (the Falashas) on account of their religion. Until the accession of King Theodoros the Jews were allowed to hold official posts, but Theodoros, who strove to establish the unity of cult, forcibly dismissed them from these posts. Then, as Halévy informs us, arrived the Christian missionaries who set every spring in motion to convert the Jews to

Christianity, to exterminate the Jewish religion and to carry the news to Europe of the fall of Abyssinian Judaism whose last hour had sounded. Many Jewish priests were summoned to Gondar to the Palace of the Negus there to have a religious dispute with the Christians in the presence of the King. An intense agitation was carried on against the Jewish religion and panic spread among the Falashas, many hundreds of whom accompanied their priests to the royal palace. The dispute had begun and the disputants were growing excited. The Jewish priests persisted in their opinions and refused to be convinced by the arguments of their opponents. Indignant at the resistance of the Jewish priests, the Negus commanded his soldiers to take aim at them with their arms. At this moment all the Falashas rose up like one man, bared their breasts and called to the irate king: "Shoot, O King, we are all ready to die for our religion." The chivalrous Theodoros thereupon dismissed the Jewish priests loaded with gifts.

Thereupon thousands of Falashas, afraid lest such incidents be repeated, left their homes with the intention of emigrating to Jerusalem. This exodus naturally proved unsuccessful; most of the pilgrims perished, while a small number, utterly exhausted, returned to their old places of residence. Halévy, who had published a highly interesting report on the Falashas in Abyssinnia in 1868, wrote as follows about this persecution: "Europe has as yet no idea what streams of tears and blood the Apostles of Salvation have caused to flow in these distant regions."

I have thus finished my description of the terrible persecutions which the Jews have had to suffer from the Christians. The reader, I am sure, will share my satisfaction to have turned the back on these dreadful places and abodes of blood and tears.

The Jews who had remained faithful to their ancestral creed through all these persecutions, who preferred to suffer scorn, disdain and contempt, to be penned up in the ghetto, to wear the disgraceful Jew-badge, to submit to all the restrictions of their civil rights, nay, to suffer prison, persecutions, poverty, misery, torments and the rack and even steadfastly suffered the most painful of deaths, these Jews were certainly anything but cunning. Nothing

prevented them from following the example of so many members of their race by formally embracing Christianity, while quietly continuing to believe in and cling to their Mosaic religion, for no man can probe the human heart. They did not do it; that was unwise, and I am genuinely sorry for them. But in this steadfastness lie such a gigantic heroism, such a supernatural, divine greatness, such a majesty of character, that I cannot help bowing low to those martyrs with reverence and unbounded admiration and exclaiming, instead of "Jew, Jew, hep, hep, hep": "Judah, Judah, hip, hip, hurrah."

CHAPTER IV

JEWS IN NON-CHRISTIAN COUNTRIES

I. *Mohammed*

WE shall now consider the relations which existed between the Jews and the non-Christian nations. Our investigation has shown that the Anti-Semitism of the Greeks and the Romans was due to the behaviour and the conduct and also to the opinions held by the Jews in those days and that their opinions were exclusively the result of their religion. In the history of the relations existing between Jews and Christian peoples I have proved that the persecutions to which the Jews have always been subjected originated exclusively in a religious fanaticism.

It now only remains for me to study the sentiments harboured and shown towards the Jews by the non-Christian nations in the Middle Ages, sentiments which are still being harboured in modern times. We shall first of all consider the history of the Jews in the Moslem countries and then that of the Jewish communities in India and in China.

In a previous chapter of this work I have already referred to the spread of the Jews in Arabia. The Jewish tribes differed but little from the numerous heathen-Arab tribes in the days before the appearance of Mohammed. Mohammed has borrowed the greatest part of his teaching from Judaism, and it may safely be asserted that Islam is nothing but a reformed Talmudic Judaism plus the Divine mission of Mohammed. Mohammed has borrowed the principal contents of the Koran first from the Talmud, then from the Torah and the Gospels, to wit, the Apocryphal Gospels. His earliest doctrines in particular bore a thorough Jewish colouring. At the beginning of his great

career the prophet left no stone unturned in his attempt to gain over the Jews. He gave them to understand that he was anxious to further the spread of Judaism in Arabia. On his arrival in Jathrib, the later Medina, in 622, on his flight and escape from the Koreishites of Mecca, he concluded a formal alliance with the Jews. For their sake he declared Jerusalem as the Kiblah, that is the direction to be observed during prayer, and he fixed the Jewish Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) as a Mohammedan fast day. At a closer acquaintance, however, the Jews grew more and more disappointed. Mohammed's insatiable sexual excesses, his sensuality and his epicureanism in particular, aroused doubts in the minds of the Jews as to the genuineness of his prophetic mission. "By heaven," said the Jews, "no dish ever satiates him and he cares for nothing but women." The circumstance, too, that in the opinion of the Jews a true prophet of God could manifest himself only in Palestine, and also the fact that Mohammed partook of the flesh and the cheese of camels, repulsed the Jews and alienated them. Mohammed's chief opponents were Jews Pinehas Ibn Azura of the Kainukaa tribe, Kaab the Ibn Asharaf, the son of an Arab father and of a Jewish mother, and the poet Abu-Afak, a centenarian, all the three of whom mocked the prophet and did their best to render him hateful. Mohammed made the best of a bad bargain and at first bore the contempt of the Jews with apparent equanimity. Several passages in the Koran even contain a friendly keynote with regard to the Jews. When the latter, however, began to snatch away his faithful and when the believers urged him to state his views on Judaism, telling him that if the Torah was a Divine Book, they ought to observe its commandments, Mohammed felt compelled to state his principles. He revealed several Surahs, among them the second Surah, Bakarah, called the cow, in which he reviled the Jews; he fixed Mecca instead of Jerusalem as the Kiblah, abolished the Ashura-fast on the Day of Atonement, and declared that he had been announced in the Torah as a prophet, but that the Jews had falsified and removed the passages in question.¹

¹ Although the Mohammedans maintain that both the Christian and the Jewish Scriptures have been falsified, they assert that in spite

Mohammed further maintained that the Jews honoured Ezra as the Son of God. After his victory at Bedr he assumed an even severer attitude towards the Jews. One night the poetess Asma, belonging to a Jewish tribe, was murdered in her bed by a man named Omeir because she had composed satires against Mohammed, and the prophet praised the murderer "who had thus rendered a service both to God and to his prophet." A few days afterwards the Jewish centenarian Abu-Afak was murdered by Omeir's son, and later on Kaab Ibn Asharaf shared his fate, because he had composed an elegy wherein he bewailed the Koreishites who had fallen in the battle of Bedr in their fight against Mohammed.

Soon afterwards Mohammed summoned the Jewish tribe Kainukaa, to which his enemy Pinchas belonged, to embrace Islam. A fight resulted, and Mohammed ordered all the Jews to be put in irons and would gladly have

of it, the extant texts still contain prophecies which refer to the prophet Mohammed. The following are the passages which Moslem theologians particularly like to quote: *Deuteronomy* 18, 17-22; *Deuteronomy* 32, 21; *Deuteronomy* 33, 2; *Genesis* 17, 20; *Genesis* 49, 10; *Psalms* 45, 1-18, *Psalms* 149, 1-9; *Isaiab* 42, 9-17; *Isaiab* 54, 1-17; *Isaiab* 65, 1-6; *Daniel* 2, 31-45; *Epistle of Judas* 14, 15; *Matthew* 3 and *Matthew* 6; *Matthew* 10, 7; *Luke* 1, 2; *Matthew* 21, 33-45; *Apocalypse* 2, 26-29; *John* 14, 15-30.

Here again we have another proof that everybody usually finds, or rather believes to find, in Holy Scripture whatever he requires for the demonstration of his assertions. The Protestant principle according to which everybody should be allowed to read the Bible is the chief reason which accounts for Protestantism being divided into so many sects. To this liberal permission of reading the Bible must also be attributed the impossibility of obtaining a unanimous Protestantism. How much wiser is the attitude adopted by the Roman Catholic Church. Thanks to the dogma that it is the function of the Church alone to explain and to interpret the meaning of Holy Writ, thanks also to the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope, the unity and unanimity of the Catholic doctrine has been safeguarded for all times. The importance of these dogmas and their utility for the maintenance of order, unity and discipline, and the great advantage in power which the Roman Church has thus gained over all other Churches are obvious. One has only to read in this respect the contents of the Encyclica of Leo XIII, *Providentissimus*, wherein the prevailing actual inspiration and the absolute freedom from errors of the Holy Scriptures are once more explicitly expressed and enjoined.

slaughtered them all, had he not been prevented from doing so. He contented himself with compelling the Jews to emigrate to Palestine. Thus the hatred between Mohammed and the Jews gradually increased, and the stronger it grew the greater became Mohammed's aversion for Israel. During the so-called trench-war Mohammed succeeded in getting the tribe of Kuraiza into his power. Nearly seven hundred Jews were slaughtered in a public square in Medina and thrown into a pit, naturally in the name of God (Surah 39). The women were exchanged for arms and horses, while Mohammed kept for his own personal use a beautiful Jewess named Rihana. In the year 628 Mohammed defeated the Jews of Khaiber and thus the last free Jewish tribe in Arabia was destroyed.

From this war Mohammed had brought into his harem two beautiful Jewesses, Saphia and Zainab. The latter pretended to be friendly and even enamoured, and while promising the prophet the fulfilment of his most ardent wishes and desires, she put before him and his guests a poisoned leg of mutton. One of the guests actually died, but Mohammed had managed to spit out the morsel in good time, and had a narrow escape, but he never really recovered from the taste of the poisoned cutlet, and even in his hour of death he felt its effects. He asked Zainab for the reason of her deed, to which she replied: "Thou hast caused my people unspeakable suffering and so I thought that if thou art merely a tyrant I will procure safety for my people by poisoning thee. If, however, thou be a prophet, my poison could never harm thee." Mohammed gave orders to put her to death, and he also commanded his troops not to use the kitchen utensils taken as booty from the Jews before they had them thoroughly boiled in water.

The Jews plotted and intrigued as much as they could, spurring on and inciting the malcontents against Mohammed. The house of the Jew Simailim in Medina became the rendezvous of the malcontents, and when the fact was betrayed the house was put on fire. After Mohammed's death Omar banished all the Jews from the Arabian peninsula, and as the motive of his measure he asserted that the sacred soil of Arabia must not be defiled

by any unbeliever. The Jews, in return, received lands near Kufa on the Euphrates.

2. *The Arabian Caliphate*

When the Arabs attacked Palestine the Jews were everywhere helpful to them and in every way facilitated their conquest of the country, for they were only too happy to exchange the Byzantine rule for that of the Arabs. In 636 Omar took possession of Jerusalem, but did not permit the Jews to reside in the city. He decreed that the Jews were not to build new synagogues nor were they to repair the dilapidated ones; they were allowed to celebrate their Divine services only quietly and secretly. Jews were not permitted to hold any official posts, to administer justice to Mohammedans, to ride on horseback or to make use of a signet-ring, and had furthermore to wear their own particular dress and pay a ground and poll-tax. In spite of all these restrictions, which were extended to Christians as well, we find the Jews on the side of the Moslems in all their fights with the Christians; everywhere the Jews welcomed the Moslems as their deliverers from the Christian yoke, and in several Asiatic and Egyptian cities they opened the gates to the new conquerors. Under Omar, Bostanai, a scion of the house of David, was even recognized as the prince and head of the Jews, and Omar gave him to wife Dara, a daughter of the Persian King Chosroes.

It is superfluous to point out that the motives which had given rise to the Anti-Semitism of the "Semite" Mohammed and his followers were of a religious nature. It is a magnificent example of an *Anti-Semitic Anti-Semitism*.

Gradually the position of the Jews under the Caliphate improved considerably. In his *History of the Civilization of the East*, Kremer writes as follows:

"We shall now proceed to the Jews whose spiritual head, the Prince of Captivity, also resided in Bagdad. According to Benjamin of Tudela, who visited Bagdad about A.D. 1170, the Prince of Captivity as the spiritual head of the whole of Jewry enjoyed the highest respect. Rabbi Daniel ben Chisdai, a scion of the House of David, held office in those

days. Under the authority of the Caliph he had the supreme command over all the Jewish congregations, a command with which the Caliph had invested him by handing him over the seal of office. Everybody, be he Jew or Mohammedan, had to rise at his approach. Whenever he betook himself to the Caliph for an audience he was accompanied by a suite of riders, while he himself was arrayed in an embroidered silk garment and wore a white turban ornamented with a diadem. Heralds rode in front of him calling out: 'Make room for the son of David.' His power extended over Mesopotamia, Persia, Khorasan, South Arabia, Diarbekir, Armenia, and Georgia as far as the Oxus, nay even India and Tibet. To all the Jewish communities he granted the permission to elect their own Rabbis and officers of the Temple (Synagogue), but it was he alone who ordained them and gave them the permission to exercise their respective functions, for which he received precious gifts from the most distant countries. This Prince of Captivity owned manor-houses, gardens, plantations and vast tracts of land in Babylonia which he had inherited from his ancestors. He also received an income from Jewish inns and markets and levied a duty on all merchandise. A great number of Israelites daily fed at his table. At the moment of his investiture, however, he had to pay vast sums to the Caliph and to the princes of the latter's house. The appointment and confirmation of the Prince of Captivity took place in the palace of the Caliph where the latter laid his hands upon the nominee, whereupon the Prince of Captivity, accompanied by musicians, returned to his own residence where he, in his turn, laid his hands upon the members and chiefs of his vast congregation and thus consecrated them."

The same traveller relates that many Jews, and among them many scholars, lived in Bagdad; there were twenty-eight synagogues, partly in the city itself and partly in the suburbs. The principal synagogue was embellished with pillars of variegated marble, and richly adorned with gold and silver, and on the pillars one could read inscriptions and passages from the Psalms engraved in letters of gold. The altar on which lay the scroll of the Torah had ten steps, on the highest of which the Prince of Captivity and

the other princes of the House of David used to take up their stand. From these indications it is evident how much more tolerantly than the Christians the Arabs had behaved towards the people of Israel.

3. *The Spanish Caliphate*

Under Moslem rule Jewish poetry and philosophy flourished, attained their highest state of development and inaugurated a golden age in Babylonia and in Spain. In 1027 the Jew Samuel Ibn Nagrela became Secretary of State of King Habus in Granada. He was succeeded in all his offices and dignities by his son Abu Hussejim Joseph, who was both Rabbi and Vizier. While the latter was in power, the first persecution of the Jews took place in Mohammedan Spain, but it was on exclusively political and not religious grounds. Badis, the Berber King, had formed the plan of massacring all the Arabs in the capital, and the Jewish Vizier had secretly warned the latter of the plot. This circumstance led to complications and finally to the expulsion of the Jews and to the massacre of 1500 Jewish families on one day. From 1105 to 1145 the famous Jewish poet Jehuda Halevi, the greatest poet of Israel in the Middle Ages, lived in Spain. In Asia Minor, in Syria and in Palestine, the Jewish population speedily increased. In the districts, however, of these countries where in the age of the Crusades Christian princes or lords ruled, there were but few Jewish communities. In Christian Palestine there were not more than one thousand families, but wherever the Crescent held sway there were considerably more Jews and they were all in a flourishing state. In Samarkand 50,000 Jews are supposed to have lived in the twelfth century, and on the island of Ceylon there were 23,000, who enjoyed equal rights with the other inhabitants. The King of the island had sixteen ministers, four of whom were of his own religion, four Christians, four Jews, and four Moslems. Into Arabia, too, the Jews had by this time again immigrated both into North-Arabia and into Yemen. In Egypt, too, the Jews enjoyed happier days.

The latter half of the twelfth century was the age of the great Rabbi Maimuni (Maimonides), the Jewish Aristotle,

that great thinker who, as Graetz expresses himself, "carried the future of Judaism on his powerful shoulders." He considered it as his task to confirm the statement that man was the image of God. From the bottom of his heart he detested all that was untrue, and therein he went so far as to show but small favour to poetry where a great deal is due to imagination. Severe towards himself, he was indulgent in his treatment and judgment of others. He opposed everything that he considered to be an error without, however, manifesting any hatred against those who persisted in their own errors. Modesty, humility, kindness of heart, a strong will-power, a keen and clear intellect, an indefatigable diligence and a vast knowledge were the qualities which distinguished him. On his gravestone the following inscription could be read: "Here lies a human being and yet superhuman; if thou wast a man, heavenly beings have overshadowed thy heavenly mother." These lines were later on obliterated and in their place the following words were written: "Here lies Moses Maimuni, the excommunicated heretic." His admirers used to say of him that "from Moses the Prophet to Moses Maimuni no one was like Moses." Maimonides was enlightened enough to declare in a hortatory epistle addressed to the Jewish communities and which has become famous—that whosoever was compelled to embrace Islam and while apparently acknowledging it, remained true to Judaism in his heart, was not to be considered an apostate. Whoever preferred the death of martyrdom rather than acknowledge Mohammed as the Divine messenger deserved a high reward. But if some one were to ask him whether he was bound to sacrifice his life rather than pronounce the words of the Islamic confession of faith, he would reply with a decided *No*. Very interesting and typical of all religions are the explanations given by Maimonides in his consolatory epistle addressed to the Jewish communities in Yemen concerning the reasons of their persecutions both by Christians and by Moslems. The Prophets, says Maimonides, have foretold these persecutions, and because, by His Grace, the Lord has particularly distinguished us sons of Israel and made us the bearers of the true religion, of the true knowledge and faith, the nations hate us. They

do not hate us for our own sakes but on account of the Divine element dwelling in our midst, and to a certain extent also in order to frustrate the Divine design. Ever since the Divine revelation on Mount Sinai, Judaism has always been exposed to persecutions either by means of the sword, as in the days of Amalek, Sisera, Sennaherib, Nebuchadnozzor, Titus and Hadrian, by means of sophistical, artful and false doctrines calculated to lead us astray from the true faith—(Persians, Greeks, Romans), or by means of false Divine revelations contradictory to Judaism. The new revelations of Nazareth and of Mecca are to Judaism what a human image unartistically executed is to a complete vigorous human life, and only children and fools are liable to take one for the other. These hostilities against Israel manifesting themselves in three different shapes, the Prophets have already foretold, and principally Daniel, but he has also prophesied the victory of the Jewish religion over all other religions. God has allowed all the sufferings to come over Israel only in order to show that the Jews alone are in possession of the true faith.

The respected reader will perhaps remember having heard similar explanations elsewhere. There is nothing new under the sun.

4. *Turkey*

Turkey, too, hospitably received the Jews who had been expelled from Europe. Sultan Suleyman permitted them to settle on the island of Rhodes, which, for the greatest part, was inhabited by Spanish Jews, and, as the famous traveller Breuning expressed himself, “to the offence, scorn and disdain of the Christians and particularly of the knightly order.” According to Schweiger they carried on commerce, practised usury and treachery, the latter occupation on the frontiers where, like gypsies, they are said to have served the Turks as spies against the Christians. As jugglers, conjurers, comedians and wandering musicians, they even had access to the most private apartments of the Seraglio. Jews were frequently private physicians of the Sultans, while Jewesses were generally great favourites of the Sultan on account of their alleged magic art. Soon the Jews accumulated wealth and stood in high respect in

the Turkish Empire. Without their aid, says Zinkeisen, one could hardly obtain anything in the diplomatic circles, and prudence alone required it of the representatives of the Christian powers to court the favour of the Jews.

When, after his conquest of Brussa, Sultan Orkhan invited merchants and artisans from the neighbouring countries, many Byzantine Jews answered his call, and when Sultan Murad I took Adrianople the Jewish communities welcomed the Turks enthusiastically. Sultan Murad II, too, was favourably disposed to the Jews and appointed a Jew to be his private physician. Mohammed II, the Conqueror, was equally well disposed to the Jews. Jewish soldiers fought in his army when he was waging war in Transylvania. Rabbi Samuel Soncino, who cracked the head of the monk Capistrano, is said to have fallen in this campaign. Mohammed II also had a Jew as his private physician. Another Jew, Mose Capsali, a pious and learned man who led an ascetic life, was raised to the highest dignities by Sultan Mohammed II. Under Bajazet II the Jews who had been expelled from Spain immigrated into Turkey. The Sultan issued a firman to all his governors enjoining upon them not only not to repulse the Jews but, on the contrary, to welcome them. Jews instructed the Turks in the art of casting cannons and of manufacturing powder. That was their revenge for the cruel treatment they had met with at the hands of the Christians. To the great joy of the Jews, Sultan Suleyman ordered the walls of Jerusalem and of Tiberias to be restored—and is said to have placed one wall under Jewish protection. We thus gather how very tolerantly the Moslems behaved towards Israel and how much more Christianlike than the Christian mediæval States. It is therefore no wonder at all that in the numerous wars between Christendom and Islam the Jews should always and everywhere have sided with the latter. The greatest enemies of the Jews in the Turkish Empire were naturally the Greeks who again and again brought the blood-accusation upon the tapis, so that not less than three Sultans, namely, Suleyman I, Abdul Medjid and Abdul Aziz, saw it necessary to issue special firmans wherein they declared the blood-accusation to be untrue. Under the Sultans Suleyman and Selim II the Jew Joseph Nassi

occupied a princely post. He received the title of Duke of Naxos and of the remaining eleven islands and an annual income of 2000 thalers from the German Emperor.

Under Murad II the Jews had a bad time. One day, in a moment of ill-humour and annoyed at their display of extravagance, he issued a decree to massacre all the Jews in his Empire, but the cruel measure was never taken. On the whole, however, the Jews were incomparably better treated in Turkey than in the Christian States. As they did not enjoy equal citizen rights with the Moslems and with few exceptions were not permitted to hold office under the crown, they interested themselves assiduously in commerce and many of them succeeded in accumulating vast wealth. Whenever a Community had grown rich a method, which in Turkey actually became a governmental measure, was employed. The sponge was squeezed after having been placed exactly where it was calculated to absorb most, that is to say, the wealthy were made to pay heavily, and when opposition was encountered the Jews were frequently massacred. Often, however, the cause of massacres of the Jews was the appearance of Jewish religious visionaries and fanatics who, in consequence of their excessive reading of the ingenious works of the Kabbala and of the Zohar, imagined themselves to be the Messiahs announced in the Old Testament and thus caused trouble in the Empire. The Turks have for ever been masters in quelling such disturbances. The most famous of these swindlers was the Smyrna Jew Shabetai Zevi who even to-day counts many followers. Under Sultan Mohammed II, who had hanged the Greek Patriarch Gregory in Constantinople because a few Greeks had looted a ship carrying Mohammedan pilgrims to Mecca, the Greeks in Morea massacred the Jews, the victims numbering five thousand, because a rumour had spread that the Jews were responsible for the execution of the Patriarch.

Under Sultan Abdul Medjid the Jews received equal citizen rights with the Moslems. In 1860 Damascus was the theatre of sanguinary excesses perpetrated against the Jews accused of having murdered Pater Thomas and his servant for ritual purposes. Several Jews admitted the fact on the rack. Thanks, however, to the intervention of

Sir Moses Montefiore and of Adolphe Crémieux the accused were later on set free.

5. *Persia and Morocco*

It now remains for me to cast a glance at the position of the Jews in Persia and in Morocco. In both these countries they have fared pretty badly. There are perhaps few countries in the world where the Jews find themselves in such a sad plight as in Indo-Germanic Persia, where the fanatical Mohammedan priests (Mollas) incessantly spur on and incite the population against them. Even as late as 1892 several instances of Jew-baiting are recorded, namely, in Hamadan, where the population tried to subject the Jews to twenty-two specific laws. These laws were :

Prohibition to go out in rainy or snowy weather.

Jewish women to be obliged to appear in the streets without any veil and to wear a cloak of two colours.

Jewish men to be permitted to dress only in blue cotton ; not to wear any beautiful garments or shoes and to sew on a piece of red cloth on their breasts.

No Jew to be allowed to walk in the open street in front of a Moslem—nor talk aloud to him.

A Jew demanding the payment of a debt from a Moslem should do so in a trembling voice and a respectful tone.

A Jew who had bought meat should hide it in the presence of a Mohammedan.

No Jew to be allowed to build a fine house.

No Jewish house to be higher than that of a Mohammedan.

The Jew should not be permitted to whitewash the rooms of his house.

The entrance door to a Jewish house to be low.

A Jew was not to be permitted to wrap his cloak around him, to cut his beard, to leave the town or to make an excursion into the country.

Jewish physicians were not to be permitted to ride on horseback.

A Jew suspected of having drunk brandy was not to be permitted to go out into the street under penalty of death.

Jewish marriages should be celebrated quietly and secretly.

Jews should not be permitted to consume good fruit.

When the above laws had been framed, the Moslems ran through the streets shouting and invoking the name of Allah and demanded that all the Jews should either be massacred or forced to embrace Islam. For forty days the Jews were besieged in their houses and nearly died of hunger and fear. The instigator of this movement was a Mohammedan priest named Abdullah, while another fanatic of the same kidney was Seyed Abdul Midjid. Jewish women had their veils torn off in the open street so as to degrade them to the low station of prostitutes. The sixty-year-old Rabbi Abraham Abdul-Medjid was bastinadoed because he had omitted to wear the Jewish badge. It came so far that the Government saw itself compelled to send troops to Hamadan to re-establish order.

In 1896 similar disturbances took place at Kirmanshah where the Jewish quarter was looted. A general Jewish massacre being threatened, many Jews embraced Islam. A law was promulgated according to which the whole property of a deceased Jew was to be inherited by those of his heirs who had embraced Islam. Once more the Mollas had incited and goaded on the people.

In 1897 similar disturbances took place in Teheran. The instigator was a priest named Seyed Rihan Allah, who forced the Jews to wear the Jewish badge and a hair-dress differing from that of the Mohammedans. The Bagdad correspondent of the *Alliance Israélite* sent at that time the following report: "In Persia one may constantly observe the fact that whenever a priest is anxious to emerge from obscurity and to gain the reputation of a pious man, he begins to preach a holy war against the Jews." The Jewish population of Teheran is poor, and there are not more than two or three Jews who possess thirty-nine to forty thousand francs. And thus in Persia, too, the Anti-Semitic disturbances bear an exclusively religious character. Not much better is the situation of the Jews in Morocco. There, too, deeds of violence and atrocities committed against the Jews have been frequent. Sultan Muley



Photo: Henriette

A SYNAGOGUE IN PALESTINE AFTER A RECENT LOOTING BY THE ARABS

Hassan had to see to it that a stop was put to Anti-Semitic vexations. In 1892 the Sultan instructed his Minister for Foreign Affairs to write to the Jewish communities and to tell them how much the injustice and the ill-treatment to which the Jews had been subjected had displeased him, and that on similar occasions they should in future address their complaints directly to the Sultan.

When Sultan Muley Hassan died in 1894 and his son, then still a child, succeeded him on the throne, Jew baiting started afresh, since the protecting hand of the old Sultan was missing. Many tribes in the interior of the country revolted against the new Sultan and all these disturbances invariably began with Jew-baiting. Reports poured in from Morocco relating outrages committed against Jews, looting, cases of rape, bastinadoes and forced conversions. I must, however, expressly point out that these outrages were not the result of mere religious fanaticism which in Semitic Morocco plays a much lesser part than it does in Indo-Germanic Persia, and that in the former country theft and rapacity are the chief motives of these crimes. It is only before the Courts of Justice where fanaticism once more plays the chief part and where justice is being withheld from the Jews for the sole reason of their not being Moslems.

6. *Old Persia, India and China*

With regard to the situation of the Jews in non-monotheistic lands, that is to say in the so-called heathen countries, we possess but scanty information. It is, however, beyond any doubt that nowhere have the Jews suffered less from persecution than precisely in the heathen countries. The Persian King Jezdegered III, who reigned from 440 to 457, persecuted Manichæans, Christians and Jews alike; and so did King Firuz, who massacred half the Jewish population in Isfahan and forcibly brought up Jewish children in the temple of Horvan in the fire-cult. As the old Persians had for centuries never dreamed of forcing their own private opinions upon others, and as their first attempt in this direction only dates from the time when they had made a closer acquaintance with the monotheistic religions, it is

quite clear that the Zoroastrians had first learnt their religious Jew-baiting from the Christians and the Jews. It was then probably that a portion of Babylonian Jewry emigrated into India where until the present day two classes of Jews exist which are differentiated by the colour of their skin, their features and customs. There is nothing to indicate that they had ever had to suffer from Jew-baiting. Nor have I been able to find any record of Jew-baiting in China.

In China, too, a Jewish community has existed from time immemorial. At what time the Jews had immigrated there it cannot be said, just as little as in the case of the Jews in the Caucasus, in Bokhara, Yemen and India. Certain signs, however, make it probable that soon after the conquest of Samaria by the Assyrians and of Jerusalem by the Babylonians crowds of Jews must have been transplanted into the above-named countries. The Chinese Jews resided in Kai-feng-Khu and to-day have shrunk to an insignificant small body.

The first account of this community is given by Trigaltius who wrote in 1617 that a Jew from the above-mentioned city had come to Pater Ricci in Peking in order, as he imagined, to make the acquaintance of a co-religionist. Trigaltius recorded the interesting conversation which had taken place between this Chinese Jew and Pater Ricci. The latter showed the Jew a picture of Jesus and the Holy Virgin, before whom St. John was kneeling. The Jew took them for Rebecca with her two sons Jacob and Esau. The group of Apostles the Jew took for that of the twelve sons of Jacob. To the question: "Art thou a Jehudi?" he replied: "I am an Israeli." He believed that the Nazarenes observed the Mosaic law, and he had never heard about the existence of the New Testament. In 1704 the Jesuit missionary Pater Gonzani visited these Chinese Jews and reported that they were greatly surprised when he mentioned the name of Jesus the Messiah. They had heard this name, they said, but this Jesus was the son of Sirach and not the man of whom Gonzani was speaking. Nor had they ever heard of Jesus Christ. It would be interesting to know whether these Jews, too, are under the curse which the Jews have incurred in consequence of the crucifixion

of Christ. I should have gladly liked to enlighten my readers on this point, but am unfortunately unable to do so on account of my total lack of theological knowledge on this question. The Chinese Jews have long ago given up their liturgical service and will probably quite soon dissolve in Islam and in Buddhism, should the *Alliance Israélite* not succeed in its endeavours to preserve them for Judaism. Forty years ago their last Rabbi, who still knew a little Hebrew, died. The children are no longer being circumcised and they frequently marry Chinese wives who adopt their religion.

Information with regard to the number of the Chinese Jews is vague. Herr von Brandt is of opinion that the number is small and is speedily decreasing, while others say that the number amounts to half a million and even to a million. This is highly improbable and must be attributed to the circumstance of their being taken for Mohammedans. It appears that these Jews have never been persecuted in tolerant China; anyhow, I found it impossible to learn anything about Jew-baiting in China.

Chinese tolerance is also due to the circumstance of the Chinese Jews having of their own accord come to adore Confucius just as the Chinese themselves do, and this was the cleverest thing the Jews could have done.

CHAPTER V

ACCUSATIONS RAISED AGAINST THE JEWS

1. *Usury*

IT is not true that the Torah permits the Jews to practise usury. The famous passage in Chapter 23 of the Fifth Book of the Pentateuch, verses 19 and 20, only says that to take interest, chiefly from his brother, that is to say from a Jew, is forbidden, but that to take interest from a stranger is permitted. Other passages, too, in the Old Testament, as Ezekiel, Chapter 18, verses 8 and 9, and Psalms 15, 5, praise those who take no interest. There is a vast difference between taking interest and usury.

The Rabbis, too, recommended the lending of money without interest even to idol-worshippers. In the *Shulchan-Aruch Choshen-Mishpat*, 34, 29, it is said: "The usurer who is anxious to regain his capacity of testifying and giving evidence must of his own free will tear up his promissory notes and entirely abandon his evil practice, so that he will take no interest even from a non-Jew." Rabbi Isserles adds that he must not even take so much interest from a non-Jew as he requires for his maintenance." And, indeed, in the history of the Jews before Christ, as well as in the whole history of the Diaspora, we find not a single case of usury mentioned. Neither the Roman and Greek authors nor those who have ridiculed the Jews and written such odious and untrue things about them have told us anything about Jewish usurers more than that. Jerusalem and later on the Roman Empire fell, and the Jews were dispersed over all the lands, and one thousand years passed without our hearing a word of usury being practised by Jews. Elsewhere in the present work I have mentioned the fact that the Church Fathers, too, who lived in the first ten centuries of our era and a number of whom had occupied themselves thoroughly

with the Jews and written down everything unfavourable to them, did not seem to know anything about Jewish usury. Nor does the Anti-Semitic Catechism, which has carefully collected every passage referring to usury practised by Jews, quote any passages dating from the time previous to the twelfth century A.D. From this significant silence observed by so many learned enemies of the Jews, and which extended over a period of twelve centuries, it can be concluded with an apodictic certainty that during the first eleven centuries of our era the Jews had never practised usury at all.

It is unfortunately a fact in which we must agree with the Anti-Semites that for about six centuries, and even to-day, the practice of usury has become and still is the national vice of Jewry. The percentage of usurers among the Jews is proportionately much higher than it is among non-Jews. Those who require money to-day and are ready to pay usurious interest know where to go. That numerous lives have been ruined by Jewish usurers is a fact which cannot be denied, but which nevertheless requires an explanation. It is precisely this explanation which can be easily found, while the reason of so many sons of Jacob practising usury is particularly transparent: the Christians themselves had first forced the Jews to resort to the practice of usury. I say *forced* and not *induced*. The Jews in the Middle Ages had been placed before the alternative of either practising usury or dying of hunger, for in the Middle Ages they were debarred from all offices, dignities and academic degrees, from guilds and corporations, trades, handicrafts and most of the commercial branches. They had no other choice, if they were not to die of hunger, but that of chaffering and usury, for only a small number of them could turn to the few occupations left open to them, such as banking, brokerage transactions or the jewellery business. In several countries the laws, too, explicitly permitted the Jews to practise usury. The great sovereigns and rulers, however, not only permitted the Jews to practise usury, but actually made them do it for their benefit. While leaving the blame for the practice to the Jews, they themselves reaped the fruits of that usury and whenever they required money they forced the Jews to

hand over the proceeds and profits derived from this practice.

Basing itself on the above-quoted passage in the Old Testament, the Canonical Law, as is well known, altogether forbids the taking of interest. For this reason and in order not to transgress this law the Jews were permitted to practise usury, and when they had sucked themselves full, the money was taken away from them on the ground that it had been unlawfully acquired and extorted from the Christians by means of usury. The people, however, from whom the money had been taken never saw it again ; it flowed into quite other pockets, namely, into the pockets of those who pretended to protect the Jews. I venture to call the reader's very particular attention to the fact that the Canonical Law which commanded the Christians to abstain from taking interest and the training of the Jews for this business directly originated in the above-quoted Mosaic Law and are therefore again the result of a Law laid down in the Jewish Torah, that is to say by the Jewish religion.

It can easily be imagined how the Jews were being encouraged to practise usury when they were constantly hearing the following reflection made by the Christians : " We Christians are unfortunately not permitted to take interest, but you may do it, therefore do it, please (and then we will share the profits brotherly)." And after all, the Christians, too, formerly practised usury on a large scale. One should read on this point the very interesting chapter dealing with exchange of money and usury in the *History of the German People*, by Johannes Janssen. On pages 4-6, Janssen writes as follows : " With the expulsion of the Jews the spirit of usury had by no means been exterminated, but, on the contrary, descended upon the Christian usurers, in whose hands it assumed large proportions in consequence of international trade and the prevailing general extravagance."

Professor J. Baum writes : " Nearly one thousand years elapsed since the rise of Christianity, during which there is no trace whatever of usury among the Jews. On the one hand the chastising blows of destiny, which an all-just Providence governing the world sends out as its messengers,

had induced the Jews to return to the commandments and ordinances of the Divine Law of Moses, while, on the other hand, the Jews hardly ever entered into closer relations with the non-Jews and would never have dared to do it in consequence of their subordinate outlawed position."

In his work, *The Romance of Martyrdom among the Jews in the Middle Ages*, Dr. M. Schleiden writes: "When the Jews were deprived of their landed property and their other possessions, when a most senseless tyrannical Christian legislation forbade them to turn to any occupation which would have enabled them to earn their living, when the laws themselves directed them to usury as the one trade left open to them, they desperately availed themselves of this expedient." Very justly does Stobbe remark: "It was on account of the practice of usury that the Jews were allowed to reside almost everywhere, in spite of national hatred and religious intolerance, but it was again owing to this practice of usury that from time to time intolerance vented itself in a dreadful manner." The Jews therefore deserve to be pitied and not to be accused, as it often happens, while, on the contrary, those who had left the practice of usury as the only line of business open to the Jews and, moreover, for selfish motives had encouraged them to pursue it, deserve a double reproach. "Temporal and Spiritual rulers vied with each other in every manner of extortion and thus compelled the Jews to make money." "It is the constant habit of the rulers," complains an author in the thirteenth century, "to demand of the Jew ten times as much as he actually possesses, to frighten and alarm him, so that he should hurry with his ransom." "They prefer to kill the Jew," writes another contemporary author, "rather than let him go free." When on one occasion the ransom to be paid for a Jew was too tardy in forthcoming, the lord who had captured him replied: "He is dead, and I have given orders for his body to be thrown to the dogs." The Jews were therefore obliged to strive after money in order to protect their lives and their liberty. But the Christians, too, were practising usury on a large scale. During the second crusade, in 1146, when Bernhard de Clairvaux warned the Christians against Jew-baiting, he

pointed out that the Christian usurers who did not deserve the name of Christians were much worse than the Jews. Luther himself accused the Papists, bishops, and monks of practically compelling the Jews to practise usury.

2. *Wealth*

That there are wealthy Jews in the world is a fact which no one will deny, but that there existed any country where the wealth of the Jews exceeded that of the Christians is untrue. The greatest wealth in the world, that is in America, is in the hands of non-Jews. Those who feel inclined to doubt this statement I would advise to read the interesting studies of M. C. Varigny in his works: *Les grandes fortunes en Angleterre* and *Les grandes fortunes aux Etats-Unis*. The author reproduced a list—published in England in 1884¹ of the world's richest twelve men. The list contained the names of four great American speculators, of one banker—the one and only Jew in the list—of one American journalist, two great American business men, and four members of the British aristocracy.

I would most urgently recommend both Anti-Semites and Social Democrats to read the above-mentioned articles and provided they are really and seriously anxious to learn the truth, they will arrive at the following conclusions:

1. The majority of the world's larger fortunes are in the hands of non-Jews.

2. The majority of multi-millionaires consist of men who started very poor and only, thanks to their industry and their diligence, managed to acquire their gigantic fortunes in an honest way.

3. Most of these men have sprung from the people and not from the higher strata of society.

Now people usually quote these not too numerous Jewish Cræsus and thunder against the wealthy Jews, but no mention is ever made of the millions of poor Jews who are living in direst poverty, of Jewish coachmen, day labourers (in Marmaros there are Jews who are working

¹ The proportion between Jewish and non-Jewish wealth has changed considerably to the disadvantage of the Jews. Editor's note.

by the day for Ruthenian peasants), of Jewish porters and so forth. Anybody anxious to convince himself of the misery and extreme poverty which prevails among the Jews should visit Warsaw and other cities in Poland and Russia. Now when these unhappy people are debarred from several occupations and professions they are forcibly faced by the pleasant alternative of either dying of hunger or of earning money no matter in what way. The majority naturally prefer the second alternative, a choice which the majority of Christians, too, would have made, only much less cleverly and with less ability. This silence therefore is a misrepresentation—half a truth which is tantamount to a lie.

The Jews are not more skilful and adroit or less honest (as the Anti-Semites would say) than the Greeks, Armenians, Parsis, Arabs, Banyas and Chinese; on the contrary, they seem to be much weaker than these commercial nations. When our Christians therefore are reluctant to try and emulate the Jews out of hatred and aversion, I would advise them to emulate the Greeks and the Armenians and then they may be sure that no Jew will ever hurt a hair on their heads.

With regard, however, to the greater amount of dishonesty which is supposed to prevail among Jews, I ask every housewife, every landed proprietor, every businessman to say whether on an average the Christian was a whit better than the Jew. Think of the many cases of poaching and the theft of timber, of the numerous false accounts, of clandestine acceptances of commissions and similar cases, and one must arrive at the very simple truism, viz. that "there are good and bad men, in the same proportion, both among the Christians and the Jews." That the connection existing between the faults, offences and crimes of a commerce-plying people and trade and commerce should be that of cause and effect is only natural.

The Anti-Semites are wont to look at the wealthy Jews and to imagine that wealth and affluence are the rule in Jewry. This, however, is a colossal error. Half of Jewry, as Dr. Theodor Herzl once declared at the Basel Congress, owns neither a stone to lay its head upon, nor a rag to cover its nakedness. At this Zionist Congress, which took place at Basel in 1897 towards the end of August, Jews from all

countries had foregathered and many of them made speeches on the situation of Jewry in their respective homelands. The pictures of the terrible misery unrolled on that occasion by the various speakers were frightful.

In Galicia, it was stated, there were on the whole 222,213 Jews, 71 per cent of whom lived in towns. A few years previously the Reichsrat Deputy, Dr. Rappoport, founded a relief-committee for the suffering Jews in Galicia and sent out a circular to 126 localities asking them for details of the economic situation of the Jews. It appeared that of the 145,000 Jews residing in these 126 localities, 74,000 had no occupation whatever, or, more correctly, were beggars. The consequence of this misery prevailing among the Galician Jews was a lowering of morality. The assertion made in the Anti-Semitic Catechism that the infamous white-slave traffic was almost exclusively in the hands of Jews is true. The author, however, ought to have added: in the hands of Galician, Polish and Roumanian Jews. It is unfortunately a fact that the houses of ill-fame in the large cities of South America, in Constantinople, in the Levant and partly also in India, Siberia and Egypt, nay, even as far as Singapore and Hongkong, are peopled by Galician Jewesses, and that Polish Jews from Europe provide these houses with their living merchandise—consisting almost exclusively of Jewesses. But if one considers the unspeakable misery of the Russian and Galician Jewries, if one remembers that white-slave traffic and usury are the two branches characteristic of the degeneration of commerce, the feeling of horror at this sort of commerce will be considerably lessened by the pity one must feel for these unhappy people who were forced to turn to this trade simply because otherwise they would have died of hunger at home.

It must further be pointed out here—and the Anti-Semitic Catechism is naturally silent about it—that in 1898 already the Rabbis Zadoc Kahn (Paris), Hildesheimer (Berlin), Hirsch (Hamburg), Horovitz (Frankfort), Ehrenreich (Rome) and Gudemann (Vienna) had sent out an admonitory letter in Hebrew against the white-slave traffic. The letter was addressed to all Rabbis and Rabbinical substitutes in Galicia, Roumania and Russia, enjoining

upon them to warn all parents not to entrust their daughters to people of a doubtful character who were luring them away by promises of lucrative situations and finally shipped them off to America or Africa for immoral purposes. The letter invited the addressees to banish from the Jewish community all the persons guilty of white-slave traffic, and expressed the hope that in this manner they would succeed in extirpating the evil.

In Algeria there are 45,000 Jews, 30,000 of whom are living in the direst misery. In Roumania and in Bulgaria, too, their situation is a desperate one. Not much better off are the Jews in the Bukovina. In Vienna, 15,000 out of the 25,000 Jewish households are unable to contribute to the synagogal taxes on account of their poverty. The Jews are well-off in England, in America and in Italy, where only a small number of them is to be found, and the country where they were best off before the war was Hungary. But here, too, the flame of Anti-Semitism which has been glimmering under the ashes has blazed up since.

In France and in Germany the Jews had sufficient to live upon before the World War, but they were continually being exposed to affronts and insults to their honour. Thus, in spite of the numerous millionaires among them, the distress and misery of the Jews have always been great and are much greater now.

A child issued from extreme misery and noble humanity is the much maligned Alliance Israélite Universelle which was founded by the emancipated Jews for the purpose of coming in aid to their oppressed brethren all over the world and particularly in unfree countries. Among other things the Alliance succeeded in preserving for Judaism the Abyssinian and Chinese Jews.

3. *Jewish World Mastery*

The Anti-Semites maintain that the Jews are ruling the world and politics. That is *not* true, for the very simple reason of its being an absolute impossibility. There are about fifteen million Jews in the world, one million of which live in Africa or Asia and four million in Russia and Poland, so that there remain ten million for the rest of

Europe, America and Australia. If we deduct children and women, there remain at most four million Jews, and among them there are poor and beggars who may be counted by thousands, who are supposed to rule and dominate over five hundred million Christians in Europe, America and Australia. That is to say, that for one Jew who lords it over there are one hundred and twenty-five Christians who are being ruled. But how weak these Christians must be ! They just require the Jews as teachers.

The vast progress made in Hungary coincided with the emancipation of and the freedom granted to the Jews, so that one might be tempted to see in this circumstance the connection of cause and effect. Great Britain had enjoyed a time of the greatest prosperity and power under the government of the Semitic Lord Beaconsfield, while Spain flourished when the Jews were being well treated in the country, but as soon as they had been expelled the decadence began.

Anti-Semitism is a morbid phenomenon, and it is a great pity that it should be one of the items in the programme of the Christian-Social Party which was otherwise so efficient and so excellent. In my opinion the diseased state is to be attributed to the fact that those who acknowledge the principles of Anti-Semitism consider a great number of phenomena and events in social life as so many different effects of one single cause, instead of attributing them to a great many and diverse causes. They consider Judaism to be the sole cause of a number of social evils. Such a conception is due to a slowness and incapacity of thought, for in the process of thinking and judging it is both much more convenient and much easier to attribute to one and the same cause everything that cannot be explained at once or grasped.

We often meet in the world half-educated men with whom it has become a mania to trumpet forth everything that happens in the world, and which appears to them to be neither good nor proper, as the work of the clergy, namely of the Jesuits. How many lies have been circulated against this order so glorious and so important for the Catholic Church, and to which alone the Roman Church is indebted for the fact that the Reformation did not succeed

in overflowing Austria, France, Spain and Portugal! The Jesuit order, too, would in the seventeenth century have gained for the Roman Church the whole Chinese Empire without striking a blow, had not the opponents of the Church, in their jealousy and absurdity, interfered and stayed the arm of the Jesuits. Whenever a ruler or a cardinal not favourably disposed to the Jesuits dies, a terrible twaddle arises and the rumour is at once spread: "Naturally the Jesuits have killed him." The people who circulate and disseminate such untruths naturally pursue their own aims, but that thousands and thousands should give credence to their words is surprising.

In the case of people who are neither anti-clerical nor hostile to the Church, either the Jews or the Freemasons must bear the brunt of explaining everything that happens. The head of a State who was not favourable to the Jews dies, and who should have poisoned him? Naturally the Jews. A number of railway accidents happen, outrages are perpetrated and popular disturbances break out, who should be behind it all? The Freemasons, of course. Now it is well-known that Jews and Freemasons constitute the greatest antithesis imaginable to the Jesuits and to the clergy, but this fact little troubles the thinkers. This is one more proof how easily a man will believe whatever his heart or his wish compel his intellect to believe. If at heart he is an enemy of some religious or other community, he attributes everything, I say everything, to the supposed machinations of such a society.

Just as the primitive nations were in the habit of personifying the powers of nature, virtues, vices and so forth, which shows the strong polytheistic trait in human nature, so uneducated people even to-day still personify their joys and their sufferings—the origin of which they are unable to imagine otherwise than anthropomorphically—by attributing them to certain men or communities.

There exists a reasonable Anti-Semitism which consists in the endeavour to educate the people in such a way as to render them commercially quite equal to the Jews. Take the Armenians. No Jew is able to cheat or to defraud an Armenian. They are splendid business men. In Constantinople every Armenian, nay, every Armenian

child, speaks three languages: Armenian, the hated Turkish, and Greek, the language of their dangerous rivals and competitors. It is well known that in England and in North America the Jew is unable to come up to the Anglo-Saxon just as little as in the Levant he is able to come up to the Greek. Unfortunately we are not Englishmen, but can we not succeed in attaining the efficiency of Greeks and Armenians in economic foresight and circumspection?

If Jews are harmless in the case of Armenians, Anglo-Saxons, Greeks, Banyas, Chinese, and Arabs, but dangerous to Germans, Magyars, Poles, Russians, Frenchmen, Slovaks, Czechs and so forth, the cause of such harm ought to be sought, according to all the laws of logic, not in the Jews, but in the particular receptivity and in the quite definite characteristic traits of the people who are being wronged. If Edouard Drumont and his political friends and partisans were right, France was entirely dominated by Jews, that is to say 41 millions by 200,000 men. Granted; but then I would venture to ask how it comes that the 120,000 Jews of Constantinople played such an insignificant rôle, and why, upon the whole, the 190,000 Jews in the Turkish Empire possessed so little power?

The number and distribution of the Jews, according to the statistics given in the American Jewish Year-Book for 1929, were as follows:

Europe	9,570,118
America	4,617,705
Asia	589,938
Africa	522,182
Australia	27,572

15,327,515

Of these, 2,854,000 lived in Poland; 2,357,853 in Soviet Russia; 900,000 in Roumania; 569,379 in Germany; 298,123 in Great Britain (including Gibraltar); 200,000 in France; 150,000 in Holland; 50,000 in Italy; 4,228,029 in the United States; and 157,800 in Palestine.

It would be interesting to know how many of these Jews were ruling Jews and how many of them were not. Among the latter women and children will most probably have to

be reckoned. Besides, a glance at the above list renders the further discussion of the subject "Jewish Domination" quite superfluous.

One day a discussion arose at some social gathering about a married man in the prime of life whom it was said his small, weakly and no longer young wife was in the habit of betraying, and of boxing his ears. A few of the people present greatly pitied the unhappy henpecked husband and could find no words sufficient to express their pity, while others were even on the point of shedding tears; one man only showed not the slightest sign of emotion. Blamed for his hardness of heart, he quietly replied: "I am sorry for every blow that missed him."

4. *The Jewish Press*

Here is the place to expose a favourite trick which lies hidden in the term "Jewish Press"; it is an expression which occurs very frequently in clerical writings.

There is a Jewish Press written by Jews for Jews, but of this particular Press no one ever thinks whenever the expression is being made use of in Anti-Semitic circles. Among the Jewish Press are to be reckoned only the newspapers appearing in the Hebrew, Yiddish and the Spaniolish languages, and further, those newspapers which, although written in the languages of the respective countries, are clearly (to the knowledge of all) being published by Jews for Jews. The Jewish Press, however, as it is understood by the Anti-Semites, does not at all belong to the above-mentioned literary productions. Under "Jewish Press" the believing Christian understands all the newspapers and periodicals which, in his opinion, show a tendency to unbelief, philosophy, negation of revelation and an antipathy against positive religion in general. But then he ought to say the atheistic, philosophical, rationalist, unbelieving, or heathen Press, instead of the Jewish Press. When he speaks of a Jewish Press he is guilty of a confusion of connotations. The contributors to the rationalist, heretic, and heathen newspapers may for the most part be Jews by descent, but by faith and creed they are not so in the opinion and after the conceptions of both Christian and Jewish believers;

they are unbelievers, rationalists, theists or atheists, as the case may be. These newspapers spread disbelief both in the Old and in the New Testament. Orthodox Jews harbour only feelings of a most rabid hatred for the Christian Saviour, as expressed in the notorious *Toldoth Jeschu*, while enlightened rationalist Jews hail, love and admire him as one of the finest flowers of the Jewish nation, in spite of their simultaneous aversion for the existing Church. A strictly orthodox Jew, one of the Hassidim, will feel indignant at the articles published in one of the irreligious newspapers, not less than a believing Catholic. When I visited the Rabbi of Sadagara in 1881 and sat in his Hebrew library with his sons, they asked me to what party my father belonged. I replied that he was a member of the Conservative Party, a party to which the Polish Rabbi S. in the Reichsrat also belonged. "Of course," they said, "all those who have any religion should keep together." The law with regard to civil marriages in Hungary had been carried mostly by so-called Jews, but genuine, strictly orthodox Jews were exceedingly ill-disposed towards this institution as it constituted an attempt to melt down and to blend Israel with the "Goyim." One has only to read chapter 19 of the Book of Ezra. In his book on the ordinances and customs of talmudical and rabbinical Judaism (p. 463), Schroeder wrote as follows: "With regard to betrothals of persons belonging to different creeds the Rabbis have given the following decision: In a betrothal which is valid in every other respect, but in which the fiancé who belongs to another faith has promised to submit to the rite of circumcision, or the fiancée who professes another religion has promised to become a Jewess, and either the one or the other has failed to keep his or her promise, the betrothal is null and void."

One must never forget the following point. If the Jews were to be asked what they preferred, either complete equality with the Christians on condition of complete renunciation of their religion, or all kinds of persecutions, the vast majority of them would choose the latter alternative. If they were asked whether they would be prepared to abandon only the one article of their faith which says that

God had elected the Jews alone and had revealed Himself face to face to Moses alone and spoken only to him, and that He had vouchsafed miracles only to the Jews and given to them alone a direct revelation, the Torah, they would reply: "No, never and never, we prefer death under torture and torments, and you may trample on us and spit on us, persecute us, expel us or burn us, we shall never give up even this one article of our faith. We prefer to kill our children at their mothers' breasts, as we have done innumerable times in the days of persecution, rather than let them become Christians." The orthodox Rabbis would hurl their curses against the majority of the articles published in the so-called Jewish Press.

No, the so-called Jewish Press attacked by the clerical set is not the Jewish Press, but the Press of irreligion and of the free-thinkers, the so-called enlightened people, and that is the reason why it is being attacked. The newspapers which really and exclusively serve the interests of the Jews are not at all attacked by the clerical party. When we tell this to one of the clerical set they reply: "Oh, yes, there certainly are Christians who are worse than Jews, Judaized Christians, as one usually says."

But who in the world forces the Christians to read the "Jewish newspapers"? If the Christians did not read these papers they would soon cease and disappear, but not so the above-mentioned real Jewish Press, since it is written and published for a Jewish public. But quite unpardonable and outrageously unjust is the well-known saying: "Yes, but it is precisely the Jews who have corrupted the Christians." This I call a conjurer's trick calculated to make another religious community responsible for one's own wickedness, and that is downright despicable and disgraceful.

I had to mention all this because it shows that the fight against Judaism is almost throughout a religious fight. It is not directed against the Jews as Jews, but against the so-called unbelievers.

5. *Further Reproaches*

The Anti-Semites further reproach the Jews with their lack of patriotism. This accusation is the more remarkable as it is unfortunately only too well known that many a country counts among its citizens hundreds of thousands, nay, millions who not only harbour no patriotic feeling at all but actually hate both their native country and its dynasty. That the Jews cannot particularly love the population of a country where they are being trampled and spit upon is obvious, and when they are constantly being told that they are neither wanted nor considered as Germans, Frenchmen, Russians and so forth, it is after all only natural for them not to consider themselves as subjects of the respective States. On the other hand, the Jews have always been faithful and devoted to the head of a State which granted them justice, and this, too, is quite comprehensible, since in the head of the State they see their supremest and often sole protector.

The assertion of the Anti-Semites that the Jews are unfit for agriculture, handicraft and manual labour, is based on a gross error. They were not accepted in the guilds and this, as we have seen, on religious grounds, nor were they allowed to possess landed property. Where should the Jews have got love and understanding for agriculture when in consequence of religious prejudices they have been debarred from it for centuries? Wherever the Jews had an opportunity of carrying on agriculture they have done so. It is true, of course, that in those countries where they have been debarred from this pursuit, custom and hereditary qualities certainly developed among the Jews an aversion for agriculture.

I advise my respected readers to betake themselves one day to Salonika. There they will meet crowds of porters, boatmen and artisans who are Jews. There the lazy Turk works as little as possible, while the Greek (Aryan) has managed to accaparate all the businesses and occupations which require neither toil nor bodily exertion. In London the Jews are tailors' and shoemakers' assistants, while in New York the workmen in shoe factories are almost

exclusively Jews. In Roumania and in the United States Jewish workmen and artisans are counted by the thousands. The Anti-Semites could not have made such assertions had they taken the trouble to study Jewish life in Roumanian towns or in Salonika, London and New York.

As for the alleged Jewish cruelty, there is no need to waste words on this accusation. God knows how many cases of terrible cruelties have occurred among all nations, and pretty frequently, too.

Here again I must mention that in the vast majority of such cases of cruelty which one encounters among the Jews, it was their religion which was the motive. Besides, many records of cruelties committed by the Jews, such as the extermination of whole nations together with their women and children at the command of God, are quite untenable. The Torah contains many humane and very noble regulations concerning the treatment of aliens and strangers in Israel, nay, even of animals, regulations which will redound to the eternal honour of Israel.

The charity of the Jews is well known and has been repeatedly admitted even by Anti-Semites. During my residence in Tokio in 1893, an earthquake having destroyed a portion of the cloister, of the cloister school and the children's crèche of the Catholic sisters, I wrote to several of my well-to-do schoolday friends and others, begging them to send pecuniary aid to the lady-superior of the cloister in her great distress. Only one of them granted my request to help the lady-superior, and sent her 20 florins, while all the others never took any notice of my letter. One man alone sent the Catholic lady-superior the not inconsiderable sum of 500 francs—and this man was a Jew. There we have a Jew, a genuine unbaptized Jew, who readily gave 500 francs to a Catholic nunnery which educated heathen children and brought them up as Christians. What Christian, I ask, would have contributed even a copper towards a Jewish missionary and educational establishment for heathen children?

With regard to the alleged boundless Jewish concupiscence and sexual lust, here, too, no nation has any right to cast a stone at the Jews. In my opinion such accusations only furnish one more proof of the great embarrassment

in which the enemies of the Jews find themselves and who are compelled to make statements which cannot be proved at all. In this respect the Jews are neither a whit better nor worse than the other children of Adam. The missionary Martin Flad informs us that among the Falashas in Abyssinia there exists even a Jewish Monastic order. Aba-Zebra, the founder of the order, lived in the fourth century A.D. in the province of Armatshoho and dwelt in a cave called Hohareva. He was a pious ascetic and reputed to have healed sick people in a miraculous way by prayers and laying on of hands. Since the time of Aba-Zebra all those who wish to become members of his order are obliged to let themselves be castrated. Thus this order, which has existed for over fifteen centuries, furnishes a striking proof that among the Jews, too, there are men who possess the moral strength to renounce sexual love for ever.

“To the Jew,” says the Anti-Semitic Catechism, “virtue is only that which promises him personal advantage or enjoyment.” Nothing is more unjust than this accusation. Had it been true, the Jews would never have suffered the terrible persecutions to which they have been subjected in Christian countries, nor slaughtered their own children and sacrificed fortune, family and respect, nay, even life itself, for the sake of their faith. Even to-day, at least in many countries, it requires a considerable heroism to proclaim oneself a Jew and neither convert oneself for form’s sake nor pretend to have no religion at all. Personally, I fail to understand how any Christian could write down such lines as those which I have quoted from the Anti-Semitic Catechism. My own conscience would never give me a moment’s respite until I had retracted such a statement.

The Roumanian Minister Carp once made the following declaration in the Roumanian Parliament: “Are you anxious to fight with the people against Jewish competition? Well, then become as industrious, as sober and as thrifty as the Jews are, and then you will have no reason to fear them.”

The constantly latent religious hatred requires, of course, some cause or motive to manifest itself. This cause is very frequently not of a religious nature but profane and petty.

Most frequently they are material interests which fan into flame the already existing religious fanaticism.

One often comes across opponents of Anti-Semitism who maintain that this feeling is rooted not in any religious fanaticism but in envy, jealousy and a feeling of one's own inferiority. Religion is only a mask of which envy avails itself in order not to appear in public in too ugly a light. This explanation certainly fits the case of a good many persons, but anyhow only a minority. That on the whole only religious fanaticism and not envy is the principal cause of Anti-Semitism becomes evident from the fact that we find a hatred of the Jews among hundreds of thousands of men who have nothing whatever to do with Jews, who have no occasion to compete against a Jew, in a word, in whose way no Jew ever stands. Thus, to quote one instance, Jews are intensely hated in Paraguay, and yet there are no Jews at all in the country. Therefore religious hatred is the prime motive.

But if Anti-Semitism is not a religious question, then it cannot be anything else but a manifestation of commercial envy and jealousy, and this people are usually ashamed to admit. They prefer to hide their envy, their jealousy and their rancour, under a tiny moral cloak.

It is forsooth an old song which forever remains as new as it is unjust and mendacious. While hankering after money one prefers to preach morality.

The Anti-Semites are further accustomed to reproach the Jews with cowardice. If by cowardice they mean a lack of moral courage, then the whole history of the Jews, their heroism during persecutions and oppressions, prove just the contrary. If, on the other hand, by cowardice they mean bravery and valour, then the assertion is true enough for our times but can easily be explained by the servitude and the thralldom which for centuries have crushed all the personal valour of the Jews. And yet, in spite of all this, we have many proofs of personal valour even among the Jews in our own days. English officers have repeatedly called special attention to and praised the military efficiency of the Jewish Beni Israel in India. In the war of 1870-71 the Jews Otto Bibo, Saul Daus and Alexander Hirschmann, had distinguished themselves by

particular bravery and valour. The bravery, too, of the Bulgarian Jews at the battle of Pirot earned them the praise of Prince Alexander, who addressed them in the following words : " Brave Jews ! by your heroic conduct you have shown yourselves to-day to be the true descendants of the Maccabees." One thing, however, is certain : the bravery and valour shown by the Jews in the fights of the Maccabean days and in the wars against Titus and Hadrian were downright splendid and admirable and have earned them immortal glory.

The Anti-Semitic Catechism has compiled a whole list of unfavourable statements made by eminent men concerning the Jews, evidently with a view to making the reader believe that the most learned and the cleverest men have all been Anti-Semites. This book, however, passes over in silence not only the numerous statements made by other eminent men which are favourable to the Jews and which the reader will find enumerated in the *Anti-Semiten Hammer* of Joseph Schrattenholz (Dusseldorf, 1894), but it is also silent about the friendly opinions concerning the Jews expressed by men who once in their lives had written or said unpleasant things about the Jews and who in later life had altered their views and written or spoken differently. The book mentions only the hostile but not the favourable statements made by these men. Thus, for instance, the Anti-Semitic Catechism reproduces part of a speech made by the young thirty-two years old von Bismarck in 1847 in the united Landtag against the emancipation of the Jews, but it passes over in silence all the declarations concerning the Jews made by the great mature Imperial Chancellor Prince Bismarck. The book does not mention the fact that the Anti-Semites had repeatedly accused Prince Bismarck of being a friend of the Jews. Certain of these reproaches raised by the Anti-Semitic Press against Bismarck on account of his friendship for the Jews have been compiled and reproduced in the *Antisemitenspiegel* (printed and published by A. W. Kafemann, Dantzig). Thus, for instance, the Anti-Semitic Catechism reproduces the hostile but not the favourable statements which Luther made concerning the Jews. The book further reproduces the hostile statements with regard to the Jews which Field-

marshal Count Moltke wrote when he was only a lieutenant, but which he is said to have crossed out in later life.

This by no means denies the fact that very clever, learned and even gifted men have been and are Anti-Semites. "They just feel an antipathy for the Jews." It would, however, be interesting to know the source of this antipathy. With a good many this source is frequently nothing else than exceedingly unpleasant personal adventures and experiences with usurers, revolver-journalists and so forth, while in the case of many others it is hatred of the so-called revealed religion, in Europe particularly of Christianity, and as one is rather loath to hit out against Christianity one inveighs and rails against Judaism in general.

In the case of others, Anti-Semitism actually originates in envy, jealousy and in the feeling of one's own inferiority, while with others again—such is the case of several scholars—Anti-Semitism is a scientific hobby, as for instance in the case of those who are always abusing and harping on the equation of Semites-Nomads or Jews-Semites and then ride this hobby-horse to death through thick and thin.

I should like every Anti-Semite to ask himself for once on what occasion he had for the first time experienced the feeling of Jew hatred. In the vast majority of cases this will already have happened in his earliest childhood when as a child he had not yet met any Jews at all. I should also wish the Anti-Semite to ask himself who the persons were who had for the first time prejudiced him against the Jews and put him in an Anti-Semitic mood.

6. *Facts*

The discussion of all Anti-Semitic accusations raised against the Jews has thus been exhausted and what remains as true of these accusations?

Nothing else than the following point :

To-day the Jews still produce a relatively greater percentage of usurers, procurers and swindlers than the Christians. To-day still! That is a fact which no one could gainsay and which must simply be put down as a truth. To-morrow perhaps no longer!

This fact is the necessary consequence of the situation

into which the Christians have pressed the Jews. These defects were never inherent in the Jews, and only began to develop since the twelfth century of our era, and it may therefore be asserted with apodictic certainty that the percentage of these defects among Jews and Christians will be equalized through freedom and enlightenment. The truth of this my assertion can be logically demonstrated by the following two deductions.

1. A nation which in the course of time and under the pressure of circumstance has developed certain defects, vices and bad habits which for centuries it had never possessed may, and certainly will, get rid of these defects and vices just as it contracted them, once the circumstances which have given rise to them disappear.

2. The above-mentioned vices, like usury, panderism and deceit, are precisely vices which are more frequently connected with the acquisition of money—which until recently was almost the exclusive occupation of the Jews—than with other professional branches. It stands to reason that these vices will diminish in a measure as other professions and occupations will not only be opened to the Jews—which is already the case to-day—but as soon as the latter will have accustomed themselves to embrace them more frequently. These vices and defects of the Jews are, however, outbalanced by their numerous virtues, viz. industry, economy, craving for knowledge, patience, family sentiment, sobriety, diligence and charity. If therefore in a few countries the Jews are furnishing a plus in the three above-mentioned vices, they show, on the other hand, a minus in all other crimes and offences. If we now try to draw the balance of the various sums of virtue and vices and compare the sum-total with those of other nations and peoples we once more arrive at the most ingenious, original and new conclusion, after the formula $2 \times 2 = 4$, namely to the conclusion that there are good and bad men among all religions.

Renan says : “ Several times we have called attention to the curious circumstance that the Jews, if I may say so, harbour in their bosom two extremes, the struggle between good and evil. No malice actually comes up to the malice of the Jews, but in spite of it, Judaism has been able to

give birth to the ideals of kindness, ready devotion and love. The best of all men have been Jews and the most wicked of men have also been Jews." What has been said of Jewish men applies also to Jewish writings. Some of these writings are the noblest and deepest that have ever been written, as for instance the Book of Job, Ecclesiastes, many sections of the Torah and the Prophets, particularly Isaiah. On the other hand, we also meet poisonous mushrooms of a most suspicious kind which hide in their inmost the seed from which intolerance, fanaticism, religious wars, condemnation of heretics, inquisition and so forth have blossomed forth.

The Jews are extraordinarily great both in good and in evil. Anybody who remembers that the Lord Jesus Christ was born among this nation will not wonder at its differing so greatly from all other nations.

But that there should be Jews who deny their membership of this great nation instead of boasting of it, like the great (baptized) Lord Beaconsfield, and of proudly exclaiming with Uriel Acosta: "You may curse me, because I am a Jew," this, I say, is disgraceful.

CHAPTER VI

EMANCIPATION AND ZIONISM

A THOROUGH study of the Old Testament by Edward Reus would be a radical remedy for both Christians and Jews. But it is precisely the orthodox Jew who will be the quickest of all to run up and snatch the torch from the hand of the scholar, because he believes that only by faith in the Torah and by the observance of the Law salvation and the Messianic era can be brought about as if by magic. The disease therefore is incurable, and both Jews and Christians are responsible for it. An orthodox Jew is not even permitted to eat at the same table with a non-Jew, while orthodox Jews and believing Christians contract no marriages one with the other, *mensa, connubium negatur*. What is the result? . . . But what is true is the fact that the Jews are a nation for themselves which needs must hold together and which has been ill-treated in such a way that as long as there will be a Jewish religion and a Christian religion, it will be quite impossible to expect the Jews to pardon the Christians for what the latter have done unto them. Therein, of course, lies a great danger. By tremendous detours and indirectly Anti-Semitism has produced a good effect, for it has called the attention of both Christians and Jews to the impossibility of bridging over the contradictions as long as both of them are clinging to their respective faiths.

A further effect of Anti-Semitism has been its success in making it clear to the non-Jewish population that in order to be able to compete with the Jews it must, first of all, become as sober, as industrious and as economical as the latter are.

Anti-Semitism has also in so far acted as a beneficial incentive. Nobody will blame the Christians when they

energetically fight with the same means against the Jews wherever the latter unite and monopolize commercial branches and form corners. It does not, however, follow from such a fight that the Jews are really hated and despised or that every social intercourse with them is being avoided.

“The best definition of the Jews,” says the great Schopenhauer, “still remains that of a *nation*.” A nation still continues to exist even if—as it is natural—ever so many of its members have left it and attached themselves to other nations; it also continues to exist even if ever so many new elements have been received in it. The Jews, of course, lack one of the factors which constitute a nation, namely, that of language, for they possess no living common speech. They converse in the respective languages of the nations in whose midst they are dwelling or have dwelt, viz. in German, Spanish and Arabic. But the sacred languages, Hebrew and Aramaic, compensate for this lack. Further factors are their common customs and practices which again have their origin in the Jewish religion. As for common characteristic traits, only very few of them can be proved to exist among the Jews on account of the great diversity between the various Jewish groups. These characteristic traits, too, originated in their religion. The most zealous Anti-Semite would despair of discovering and proving any common characteristic traits, independent of religion, which exist between the Spanish and the Arabian Jews—the Sephardim—and the German and Polish Jews—the Ashkenazim—between the remnants of Chinese Jewry, which are still to be found in Honan, and the black and the white Jews on the Indian coast of Malabar, then again between all these groups and the Jewish Falashas in Abyssinia. The German and the Polish Jews are well known for their chaffering and commercial spirit, but quite different are the Sephardim in the East, and the Arabian, Indian, Chinese and Abyssinian Jews. What Anti-Semite will venture to try the trick of bringing all these Jews under one and the same label? I should like to see him do it.

Suppose, although it cannot be admitted, that all those bad characteristic traits and infamies which the Anti-Semites reproach the Jews with be true, namely, everything

that is enumerated in the chapter of the Anti-Semitic Catechism quoted above (on p. 24), then the reproaches would only apply to the Polish and German Jews, that is to say to one fraction only, but not to the whole of Jewry. This is so clear and self-evident, is such a logical truism, that it requires no proof. Should, however, the Anti-Semites be forced to admit it, then I ask them whence this difference comes? Why should those Jews who have lived for centuries in the countries of Islam and in non-Christian lands be so different from the other Jews who have always remained in Christian countries? The reader will admit that it is precisely this question which is the focus of the problem. Whence, I ask, this difference between the various branches of Jewry, whence the diversity and dissimilarity between Jews who have lived in various periods of history?

The Jews to-day are for the most part what the nations in whose midst they have lived have made them. If the Jews once possessed good and noble qualities and virtues which they now no longer possess, if they have contracted vices and habits which they had formerly not possessed, this is merely the effect of the influence which the nations have exercised upon them.

What are the Jews in reality? They are an artificial nation, a compound of numerous nationalities brought about by a common religion, formed both by a voluntary and a forced separation from the other nations and by the prohibition of mixed marriages, all of which have been the result of religious principles. This exclusion or rather separation, together with a very definite mode of life prescribed by their religion (circumcision, marriage, dietary laws and so forth), and also the constraint under which they lived and which forced them to develop only in one fixed direction (commerce, chaffering, usury and so forth), have developed in this nation a distinct and definite physical and moral type. The definition applicable to the Jews would therefore be: "an artificial nation created by religious rules and ordinances and compounded of numerous racial elements."

This definition fits all Jewish groups, the Polish Jews as well as the Falashas, the Indian as well as the Chinese

Jews; this definition alone explains and accounts for the alleged Jewish characteristic traits and for the physical type so different from ours. For about one thousand years Jewry has, of course, not absorbed any foreign elements, but, on the other hand, streams of Jewish blood have ever since flown into the Christian nations as a result of conversions. Renan says expressly that there are several Jewish races. That there is no unique Jewish race I have already proved in the first chapter of this work. Those who are absolutely decided to apply the term "race" to the Jews can do this only with the express reserve that by this term they wished to indicate an artificial nation consisting of numerous races which began to exist at the moment when Jewish proselytism (conversion of the Khazars) had ceased—and has preserved itself pure in consequence of the prohibition of mixed marriages, of exclusion and seclusion.

Considering the comparatively vast quantity of foreign blood it has absorbed, a very small fraction only of this artificial nation can be said to be related by blood to the ancient people of Israel. If we now leave out the small quantity of old Jewish blood and ask what remains of modern Jewry the answer will be: nothing more than a religious community which, in consequence of religious ordinances, has developed into several new races during the last twelve centuries. But those who are speaking of a Jewish race are always thinking of the descendants issued from the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, for the other ten tribes had already completely disappeared with the fall of the Israelite Kingdom in 772 B.C., that is to say had been absorbed by other nations, just as the hundreds of thousands of Jews who had been forcibly converted to Christianity and Islam have been. When we speak of a Jewish race the term can therefore have some sense and meaning only if the word *Jewish* is not taken in either an ethnographical or an anthropological sense, but merely connotes the Mosaic faith which has created this new race. One should always bear in mind the fact that already in the times of Christ the number of non-Jewish followers of Judaism was greater than the number of Jews authentic by blood, and that under Titus and Hadrian perhaps one-half, if not more, of all the Palestinian Jews had been exterminated. From

what has been said above it follows that the quantity of Jewish blood flowing in the veins of the Christian and Mohammedan nations in Europe, in Western Asia and in North Africa, is larger than that which flows in the veins of the modern Jews.

2. *Emancipation*

The emancipation of the Jews by the French Revolution, a measure which was soon emulated by the majority of the other European nations, seems more and more to reveal itself as a fiasco. In a speech delivered at the Zionist Congress at Basel, Dr. Herzl rightly said :

“I must utter a few painful words. The nations who emancipated the Jews were under an illusion with regard to their sentiments. If the emancipation was to produce its full effect it ought to have originated in sentiment before it was expressed in law. Such, however, has not been the case, and the contrary is true. The history of the emancipation of the Jews is one of the most remarkable chapters in the history of European thought. It is not the result of discernment, of a realization that a tribe had been grievously wronged, that a horrible treatment had been meted out to it and that it was high time to atone for this millenary injustice ; the emancipation was solely the result of the geometrical, rectilinear mode of thought of French Rationalism in the eighteenth century.

“This Rationalism was based solely on logic, without any regard for any vivifying sentiment ; it was based on principles of a mathematical axiom, and it insisted upon raising a fictitious structure imagined in the world of reality. ‘Rather lose the colonies than abandon one principle!’ runs the well-known maxim which fully expresses the method of applying rationalism to politics. The emancipation of the Jews represents as it were another automatic application of the rationalist method. The philosophy of Rousseau and of the Encyclopædists had led to the declaration of the rights of man, and from this declaration the rigid logic of the men of the great Revolution deduced the emancipation of the Jews. They drew up a regular equation : viz. every man by nature possesses certain rights, the Jews are men, and consequently they, too,

possess the rights of man. And the equality of rights of the Jews was proclaimed in France not out of a brotherly sentiment for the Jews but because logic demanded it. The sentiments of the people often resisted against it, but the philosophy of the Revolution commanded it that logic should be put above sentiments. I hope that I shall be forgiven for saying this, for my words in no way imply any ingratitude, but the men of 1792 emancipated us out of pedantry."

I may venture to add that the emancipation has for the most part been carried out with a view to annoying the Church which, I dare say, is to-day laughing into its sleeve at the comical issue of that measure.

"The Jews are men," proclaimed the liberals of the emancipation period, "that means in a manner of speaking," resounds to-day the refrain of the Anti-Semites. "The Jews possess equal rights with all the other citizens of the State," proclaims the law, "that means to say on paper," is the answer of our enlightened age. For in reality official heads and principals of departments bang the doors in the face of Jewish candidates wherever they can do it, and the professional posts open to Jews are growing less and less numerous.

The emancipation came at a moment when it was already too late. When the emancipating States burst open the gates of the ghetto and proclaimed the equality of rights of all citizens the whole of Israel exulted and uttered a shout of joy. Perfectly happy, the Jews threw themselves into Christian society, and a great many of them, the assimilators, heartily and gladly did what they could to resemble as much as possible their Christian fellow-citizens in dress, customs, manners, deportment and fashions. It became for them a question of ambition not to be taken for Jews in society; they were ashamed of their origin and of their race, and many of them even became Anti-Semites, Jewish Anti-Semites, which is nothing else than a *nec plus ultra* of meanness!

But how these Jews have been deceived! To-day they are openly given to understand that whether baptized or not, whether speaking correct German or like a Jew, they will always remain despised Jews, be they rich or poor,

good riders on horseback, cavaliers, good dancers, good shots, or Philistines—no matter, “Jew remains Jew! You do not belong to our society.”

Formerly the liberal Christians were quite willing to admit the Jews into their society. Why are they no longer so to-day? The Jew has become exceedingly unsympathetic to the Christian, even the most liberal Christian. How is this to be explained?

As a result of their mutual religious prejudices Jews and Christians had lived for centuries completely separated one from the other. On account of this separation and seclusion a definite Jewish social type developed in the ghetto, a caste with specifically peculiar habits, dialects, gestures, movements, manners, customs and usages, with different conceptions of honour and of tact. Moreover, as a result of the Jewish dietary and purity laws and also of the fact of their having been penned up in a dirty ghetto and of their sedentary mode of life, the Jews also developed a physical type which in many ways differs from that of the Christians. The assimilators among the Jews had at first imagined that it only needed their willingness and that they could at one stroke strip off their Jewish nature (Jewishness) and exchange it for that of Christian society.

Therein, however, they have been mightily mistaken. The external marks of a certain civilization cannot be taken off like an overcoat and exchanged for those of another civilization. In the ghetto the Jews had spoken their own peculiar jargon. This accent, of course, all those who had spoken the dialect in their childhood had retained, and only the de-Judaized Jews lost it, that is to say the Jews who had grown up and been educated in non-Jewish circles from their earliest childhood. It required new generations, at least two, that is several decades, to eliminate and to efface the jargon and also an early separation from the members of the Jewish race. The same applies to gesticulation. In the ghetto the Jews, both by birth and by education, had acquired certain gestures, movements of hands and fingers, which, as is almost always the case, are closely connected with the mode of life and of dress. In these gestures heredity and atavism undoubtedly played a part. They cannot be abandoned at will and others assumed in

their stead. Everything must be learnt, as one knows, even the manner and mode of walking, sitting, sitting down, saluting, entering a room and a social gathering or leaving it, the manner of eating and drinking, in a word, all the innumerable shades and nuances of daily social life. Those who have lived long in the countries of Islam and in Eastern Asia know what trouble it costs to acquire the customs and manners of an alien civilized nation. A European will probably never learn to imitate the graceful mode of saluting among the Japanese; the Japanese dress, too, is required to execute gracefully this salutation which in European dress would only be grotesque and ridiculous. To be able to behave like a Moslem in Arabic dress requires several years' practice. This applies also to Chinese and Korean etiquette. Chinese and Koreans look upon Europeans as churls on account of their manners and gestures, although the former themselves behave in society and even at table in a manner which we consider to be the culminating point of a boorish behaviour. Similar things we notice in the Islamic East. Now in their ghetto the Jews possessed their own rules of social conduct and behaviour. This behaviour was entirely Asiatic and dignified. I have myself had many an opportunity of observing this as a guest in the houses of orthodox Jews in Bosnia and in the Bukovina. The etiquette there and the behaviour of the children towards their parents, of the subordinates towards their superiors, of the young towards the old, was very dignified, ceremonial, decorous and respectable, but totally different from the behaviour customary in modern Christian houses.

The gates of the ghetto had been pulled down, and the Jews with their habits and customs entered Christian society. One portion of them, the better and cleverer, retained their Jewish dress and their dignified Asiatic deportment, although it was frequently interpreted as cringing and servility. Another portion, however, was anxious to imitate the Christian population. They assumed and copied, as well as they could, Christian dress, Christian manners and behaviour. The first emancipated generation naturally failed lamentably in its endeavour, the second succeeded in a very small degree, and again only those few who had from childhood been brought up and educated

like their Christian fellow-citizens. Just as the European, arrayed in Arabic, Chinese or Japanese dress, who tries to imitate the manners of the respective foreign nation only cuts a ridiculous figure in the eyes of that nation, so it also happened with the Jews. First of all they dressed very badly and tastelessly, enthusiastically donned top-hats of the most incredible shapes; in short, they dressed as unpicturesquely as possible. With frock-coat and tail-coat they retained their movements and gestures which may have been in tune with the long caftan, and thus produced a disagreeable impression upon their Christian fellow-citizens. Particularly did the dancing motion of the feet, so frequent among the Jews, the lifting up of the outwardly turned palm of the hand with outspread fingers to the height of the shoulders and the frequently bowed carriage, disconcert the Indo-Germans.

One may easily observe that people who do not know how to behave in society, and are greatly embarrassed, frequently grow pert, saucy and insolent, in order to hide their embarrassment. Thus it frequently happened with the Jews at their first entry into Christian society. At first they never succeeded in hitting off the right tone, and where should they have learnt it? Surely not in their ghetto. They thought it right to talk in society about subjects which but little interested the company in which they happened to find themselves. Frequently, when they were at a loss for a subject of conversation, they put questions or touched upon subjects the mention of which produced an unpleasant and even painful effect upon the others.

It is well known that in the different civilized and cultured circles and gatherings there are various topics which are either permitted or tabooed. It is, for instance, considered impolite in the Mohammedan East to make any mention of the female members of the family when conversing with one of the family. In other countries, talking about the head of the State or to mention his name is tabooed, and so forth. To exhibit curiosity with regard to the family and the fortune of a person addressed, but with whom one is not on intimate terms, is considered to be impolite amongst us, but is an act of politeness among the

Chinese. All these are social nuances of tact and manners which even among European nations vary considerably. What a difference there is between the social life, the rules of behaviour and the manners, in Russia and in England. One may therefore imagine what social blunders the poor Jews must have committed when they left the ghetto for the first time and were admitted into Christian society.

It is amazing that they should not have committed more such blunders and that they should have managed to assimilate themselves even so far as they have done. Today, of course, the young generation of Jews which has grown up outside the ghetto and has been entirely educated in Christian fashion, a generation which practises gymnastics and other sports, especially in England, France and America, can scarcely any longer be distinguished from the Christians. One more generation, at most two generations, would have sufficed, and Jewry in Western and Central Europe would have melted away and been dissolved among the Christian nations like sugar is dissolved in water.

But this was not to happen. Anti-Semitism suddenly flared up anew, drove the Jews from Christian society and compelled them more than ever to cling together still more closely.

The Jews now understood it quite clearly that they were not wanted, that people refused to recognize them as Germans, Frenchmen, Austrians, and so forth. They now return to where they have come from and call to the Christians: "You will not recognize us as members of your race, you tell us that we are aliens and Jews; very well, then let us be Jews as you proclaim us to be." Zionism is the inevitable result of Anti-Semitism. Both phenomena arise from the same root and have the same nature, being only different expressions for the same thing, although, of course, there is not a shadow of understanding between the Zionists and the Anti-Semites. Foreign, distant and cold, the two groups face one another, and it is precisely the Anti-Semites who look upon Zionism as upon a ridiculous Utopia. One has only to read on this subject the interesting publication *Rabbinism and Zionism* by the

learned Anti-Semite, Professor Dr. Adolf Wahrmund. The Jewish emancipation proclaimed by the French Revolution has declared its complete bankruptcy, and as victors in the field there remain only the various Christian Churches ; they can now split their sides with laughter at the failure of their opponents. For the present !

3. *Zionism*

We notice how all over the world both religious and national fanaticism are flaring up anew ; we see how the latter is availing itself of religious particularism—as in the “ Away from Rome ” question, in the Huss-cult and in the numerous measures which the Government of the Tsar had many years ago taken against dissenters. We also see vice versa how the various religious bodies avail themselves of the folly of nationality for their own ends and purposes, and we had an instance of it in the attitude adopted by a portion of the French population during the Dreyfus affair. Very frequently it is even difficult to say which is the driving force, whether politics or religion. Where, however, as is the case with the Jewish question, oppositions cannot be reconciled and the vehicle gets so entangled and stuck in the mud that it can no longer be dragged out, where hatred and aversion, in spite of all attempts, are continually increasing, there separation is best for all parties. This separation the Zionist movement intends to bring about. The aim of Zionism, a movement which has now spread among the Jews all over the world, is to make it possible for the Jews in all countries to emigrate and to form a united nation and a Jewish State in Palestine. This is the one and only radical remedy possible for the present, for considering the small degree of enlightenment and of humanity to be met with to-day, it will take a long time before one may count upon peace and justice. “ Out with the Jews ” is the cry resounding everywhere in Anti-Semitic camps. Very well, but whither ? “ That is not our business,” reply the Anti-Semites, “ that is for the Jews to decide ; it is their concern where they go—but it is nothing to us.” No, I say, it is very much the concern of the Anti-Semites, for the neighbouring States, too, shout : “ Out

with the Jews," and when one State ejects the Jews the neighbouring State sends them back and avails itself of the opportunity offered to smuggle in its own Jews and then one is just as far as before. The question "Whither with the Jews" is therefore one which every State must seriously think how to solve, and it is worth their while to take counsel together and to arrive at a common decision. Once a country has been found and all the Jews have been proclaimed citizens of that country, then indeed they will be aliens and strangers among us; then, for aught I care, the desired specific laws may be promulgated without trampling under foot progress and enlightenment, humanity and Christian charity; then, without being cruel, one may behave against the Jews in such a way as to make them sick of and disgusted with a sojourn in a foreign land. Then Anti-Judaism will no longer be cruel, although certainly narrow-minded and unwise, particularly very, very unwise. For it must be borne in mind that the Jews are one of the most highly gifted and talented nations in the world. In the first place, this is due to cross-breeding and to an intermingling with foreign blood which was so frequent among the Jews, a circumstance which always invariably results in a talented progeny. Secondly, their situation during the Middle Ages had forced the Jews to exert their intellect in the highest degree in order to be able to live. The latter circumstance, thanks to heredity and training, has frequently resulted in the development of a stupendous intellectual capacity of production, to which should also be added their diligence and sobriety. What a host of great and famous men in all stations of life the Jews have produced, in spite of the oppression which weighed so heavily on them! I will mention here only the following: in music, Bizet, Halévy, Brüll, Meyerbeer, Mendelssohn, Offenbach, Rubinstein, Goldmark, Auer, Joachim and Reményi; in dramatic art, Sonnenthal, Sarah Bernhardt, Dawson, Ascher, Rothmül, Robert; in painting, Jacoby, Junker, Liebermann, Oppenheim, Sichel, Kaufmann, Possart and Horowitz; in poetry, Heine, Börne, Auerbach; in literature, Herzl, Nordau, Saphir and Wolff; in science, Halévy, Dérenbourg, Geiger, Goldziher, Graetz, Neander, Lazarus, Mendelssohn, Vambéry, Grünhut and Emin Pasha; in statesmanship

and politics, Lord Beaconsfield, Crémieux, Kuranda, Lasker, Marx and Lassalle.¹ This, however, is only an insignificantly small fraction of the number of famous Jews of our age. To those who are interested in the subject, as everyone who is writing about the Jews ought to be, I would recommend the work by Dr. Adolf Kohut entitled *Berühmte israelitische Männer und Frauen in der Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit* (Famous Jewish Men and Women in the History of Civilization of Humanity).

And it is to such fellow-citizens that we are anxious to show the door! But the expelling State is the greatest loser, while the hospitable State which offers shelter to the exiles derives the benefit.

But I am convinced that the great and wonderful nation of the Jews—Reform-Jewry, of course, never and never orthodox Jewry—is still destined one day to bring salvation and blessing to all mankind.

Oppressions and specific laws have developed the Jewish intellect and its capacity for work to the highest degree—at the expense of all other organs, particularly at the expense of the physical capacity of production. But then the Christian States should at least make an attempt and try to derive some profit from these intellectual gifts which they themselves have trained. Instead of expelling the Jews, of oppressing them and thus crowding them into business concerns where, as the Christians pretend, they develop such a pernicious activity, the Christian States ought to put the Jews to the chariot of progress.

Five-sixths of the whole of Jewry are in the highest degree interested in the accomplishment and the attainment of the aims of Zionism. Five-sixths of all the Jews in the world are ready to emigrate and to betake themselves to the Jewish State which is to be founded. It is not true what the Anti-Semites say that the Jews would not go, because they would then be reduced to the necessity of cheating each other, and this they do not wish to do, preferring to use Christians for this purpose. Try it, gentlemen, work for Zionism and you will soon see how crowds of Jews will

¹ Among the Jews who have in the meantime attained universal reputation are among others: Einstein, Bergson, Ehrlich, Trotzki, Mahler, Brandes and Freud. (Editor.)

emigrate. When the idea of Zionism was first mooted, a considerable portion of Jewry was, of course, against it, but since then many of the opponents have been converted to it. Now this movement has since 1917 grown among the Jews and it is bound to grow even more, for with the spread of Anti-Semitism the misery of the Jewish masses is constantly increasing and the Jewish masses must either go abroad or be destroyed. As things are to-day, the Anti-Semites cannot harm the Jews very much, for they cannot, after all, kill them in a body, while to confiscate their fortunes would be a dangerous precedent and would sooner or later result in the confiscation of the fortunes of the non-Jewish rich. Once a hand has been laid on property, our entire social system will break down. And if the money of the Jewish millionaires were to be taken away the millions of Jewish proletarians would still remain. If the money of the Jewish millionaires were to be distributed among the ten million poor Jews, then each poor Jew would receive a trifling sum and there would soon be more poor Jews who would become a burden to Christian charity, but no wealthy Jews able to help their poor. The misery would remain the same, while so many Christians who are now in the service of rich Jews would be out of employment and without bread, just as their former masters. Specific laws forbidding the Jews to hold any posts or to be employed in the service of the State and so forth, to acquire academic degrees or devote themselves to some profession not connected with commerce, as the Anti-Semites demand it, would only result in driving the entire Jewish community into commercial enterprises. Now since the Jews are more than a match for the Christians in this respect, they would grow even richer, while their growing hatred against their tormentors would induce them to employ their wealth to the detriment of the Christians. Should the aims of Zionism not be realized, cruel catastrophes are imminent, dangers of which no man can tell whether they will be limited to the Jews alone. Once the populace has been let loose, it will hardly make any distinction between Jewish and Christian capital, and if the moneyed Jews are threatened, the Jews themselves will set the mob against the Christians. They will say, and who could blame them for it: "If we

are to be ruined financially, we are not going to crash alone; no, the rich Christians, too, shall be ruined in our company," and they will know well enough how to manage it.

May the Jews, therefore, emigrate if they so wish it, and let us be sure not to put any obstacles in their way, and let us work for the Zionist idea.

If we fail to do it, if we hinder their plans of emigration and refuse them the necessary diplomatic support—it is hard to imagine what may be in store for us. Despair and fury which lend gigantic strength will seize Jewry. Such an eventuality would prove extremely dangerous, and it is therefore urgent to look round as long as there is still time. What would we think of a man who had shut up in damp and musty cellars fugitives who came to him imploring and begging, a man who had cut off all intercourse with these prisoners and forced them to devote themselves to the meanest, dirtiest and lowest occupations in order to keep their bodies and souls together? After many years these unhappy, cooped-up men would have been ruined both physically and morally. They would have grown accustomed to a ridiculous jargon, would have acquired comical gestures, and neglected their personal attire; they would have become bleary-eyed, their eyes would be dripping, their spines curved, and their efforts and endeavours low and common. It would have been a horrible crime, but nevertheless explicable by the wickedness of human nature. But if the tormentors were now to treat these artificially degenerates to kicks, if they were to make merry over the latter's physical and moral infirmities and to overwhelm them with scorn and disdain, such a deed would no longer be human but fiendish. But the ugliest part of Anti-Semitism is the fact of it being a fight against its own mother and not against strangers.

Racial Anti-Semites will perhaps be of opinion that no Anti-Semite in the world could have any objection to the return of the Jews to the Promised Land, but whoever believes this is guilty of a tremendous error. It is almost a dogma of all believing Christians that the Jews will never again form a State, that never again will a sceptre blossom in Judah, never again the Temple be rebuilt. Rohling

openly expressed this view of Christian theology when he wrote :

“The Bible says that Israel will exist as a nation until the end of times, when it will be converted *en masse*. The Jews are therefore a continuous witness to the truth of Christ before our eyes, but many have eyes and do not see. On this occasion another remark : Christ prophesied that the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem would be destroyed for ever. It would therefore be worth while for Judah to repeat the attempt made by Julian the Apostate. Judah has power and Judah has money ; it rules the princes ; arise then, rebuild the Temple, and should the enterprise succeed, then the prophecy of the Nazarene would be annulled, his Divinity would prove to be a delusion, and we would all turn Jews.”

Now there may be many theologians who are secretly harbouring the opinion that the Temple of Jerusalem could after all be rebuilt one day, and which, of course, would be tantamount to a colossal *démenti* of the Christian creed. Now what are these theologians going to do ? Everything, I say, that lies in their power to prevent the Jews from attaining such a position which will make it possible for them to try and perform the trick of rebuilding the Temple. Should it ever come so far that when all preparations for the exodus will seem to have been made and yet unexpected obstacles arise over night, then Jews will at least know where to look for those who had put such an obstacle in their way and bolted the door.

Once the bulk of Jewry was away, the Christians would get on very well with the remaining Jews in Europe on account of their small number, and Anti-Semitism would have lived. In Zionism lies the remedy, the deliverance and the salvation of the Jews, and it ought to be the common aim of all the Jews and Christian philanthropists to carry it through by all possible means. Insults, blustering curses, affronts and suspicions will never advance the enterprise one step. What is required is action ; one must act quietly, deliberately, systematically and consistently, and then this question, too, will find a speedy and passable solution.

CONCLUSION

I hope to have proved that the essence of Anti-Semitism is nothing else but fanatical religious hatred, whatever the mask it puts on or the altered features which it has actually assumed to-day may happen to be. I feel sure to have abundantly proved that Anti-Semitism cannot be a racial hatred because there is *no* such thing as a Jewish race—just as little as there are a Semitic race and a Semitic character which are mere chimeras. I have shown that the group of men who constitute Jewry to-day and who so greatly differ from ourselves in their mode of thought and action, in their desires, sentiments, conduct and behaviour, is the product of an artificial selection, the result of treatment and education, and that the principles which have brought about this differentiation are rooted exclusively in religion. Both Jews and Christians are responsible for it. Anti-Semitism is not a religious phenomenon simply because the Jews are maintaining a passive attitude towards it, while they, in turn, have been and are objects on which the non-Jews are wont to put into practice their religious conceptions. The Jews have never been a lifeless clay which religious antipathy has been fashioning and moulding; no, they too have been active and often participated in the work, more offensively during the first centuries of our era, and later on, during the Middle Ages and in modern times, in a more defensive way. If we investigate the matter thoroughly and go down to its roots we are bound to admit that the Jews themselves are responsible for the whole mischief on account of the principles which some of their Biblical authors had laid down, principles which were later on accepted as true and right both by Christians and Moslems. It is the principle, for instance, that there is only one true religion, that God is a jealous God who will be adored in one way only and to whom the worship of other Gods is an abomination and a crime which deserve punishment. It is the principle that one must have no other God besides Him who has revealed Himself in a certain way and through certain persons and who must be adored in that way only and not otherwise. It is the principle that one must not

bow to other Gods and therefore take no part in another cult, have no *communio sacris* with people of another religion, for such an action is a heavy sin punished by eternal torments in hell. It is the principle that one must sacrifice one's life under cruel tortures rather than renounce the only true religion, outside which there is no salvation. It is the principle that one must not recognize or adopt another religion by either word or deed, were it even out of an instinct of self-preservation or out of courtesy.

These principles, Jewish principles, are the sole cause which was instrumental in making martyrdom in Judaism, Christianity and Islam, at all possible, for otherwise such martyrdom would have been quite unthinkable. Jewish authors are therefore beyond all doubt responsible for the blood of Jewish, Christian and Moslem martyrs of all times, to begin with the days of the Maccabees down to the Chinese martyrs in our own days. Add to this the idea that being slaughtered for the sake of one's faith is not only a sacrifice pleasing unto God but also brings salvation to others, an idea which certain freethinkers have called Molochism. This idea again has a close connection with another Jewish conception, viz. that God finds delight in the blood of sacrificed animals. The ritual ordinances which say that the sacrificial animal must be pure, noble, young and faultless, easily lead to the following conclusion : the nobler the sacrificial animal is objectively, the more agreeable it is to God ; now the noblest creature is man, and the nobler, purer, nay, the more innocent he is the more agreeable to God he must be. If, on the other hand, the fact of it being pleasing is not due to the intrinsic worth, the beauty and the purity of the sacrificial animal objectively, but rather subjectively to the *pretium affectionis*, that is to say to the value which the sacrificial creature represents for the person offering the sacrifice, then again there must exist a tendency to choose as a sacrifice what is most valuable and dearest to us, viz. our own child, or a friend, in a word, a man. Thus both these conceptions must always lead up to human sacrifices. Biblical criticism is now anxious to prove that the writings which are dealing with Jewish sacrifices of animals, with the expiatory power of blood, with the pleasing odour of slaughtered sacrifices,

with the punishment for unbelief and errors, with the only and exclusive salvation, are anything but trustworthy. Those books are simply the work of a few anonymous Jewish authors of whom no one knows when and how they lived, nor who they were or what their names were. The terrible consequence of all this is that for centuries the followers of Judaism, of Christianity and of Islam have been and still are simply the victims of a huge mystification. The three monotheistic religions are rooted in these anonymous writings, *inde lacrimæ* of the last twenty-five centuries (by the way, an insignificantly small period in the history of mankind as geology proves). It is for this reason that the cry now so often resounds: "Back, back to the religion of those who were good in an age when neither Judaism nor Christianity or Islam as yet existed, when the books in question had not yet been written"; back to the original faith of primitive humanity. And behold! On the horizon of the Old and the New Testaments as on that of the Koran there rises up the figure of a man who, without being either Jew, Christian or Moslem, had led such a holy life and walked with God, according to the Christian, Jewish and Mohammedan faiths, that God called him unto himself without letting him taste the agonies of death; the Moslems even attribute to him the invention of the art of writing and of science. His virtues could not have consisted in anything else but in his love of God and of his neighbours, and to return to his faith would only mean a return to two moral principles, viz. love of God and love of our fellow-men, and to the dogmas of "God, immortality and responsibility." There would thus be an end to all further morality and dogmatics, which is precisely the aim of all freethinkers in the world. Hitherto, however, they have been lacking a concrete catchword, the personification of this idea, but which I believe to have discovered in *Enoch*. Revered as he is by all the three monotheistic faiths, he should certainly be acceptable as a symbol. But only when Judaism, Christianity and Islam will have recognized the close connection existing between them, will extend a hand one to the other and for ever banish from their respective theologies and moral teachings all that is called blood; only then, and not before, shall we see the dawn of that

hoped-for day which the Jews symbolize by the lamb and the wolf pasturing together, which connotes the Messianic age.

No reasonable man will deny the immense advantages which the adoption of the great world-religions, and particularly of the monotheistic religions, has brought to the nations who had embraced them when they were still on a low level of civilization, if he considers the difference in the civilization of these peoples before and after their conversion. He must also remember how a religion alleged to be based on a higher revelation and dealing in a practical manner with daily life was necessary in order to support and console poor humanity in its misfortunes and its sufferings. Philosophy never makes men prosperous, nor has it as yet ever made anybody happy. Religion, on the contrary, has achieved it, and for this it deserves to be preserved, for experience teaches us that the majority of men who lose their faith fall a prey to the miseries of materialism. Nothing is better calculated to guard men safely against such a misfortune than one of the three monotheistic religions, for there are certainly few who understand Kant, Schopenhauer and the philosophy of the *Vedanta*.

Opposed, however, to these considerable advantages offered by religion is the disaster which has overtaken humanity in consequence of the contrasts which not only separate the monotheistic religions but place them in hostile opposition one to the other and to other religions. For twenty-five centuries the hostilities and the incompatibility between the three monotheistic religions and their sects and the other religions have been the source of a terrible disaster which has fallen over humanity and so frequently inundated it with streams of blood and tears. Remember what havoc this mutual hostility has already worked; remember the wars of the Jews, the persecutions of the Christians in the Roman Empire, the terrible wars of the Moslems against Christians and the "heathen," the Crusades, the Thirty Years' War, the war of the Albigenses and the religious wars in general based on Biblical-Judaic principles which are being repeatedly invoked;¹ remember

¹ Cf. *Pent.* II, 32, 27; IV, 25 and 31; V, 7; *Joshua* 6, 8, 10 and 11; *Pent.* II, 3, 22.

the Inquisition which extended as far as Goa and Lima, the burning of heretics, the *autos-da-fé*, the trials for witchcraft which are deeply rooted in the Levitical, that is the Jewish commandment: "Thou shalt not let a witch live"; remember the carnage of Jews, the massacres like that of St. Bartholomew, the extermination of whole tribes of Indians in America, the expulsion and extermination of the Moors in Spain, the infamous mutual persecutions of Catholics and Protestants in England and in Ireland. One has also to study the part played by the hostile contest between different religions in the Taiping revolt which cost the lives of twenty million men, in the Indian Mutiny, in Mahdism, in the abominable Armenian massacres, in the Mohammedan revolt in China and in the recent sad massacres of Christians there, and one will easily understand the terrible disaster caused by the contrasts existing between the different religions. It is clear that this evil is the result of principles contained in Jewish writings, principles which were unknown to the so-called heathen in antiquity and also all over the Far East and in India where half of the entire human race lives (that is to say before the latter countries had made the acquaintance of and entered into contact with either Christianity or Islam), and that the sufferings are not necessarily one of the concomitants of the sad fate of humanity. The recognition of this fact and the struggle against the above-mentioned principles and their neutralization is the only true salutary Anti-Semitism, and among whose adherents may certainly be counted the majority of the enlightened Reform-Jews, that is to say of Jews of the stamp and the opinions of Solomon, Philo, Josephus, Maimonides, Spinoza, Mendelssohn, Lazarus and numerous others.

Many people believe that the dark days of fanaticism are gone for ever. But what do we see? Religious conflicts and contests are flaring up anew everywhere and in the most alarming manner, no matter whether this movement be partly (and to a higher degree than before) mixed up with politics or is standing in their service. One has only to look at the Anti-Semitic and the "Away-from Rome" movements, at the activity of Pan-Slavism and Pan-Islamism, and one is bound to admit that religious

fanaticism is glimmering everywhere, nay, is already blazing here and there.

Mention must also be made of the words which a Catholic bishop has to pronounce at his ordination: "Hæreticos, schismaticos pro posse persequar et impug-nabo." And who can tell how all this is going to end and what dimensions such movements may assume. What would happen should a monarch, as the protector of his own creed and that of his subjects, be forced to go to war against a hostile religious community under the protection of another mighty prince. The very idea of such a possibility is enough to make our flesh creep. It is therefore necessary that all those who are inspired by feelings of tolerance and who have understood and recognized the good and the merits of all great religious communities should unite in the sacred name of *Enoch* and conclude a mighty alliance, that of *Enochism*, with the express aim of fighting everywhere against fanaticism. While thinking highly of and preserving their own respective religions, the members of the alliance should fight against fanaticism wherever it appeared, and particularly in places where it threatened to become dangerous, in order to trample out the sparks of religious conflicts in good time. Every religion should be studied, the good it contains be elucidated and light thrown on it, and the knowledge of it should be disseminated in the widest circles. Wherever possible this should be done by persons not belonging to the religion in question, for such a procedure would furnish a better guarantee for impartiality. No religion must be attacked, criticized, insulted or ridiculed, except when this religion itself proceeds in a hostile and odious manner against other faiths. Fanaticism alone should be the object of the attack, but at no time the dogmas, views or institutions of any religion. *Sacra non tangere* should be the first principle, to be followed by that of *suum cuique reddere*. To the latter principle belong also the elucidation and publication of all the good and the blessings which just and pious men have brought to humanity by following and complying with the principles and the doctrines of their respective creeds.

The surest means calculated to acquire and spread that

tolerance in the Enochist sense would be the study of beneficence and charity (*Caritas*) which exist among the different creeds, the comparative study of religion, as taught in the High School for the History of Religion in Paris, the circulation of the biographies of Saints, of pious men and martyrs, of good priests and philanthropists of all faiths, and a comparative study of the psychological phenomena (miracles) alleged to have occurred at the various places of pilgrimage. A study should also be made of the criticism of Holy Scriptures upon which all religions are based, of their origin, the date of their composition and the history of their respective texts. A particular study should be made of the relation existing between the contents of the first eleven chapters of *Genesis*—upon which Judaism, Christianity and Islam have been built up—and the mythology of the Babylonian Empire founded, according to legend, by Nimrod, which is the original source from which our entire modern civilization has proceeded. The persecutions to which every new religion was subjected and the history of its spread should also be studied.

Those who will have grasped the great and eternal truth that there is only one religion, the sole substratum of which is moral consciousness, and only one morality, namely, compassion and love of our neighbours, which are mysteriously rooted in this consciousness which again, being a metaphysical phenomenon, defies all attempted explanations; those who will once have grasped the fact that every religion vainly, eternally and hopelessly exerts itself and endeavours to explain this phenomenon by empirical modes of cognition and perception, will, upon the whole, find it impossible to be intolerant. Every man should also bear in mind that the circumstance of his being convinced of the truth of a thing is not at all a proof, nor can it be, that his own conviction really corresponded to the truth. These considerations to which science leads us are, as I dare say, calculated to render us not only tolerant but also humble and thus make us agreeable both to God and to man, as that ring in the beautiful story, and to teach us to pray, as King Henry in *Lobengrin* prayed: "So preserve us, Lord, for these days of grace, because our wisdom is stupidity."

Catholicism, Protestantism and the Orthodox Church teach that no salvation is possible outside the Church of Christ and without faith in it. Islam teaches that all those who do not believe in the unity of God and in the Divine message of Mohammed will be damned, that is to say that all non-Moslems (little children, who are considered as Moslems, excepted) will go to hell. The *Talmud*, on the contrary, teaches us that "the just and pious men of all nations will inherit the world to come" (will be saved), and the Jews therefore no longer make proselytes. People who desire to become Jews are usually dissuaded, and the above Talmudical passage is quoted to them, while Christians and Moslems are zealously endeavouring to make proselytes. When a Jew is being baptized the baptizer tells him: "Horresce Judaicam perfidiam, respue Hebraicam superstitionem." I consider every further comment to be superfluous.

During the Dreyfus case and the Anti-Semitic baiting in France, a prayer for the "persecutors" was offered in a London synagogue. A great moral progress.

The old orthodox post-exilic Judaism, the faith of the Pharisees and of the Hassidim, was the most fanatical of all religions and the source of fanaticism in general. Hellenistic Judaism, the Judaism of the Sadducees and of the Diaspora, was liberal and tolerant, but modern Reform-Judaism is the noblest and most beautiful rejuvenation of Judaism and the greatest imaginable simplification of Monotheism. This Reform-Judaism is international, cosmopolitan, as everything that is really great is, just as science, art, and the great world religions are. It is cosmopolitan as it has once been in the Diaspora, "*dans ses beaux jours*," when thousands of God-fearing heathens joined Judaism without any coercion and only urged and attracted by the magic effect produced upon them by the pure imageless adoration of God. Now this Reform-Judaism has a task and a duty to perform, that of curing half of humanity of the poison of religious fanaticism with which a few orthodox authors have inoculated it. There is no doubt but that many Reform-Jews have already understood their duty and are doing their best to carry it out. Only when the daughter of Judah will have thrown off the veil of prejudice,

she will be able to lift up the torch of progress and to lead her children back to the primitive old creed of humanity which we find symbolized in Enoch.

Salus ex Judæis ! Salvation comes from the Jews. It is a profound truth which is unfortunately being forgotten. To millions of men to-day, as it was centuries ago, this salvation lies in the belief that we are all children of the same primeval parents, and therefore brothers ; that we are all the creatures of an omnipotent, all-bountiful God who created the world and who rules over us and guides our destiny ; that we possess an immortal soul which is destined for eternal bliss. This belief has come from the Jews. It has been expressed by Jewish prophets, and it was in the language of the Jews that those words resounded which constituted, and still constitute, the salvation, consolation and the bliss of millions and millions of men, be they Jews, Christians or Moslems. This belief has consoled and fortified poor humanity in its sufferings, for it dries the tears of widows and of orphans, alleviates the pain of the sick, fortifies them in the hour of death and saves them from despair. That is what the world is indebted for to Israel ! To guard this belief, to preserve it, to re-establish it where it has been lost or become overgrown, to purify it from the dross of centuries, such is the task which Reform-Judaism has set itself.

It is my firm conviction that it is only a question of time when all educated Jews with their capacity for education and their love of knowledge will hail and adore Christ, our Lord, as one of the best, greatest and holiest men of their nation, while persisting at the same time in their aversion for Christianity. Their hatred will be directed against the Apostles, particularly against St. Paul, against Constantine, the Church-fathers of Nicæa and other ecclesiastical authorities, while their efferous hatred against Christ will not only disappear but slowly make room for boundless enthusiasm and love. This will happen on the day when their disbelief and their scepticism with regard to the authors of the Gospels and the Talmud will have made them ready for it. Many rationalist Jews have already reached such a standpoint, albeit a few decades only have elapsed since modern education and the access to the Universities have

been opened to them. Let us wait another fifty or a hundred years. Jesus Christ, the Lord and Saviour of the world, is slowly conquering all hearts. Devout Christians worship Him as the Son of God, as the second person of the Trinity, while for the Moslems He is the only sinless man who has ever lived. Islamic tradition says that two persons had not been touched by Satan at their birth like all other mortals, namely Christ and His deiparous Virgin Mother Myriam. In Japan the Red Cross—the symbol of Christ—ornaments the dress of Buddhistic sick-attendants, while the entire new legislation of Japan is based upon principles which, like every civilized legislation, are borrowed from the innermost essence, the root of the teaching of Jesus. Japan no longer differs from other Christian countries. Both the Freemasons and the Social Democrats claim Jesus for themselves, count Him among their own, and so do numerous enlightened Buddhists. If not exactly in the sense of the Church, it may already be asserted to-day from the point of view of enlightened rationalism that Christ is actually the Lord of humanity, its Saviour and its Salvation. Elevated on the mount of His immortal Sermon, He is even to-day drawing unto Himself all men, be they baptized or unbaptized.

Love of justice and the hope of contributing, according to my feeble powers, to a reconciliation between Jews and Anti-Semites are the sole motives which induced me to write this book. I have described the terrible sufferings and persecutions to which this unhappy nation of the Jews has been subjected and also the distress and misery which it has to suffer in so many countries even at the present. The reader will agree with me that, barring about two hundred millionaires and several hundreds of thousands of well-to-do people among them, about two-thirds of the Jews constitute a nation of beggars. Considering, however, the exceptional laws to which the Jews are subjected, be they written laws and component parts of the legislation or social vexations which are the result of habit, the Jewish beggars are suffering more acutely than do the Christian or the Mohammedan poor. The Jewish beggars therefore deserve more pity than do the others. The majority of Anti-Semites have no idea whatever how much Israel has

suffered and is still suffering. Many people consider Anti-Semitism to be a moral movement, and innumerable noble, honest and great men are Anti-Semites, for this exceedingly contagious moral influenza seizes its victims indiscriminately, be they wise or foolish, good or wicked, learned or ignorant.

I confess that among my Christian friends and acquaintances I can call to mind only three who were inspired by Philo-Semitism. I confess that I have myself been a theoretical Anti-Semite. When I was much younger I was even a practical Anti-Semite, and this for excellent reasons, because I had had the most unpleasant experiences with Jewish usurers. Had I been asked a few years ago, when I decided to study the Jewish question and to write a book on it, whether this work would turn out Anti-Semitic, my answer to this question would most probably have been in the affirmative. A serious and, as I believe, a thorough study of the subject has taught me better, and I thought that I would be rendering a service both to the Jews and to the Anti-Semites by expounding and demonstrating the results of my investigations and researches, namely, that "Anti-Semitism is based upon religious fanaticism." Yes, I hope to have rendered a service to all those Anti-Semites whom I may have succeeded in convincing that they are on the wrong track when they make the Jews guilty of a number of political and social critical conditions which they are quite innocent of. The Anti-Semites might then turn round, seek another road and perhaps discover the right one.

I should be obliged to my readers if they would show me what errors I have committed so that I could correct or better avoid them in my future works. I must only ask them to adduce scientific proofs for their eventual criticisms, for mere assertions to the contrary or perhaps insults I could, unfortunately, not take for counter-evidence.

Let us now work all together with a view to putting an end to Anti-Semitism which I consider to be a monstrum left over from long-forgotten days. Our age of progress and work has much bigger and much more interesting problems to solve. First of all there is the most important problem of all, the abolition of wars by submitting the

disputes arising between different States to an international court of arbitration ; then there is the amelioration of the situation of the working men and proletarians ; in a word, of the poor, and the alleviation of their sufferings. Numerous important scientific questions are still awaiting solution. Nor should we ever forget that Anti-Semitism is calculated to drive the Jews away from Christ, the Lord for whom many of the best and most-learned Reform-Jews, as I have already shown, have begun to manifest their love. They rightly feel that it was He alone who has raised the Jews to a degree of importance, greatness and fame, which without Him they would never have attained. For wherever Christianity and Islam are holding sway to-day not only every educated man but also every child, thanks to Biblical history and the Koran, is acquainted and familiar with the principal events of Jewish history, with the names of Jewish great men, kings, lawgivers and prophets. Were Christ to appear to-day upon earth, the hatred against the remnant of the people to which He belonged would certainly not be in accordance with His Holiest Will. Anti-Semitism is absolutely un-Christian and diametrically opposed to the Will of Christ who had loved His people so much. But nothing will resist to the Spirit of Christ. To Him everything finally submits, as we say daily. In the East and in the West nations have made the chief principles of His moral teaching the pillars of their civil and social order. It is one of the many successes of Christian teaching that gladiatorial contests, slavery, polygamy, torture, and in some countries also capital punishment, the slaughtering of prisoners of war, duelling and Harakiri, have disappeared from the surface of the earth. Anti-Semitism, too, is doomed, and its days are numbered. Like the above-mentioned monstrosities, Anti-Semitism, too, will address to Judah's greatest Son the words : "*Ave Cæsar, moriturus te salutat !*" Anti-Semitism is diametrically opposed to the teaching of Christ, the principal contents of which may be summed up in the idea that we are all children of one God and therefore brothers. The Jewish law : "Thou shalt love thy neighbour like thyself" (Levit 19, 18) Christ had extended to the whole of mankind, and, according to that magnificent and noble chapter of Matthew (25, 31-46), He

declared that the sentence to be pronounced on the Day of Judgment allotting to the nations salvation or perdition, bliss or damnation, Heaven or hell, will depend only upon deeds of love, of mercy and compassion. Sooner or later, therefore, Anti-Semitism must crumble to pieces, for eternally true remain the words :

“ Salus ex Judæis ” and “ Ecce vicit leo de tribu Juda.”¹

¹ “ Behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda hath prevailed.”
Revelation 5, 5.

CHAPTER VII

I. JEW-HATRED TO-DAY

BY COUNT RICHARD COUDENHOVE-KALERGI

The Anti-Semitic Flood-tide

I. *Anti-Semitism after the World War*

COMPARED to the previous centuries, the nineteenth, dominated by the ideas of enlightenment and the French Revolution, ushered in a considerable retrogression of Anti-Semitism.

Religious fanaticism subsided. The belief in human rights, in the equality of rights of all men, irrespective of religion, race or language, became the common property of educated Europeans. The Anti-Semitic aversion, however, felt by the majority of non-Jews towards the Jews, nevertheless prevailed. Anti-Semitism manifested itself socially rather than religiously and economically.

In this century Russia, unaffected by the ideas of the French Revolution, remained the bulwark of Anti-Semitism.

With the conclusion of the World War a new flood-tide of Anti-Semitism began.

The spiritual centre now is no longer Russia, but Germany. Spiritually, this new Anti-Semitism had been prepared by the renewal of the belief in race which, with its Anti-Semitic consequences, has been definitely formulated by Houston Chamberlain in his work, *The Foundations of the XIX Century*.

A number of political events accelerated the further development of Anti-Semitism.

In the first place it was the circumstance of many Jews being found among the leaders, partisans and friends of Bolshevism; of a great many Jews having proclaimed

themselves a separate nation after the first triumph of Zionism, of nationalism and national hatred having flared up everywhere, owing to the war and its consequences. Further events were the great misery prevailing all over Europe which stirred up hatred not only against the rich in general, but against the rich Jews in particular; the migration of Eastern Jews to Western Europe and America which once more widened the gulf between Jews and non-Jews, and finally, the subsidence of Liberalism, the decline of the ideas of the French Revolution, of the faith in human rights and in human equality.

The collective result of these circumstances was a new Anti-Semitic wave of elementary strength, the political effects of which first manifested themselves in Hungary after the fall of Bela Kun, then led to the assassination of hundreds of thousands of Jews during the Russo-Polish War, and finally culminated in the Anti-Semitic governmental policy of German National Socialism.

This development has once more brought the Jewish question into the forefront of European politics and everybody is bound to take up an attitude with regard to it.

The following investigation of the causes of Anti-Semitism in the twentieth century shall serve this purpose.

2. *The Migration of Eastern Jews to the West*

The mass migration of Russian and Polish Jews to America and to Central Europe in the twentieth century has kindled the flame of Anti-Semitism in the United States and augmented it in Central Europe.

The mass migration to America was one of the consequences of the Russian Revolution and of the Counter-revolution in 1904-5. This vast migration of Eastern Jews to the United States and particularly to New York aroused the American Anti-Semitism which had scarcely existed before. The new Jewish immigrants were coming from an alien milieu, from a foreign civilization, bringing with them foreign customs and a foreign mode of life. Their assimilation and their dissolution in the American crucible was an incomparably more difficult and lengthier process than the assimilation of Jewish immigrants from

Western and Central Europe. Their persistence to cling to their ancestral religion prevented their amalgamation with Christian and Anglo-Saxon America. The contrasts were being felt more and more and resulted in an open social separation between this mass of immigrants and the other Americans (Americanism).

Thus a new attitude of Anglo-Saxon, Protestant Americanism arose, and the aims which the latter pursued were the indefatigable assimilation of all immigrants and the fight against all the elements which opposed such efforts. This fight was extended to the German-Americans during the World War and also to Catholic Italians and gradually to Catholics in general who, too, were felt to be a foreign element and attacked as such. This racial fight which was and still is being carried on against the black and yellow races, found its national continuation, namely, in the fight for the Nordic, Protestant and Anglo-Saxon essential character of the United States.

The contest triumphed in the immigration laws which put a stop to the further immigration of undesirable elements from Eastern and Southern Europe and thus facilitated the assimilation of the immigrants already residing in the country. It is to be expected that this measure will lead to a decrease of American Anti-Semitism and to a complete Americanization of the immigrated Eastern Jews. The assimilation is facilitated by the circumstances that the American Jews from Western Europe have assimilated themselves very rapidly and are now occupying prominent positions in the United States.

The second great wave of immigration of Eastern Jews set in with the World War which had turned Poland into one of the principal theatres of war. Owing to the blockade of the Central Empires this wave of immigration discharged itself principally upon Central Europe, Germany and Austria. Hundreds of thousands of Polish Jews immigrated to Vienna and to Berlin; they were children of a foreign civilization, speaking a foreign jargon and clinging to foreign customs and foreign ideas and conceptions. Most of them came as fugitives, impoverished and forced to earn their living in the best way they could. Wherever they found the legitimate ways of earning a

living and of keeping their families barred to them they were obliged to look for illegitimate means. Several of these Eastern Jews succeeded in getting rich quickly. At a time of general pauperism, of indigence and misery, this circumstance, as may easily be imagined, led to an increase of Anti-Semitism. While the few Eastern Jews who had grown well-to-do and rich were frequently displaying their wealth in a bad taste and with the ingenuousness and *naïveté* of parvenus and primitive men, the million of Jewish fugitives from Poland and Russia who had lost everything through the war and had become wholly destitute disappeared from the horizon of public opinion. After the war a great many of the latter returned to Poland.

This immigration of Eastern Jews to Central Europe created a new crisis of assimilation. While in the course of one century the Western Jews had succeeded in attaining a far-reaching assimilation, the Eastern Jewish wave once more created a deep gulf between this foreign element and the Central Europeans. In culture and in intellect the Western Jews stood incomparably nearer to the non-Jews than to the Eastern Jews whose nature and character were foreign to them. But Anti-Semitism paid no heed to this contrast, it saw in Jewry an entity, a great community, and partly out of ignorance and partly purposely, it ignored the cultural contrast which existed between Western and Eastern Jews. Thus it drove entire Jewry to take up a common defensive attitude.

The retort to such an attitude and to the increase of Anti-Semitism was the growing strength of the national sentiment, of Zionism, and the idea of a Jewish community of culture and of fate gained more and more ground, both among Eastern and Western Jews.

In protest against Anti-Semitism the Western Jews tried to bridge over as much as possible the contrasts existing between themselves and the Eastern Jews and thus widened the gulf between themselves and their non-Jewish fellow-citizens.

On both sides the contest was now carried on as a national fight, only the small minority of Jews had to face the overwhelming majority of non-Jews.

A geographical outline of the field of action of modern



CALUTH OR EXILE
After the famous painting by Hirszenberg.

Anti-Semitism in Europe, viz. in Germany, Austria, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Roumania and the Baltic States, clearly shows what connection there is between the migration of Eastern Jews and the strengthening of Anti-Semitism. The countries just mentioned are the districts of settlement and immigration of the Eastern Jews.

In Western and Northern Europe Anti-Semitism no longer constitutes any problem at all.

3. *Bolshevism and Anti-Semitism*

The victory of Bolshevism in Russia and its attempt to conquer Europe furnished Anti-Semitism with new arguments of great vigour.

Both among the leaders of Russian Bolshevism and the champions of Communism in Europe the number of Jews was proportionately large. This applies also to the leaders of the Soviet governments in Hungary and in Bavaria.

The causes of this circumstance are manifold. Those who are acquainted with the oppression and persecution of the Jews in pre-revolutionary Russia require no explanation why the majority of Russian Jews were bitter enemies of Tzarism and why their intellectual leaders joined the most radical parties opposed to the Anti-Semitic system of government.

And yet, neither Lenin, the creator and founder of Bolshevism, nor Stalin are Jews. Trotzky, who of all Jews had taken the most preponderant part in the Bolshevik revolution, has been overthrown and exiled by Stalin. Stalin's most important and influential collaborators and the leaders in the Soviet Union to-day are non-Jews. To speak therefore of a Jewish rule in Soviet Russia is a wilful misrepresentation of facts.

And yet, there exists more than an outward connection between Socialism and Judaism. It is no mere chance that the founders of the two strongest social movements in the West, viz. Christianity and Marxism, were Jews. The principles of Socialism have been traced out in the Jewish religion and in Jewish ethics.

Approbations of a just social order are already found in the Mosaic law and in the books of the Prophets who had

preached against the immorality and the injustice of the ruling classes in a spirit similar to that of the best among their modern Socialist successors.

This religious spirit of earthly justice which permeates the Jewish religion has developed into Socialism among many enlightened Jews. To the latter Socialism and Communism are not political but religious movements. Long-forgotten Messianic hopes mix and mingle with the dreams of a Socialist future State. The social ethics of the forebears became social politics in the case of the grandchildren.

In this religious spirit many Jewish champions of Socialism have to-day displayed the same heroism and ready devotion as their ancestors did in the days of religious persecutions.

Side by side with this noblest source of Jewish Socialism which is rooted in religion, other motives, too, have driven the Jewish youth to the parties of the Left.

It is precisely the Anti-Semitism of many political parties which frequently prevents principled and self-respecting Jews, even if they are conservative in their opinions, from joining these groups. Add to this the circumstance that in these parties the Anti-Semitism prevalent among the mass of electors is so strong as to render the chances of a Jewish candidate exceedingly precarious.

The result is that Jews who are animated by any political ambition are automatically driven to those parties which are on the look out for strong energies and intellects, without inquiring after religion or race. While the fear of showing too high a percentage of Jews among their members is growing not only in the Liberal but also in the Social democratic leading circles, Communism does not share such misgivings, so that this circumstance alone already constitutes an attraction for ambitious Jews who are thus enabled to take up the struggle for political power without any handicap.

It requires no further explanation why, in addition to all other points of its programme, the attitude of a political party to Anti-Semitism is a decisive factor for the Jewish attitude itself. Nor does it require any explanation why

many Jews, even when they are not in sympathy with Marxism, feel themselves induced to vote for the Socialist Party in countries where the bourgeois parties are more or less favourably disposed to Anti-Semitism.

Thus the Socialist attitude of numerous Jews is both one of the causes and the effects of Socialism.

History teaches us that the political attitude of the Jews in various countries is the effect of the treatment meted out to them.

While in Russia of the Tsars an overwhelming portion of the Jewish *intelligentsia* was revolutionary in its views, the intellectual Jews in England have remained Conservative or Liberal just as the non-Jewish *intelligentsia*.

Disraeli, the greatest leader and renovator of the Conservative Party in England, was a Jew. And to-day, too, a number of eminent Jews are at the head of the English Conservative and Liberal Parties. They love their country and co-operate in its leading political parties which reject Anti-Semitism and guarantee to the Jews full political and social equality of rights.

In Central Europe the position of the Jews lay between two extremes, the Russian and the British. The Jews were equal to the non-Jews politically and economically, but not socially. There were, of course, no pogroms, but the Jews were despised and derided as second-rate citizens. No wonder therefore that this circumstance stirred up the hatred of numerous Jewish intellectuals in Germany, Austria and Hungary, and drove them into the opposite or revolutionary camps. Nevertheless, the overwhelming majority of the Central-European Jews remained good patriots, and made neither the State nor society responsible for the undignified situation in which they found themselves.

The Central-European Jews, too, would undoubtedly have been just as Conservative or Liberal as the bulk of English Jewry, had their social position been the same as it is in England. Thus Anti-Semitism in Central Europe operates not as a rampart against social revolution, but as its fertile soil.

Jewish Socialism is rooted both in racial sentiment and in the Biblical craving for justice.

The claim of equal rights was bound to exercise the strongest power of attraction upon the Jews in all countries where such rights were either theoretically or practically being refused unto them. This applies both to Liberalism and to Socialism and Communism. Fascism, which declines Anti-Semitism, has aroused both in Italy itself and outside the country the enthusiasm of many Jews. The circumstance that the socially oppressed Jews should become the natural allies of the economically oppressed proletarians in the latter's struggle against the existing social order was nothing else than the natural development and the consequence of Anti-Semitism.

In its abstract, materialistic and mechanistic attitude to Society, Marxism is the child of the trend of thought prevalent in large cities. To the urban inhabitant property has a more relative value than it has for the peasant. By his traditions the townsman is less attached to the past and to development, is less dependent upon nature and its moods, less believing and less superstitious. The large cities are therefore the natural fertile soil of Marxism.

Now European Jewry, in consequence of the old prohibition to own landed property, has become the urban population *par excellence* with an urban attitude towards life, politics, economics and society. Thus it happens that for many Jewish intellectuals a nationalist and mechanical construction of society, which is expected to supersede as quickly as possible the historical organization of the present social structure, has become the essence of political wisdom and of human progress.

These internal and external relations between Judaism and Marxism have driven the majority of radical Anti-Marxists into the Anti-Semitic camp.

Anti-Semitism became an effective weapon against Marxism, while Anti-Marxism, in its turn, became an effective weapon against Judaism. There was nothing better calculated to alienate great portions of the working classes from Marxism than its alleged identity with Judaism and the Jews. On the other hand, nothing is better calculated to stir up Anti-Semitism in bourgeois quarters than the alleged identity of Judaism with Marxism.

Anti-Semitic prejudice and its subconscious manifesta-

tion, the Anti-Semitic instinct, were still too strong both in the bourgeois and the proletarian masses not to be aroused by an effective catchword.

This catchword proved the more effective since Marx was a Jew. But his closest collaborator already, Engels, the co-founder of Marxism, was a non-Jew. And ever since we find by the side of Jewish Marxist leaders, like Lassalle, Adler, Trozky and Luxemburg, a number of at least equally eminent and influential non-Jews like Liebknecht, Bebel, Jaurès, Ebert, Henderson, Lenin and Stalin.

A historical study of the Marxist movement shows that while Jews have taken a prominent part in it, any identification of Judaism and Marxism is a two-fold falsification of history. And yet, this parole has proved to be one of the most effective catchwords against Socialism and Communism, a catchword which drove millions of European working men from the Socialist into the Nationalist camp. At the same time it has availed itself of the life-and-death-struggle which had broken out between the bourgeoisie and Socialism after the war—for the purpose of turning the deadly enmity of the bourgeoisie against Communism into Anti-Semitism.

The persecutions of the Jews in Hungary and in the Ukraine were the immediate concomitant results of the Anti-Communist counter-revolution. The opponents of Communism wreaked their revenge upon the non-Communitistic Jews for the misdeeds of the Communist régime. The German hatred of the Jews in the Third Reich is also closely connected with its Anti-Marxist propaganda.

Bolshevism to-day thus constitutes one of the strongest arguments in favour of Anti-Semitism. Millions identify the movement with Judaism, although the Bolsheviki persecute the orthodox Jews just as they do the orthodox Christians. But for political demagogues and for half-educated, dull and indolent men, the identification of Judaism not only with Bolshevism and Socialism, but also with Liberalism, Parliamentarism, Capitalism, Materialism, Enlightenment, Nationalism, Freemasonry, Democracy and disintegration, is too convenient not to be made use of.

Thus Anti-Semitism has become a universal remedy and

invariably finds an echo everywhere because it meets half-way a deeply rooted prejudice of the masses.

4. *Pauperism in Central Europe*

Pauperism in Central Europe as a result of war and inflation has given a new and strong stimulus to Anti-Semitism. In the overcrowded districts envy is a great power, one of the most powerful sources of political and private hatred. This envy grows concurrently with the general pauperism and the enrichment of the few. The man who is losing money, while another is accumulating it, believes that it is his own money which the latter is taking away. For this reason the hatred of the masses has been directed in a much higher degree against war and inflation profiteers than against inherited wealth. But the latter, too, was more than ever exposed to envy and hatred. In many Central European States, where the landed nobility was still very rich, the hatred in the after-war period turned against the latter because it had provoked the strongest envy. The expropriation of the rich landed proprietors and the abolition of the titles of nobility were partly the upshot of that frame of mind of the people. First of all this general envy of the numerous poor and impoverished against the few rich and the new rich brought about the Socialist and Communist wave after the war. Soon, however, the leaders of the Right against whom this wave was being directed perceived that there was a possibility for them to divert the popular wrath into the opposite direction, and they consequently turned the envy of and hatred against the rich in general into the particular envy and hatred directed against the rich Jews.

Thus the feeling of envy against the Jews became one of the strongest components of after-war Anti-Semitism.

The proportionately high number of Jewish new rich, of war and inflation profiteers, facilitated this process. Anti-Semitism became a lightning-conductor calculated to divert the Socialist lightning from the Capitalist roof in Central Europe.

According to plan, Nationalism and Anti-Semitism were used as antidotes against Socialism and Bolshevism, and with their aid the Bolshevik onslaught was warded off.

Several facts served to further this Anti-Semitic agitation. During the war—and the inflation—period many people had rapidly amassed wealth. Compelled for centuries to devote themselves to monetary affairs, the Jews, more than other nations, had developed and perfected their financial capacities. This capacity served many Jews in a time when, owing to the inflation, the questions of currency value were somewhat of a mystery to all those who had not learned betimes how to master the secret doctrines of finance across a banknote. Thus the importance of the banks which in Central Europe were for the most part governed by Jews had increased. Speculation gained ground, speculators grew rich, although many of them were again reduced to poverty, but of the latter fact public opinion took no notice. Side by side with the banks, the stores, too, became the targets of an economic Anti-Semitism, for most of the stores were owned by the Jews. They incurred the hatred and envy of all small merchants, shopkeepers and tradesmen whom they underbade and partly ruined by rationalizing and damming in the commission business and the intermediate trade.

The Nationalist Press, for the most part owned by non-Jewish industry, gladly diverted the popular hatred from the Capitalists in general to the Jewish banks and stores in particular, to the hated strongholds of Jewish wealth. The newspapers, of course, concealed from their readers the fact that banks and stores were constituent parts of a progressive capitalism and that the fight against them was either a mere manœuvre of diversion or calculated to lead to Bolshevism.

The hatred against the Jews was frequently heightened by the conduct of the Jews themselves. Many of the Jewish new-rich fell into the errors usually committed by the parvenus of all races and in all times and displayed their newly acquired wealth in bad taste. This circumstance, considering the misery of the masses during the war—and inflation—period, produced a two-fold effect, for it resulted not only in an elementary increase of Anti-Semitism, but at the same time also in a fantastic overrating of Jewish wealth in proportion to non-Jewish fortunes.

In reality the World War, far from increasing, has

considerably diminished the total wealth of Jewry. The misery of the Eastern Jews, owing to the World War and the Russo-Polish War with its concomitant pogroms, has grown more acute. The chief war profits were realized by the Armament industry and by agriculture, two branches of domestic economy from which the Jews were almost entirely excluded.

As for the inflation, it enriched only a small number of Jewish speculators, while the bulk of Jewry which owned neither landed property nor real estate lost its last values in money.

The latest statistics of Jewish wealth are rather more unfavourable to the Jews than those of the pre-war days. The house of Rothschild, which throughout a century had occupied a domineering position in the European financial world and had principally led to the over-estimation of Jewish wealth, not only lost a considerable portion of its fortune in the after-war period, but its great influence.

The only banking firm which represents a world-power to-day, that of J. P. Morgan, is in non-Jewish hands. The largest American fortunes, too, those of Rockefeller, Ford, Mellon, Vanderbilt, and Astor, belong to non-Jews.

With very insignificant exceptions the leading German industrial magnates in the after-war period were non-Jews, and, above all, their prominent representative Hugo Stinnes. Had Stinnes been a Jew, all the Anti-Semites in the world would have availed themselves of this circumstance and made the Jews responsible for the prolongation of the war and the inflation. Had Ivor Kreuger been a Jew, all the Anti-Semites would have shouted after his fall: "Such are the Jews." Since, however, he was not a Jew, but a Swede, nobody dreams of making the Swedish nation responsible for the case Kreuger. Had, however, Morgan been a Jew, a whole literature would undoubtedly have existed to-day trying to prove that his banking house was the centre of a Jewish world-conspiracy and of Jewish plans for world dominion.

All these facts, however, help but little. The sole circumstance of the existence of numerous Jewish capitalists is being misused in order to identify Judaism with Capitalism, just as the circumstance of a few Jews being

found among the leading Communists suffices to identify Judaism with Communism.

We thus witness an interesting paradoxical result: Anti-Semitism was used as a weapon both against Capitalism and against Communism. Such a result is of course against all political logic, but it was a question of politics and not of logic. Each political group was anxious to hit its opponent. In Anti-Semitism they found a ready weapon which could be utilized at all times and against everything. The fundamental frame of mind of the masses, a hidden inheritance of early Christian education, is Anti-Semitic. Whoever appealed to this deeply rooted prejudice was sure of being able to utilize it in connection with the latent envy as an unrivalled political explosive material. Shortly after the completion of the war a party-leader in a Central European State submitted to me the outline of his new party-programme and asked for my criticism. I called his attention to the flagrant contradiction existing between his claim for the equality of rights for all religious denominations and the subsequent demand for the restriction of Jewish influence. To this he retorted: "I am no Anti-Semite, on the contrary; but if we do not insert this paragraph the (here he mentioned the name of an opposition party) will snatch away our electors."

The chief motive of political Anti-Semitism is that of catching electors by means of an attractive catchword, a deeply rooted prejudice. The elector is being courted, not instructed. The candidate is not trying to raise him up to his own level, even when he possesses one, but prefers to descend to the intellectual level of the elector; he bows to the latter's prejudices and, instead of opposing, vindicates them.

The general lack of moral courage thus becomes the strongest champion of Anti-Semitism.

Unemployment which has set in and the concurrent world crisis have also considerably contributed to the success of Anti-Semitism.

The overcrowding of all professions and particularly of the liberal professions has rendered more acute and embittered the struggle for existence. So long as two posts were open for an Aryan and a Jew who were both seeking

employment, an honest and sincere competition was possible. But as soon as only one post was vacant for the two candidates, a death-and-life struggle was bound to arise between the competitors, a struggle devoid of all chivalry, a struggle fought with ignoble means, one of which was Anti-Semitism. The Aryan candidate tried to eliminate his competitors by means of Anti-Semitism and, when he failed in his endeavour, he joined an extreme Anti-Semitic group with a view to supplanting his Jewish rival by force or boycott and thus conquering his post.

The struggle for existence, rendered more acute in consequence of unemployment and the economical crisis, led to the defeat of the weaker, to the defeat of the minorities, to the defeat of the Jews, for it was no longer a question of justice, but of existence.

Just as in a moment of panic women and children are the first to be trampled underfoot, so in the economical panic in Central Europe the weakest are the first to be trampled down, viz. the Jews.

Wherever they could still hold their ground they were bound to show a great superiority over their non-Jewish competitors, but this could not save them from the Anti-Semitism of the National Socialists.

This Anti-Semitic struggle for existence will cease only when European unemployment will have come to an end and when the principles of fair play, of an open free course for the most efficient, will be victorious in the professional contest. Until then all the minorities, and above all the Jews, will be menaced and prejudiced.

5. *Nationalism and Anti-Semitism*

The gradual increase of Nationalism, too, before, during and after the war, has helped to render Anti-Semitism considerably more acute.

Through the World War Nationalism became the dominant trend of thought in Europe. For years political and intellectual leaders of European nations have proclaimed the superiority of their own respective nations. To-day the belief in a national world-mission sways the Germans,

Frenchmen, Britons, Americans, Russians, Japanese and Italians, while the smaller European nations are content with a belief in their own superiority over the neighbouring nations.

Everywhere this national megalomania is supported by a pseudo-scientific literature, by a falsification of history and by biological and philosophical theories. And because these theories are flattering the national vanity, they are accepted and championed without any discrimination by the bulk of the half-educated, among whom many of the so-called educated are to be found.

Whoever opposes such theories is looked upon and attacked as a national opponent or as a traitor to the nation, because the vanity of the nations is stronger than their love of truth. It is clear that this trend of thought has been instrumental in strengthening Anti-Semitism. The hatred against and the contempt of everything alien is also directed against the Jews.

While in other countries the war-psychosis after the conclusion of the war found an outlet against those who belonged to a national minority, in Hungary and in Germany, where only few national minorities had remained, it was chiefly directed against the Jews. Here was an opportunity to wreak revenge for the sustained injustice without thereby provoking a neighbouring State. The Jews thus shared the fate of the minorities, only their troubles were more acute and much harder.

Worse than the hatred is the contempt to which the Jews are exposed.

Most men are pleased to disdain. The deeper they are able to look down on others, the higher they feel themselves to stand. This contempt of others strengthens one's own self-conceit.

The nobility looks down on the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie on the proletariat, for the will to despise is deeply rooted in the human soul. The caste system is based on this contempt. In countries where several races are living together this will to disdain finds an outlet in racial contempt. Even in insular Japan this will to contempt has created a Pariah-caste, viz. the Eta.

Now in Europe this will to satisfy and to enhance one's

own self-consciousness by disdaining others finds an outlet in Anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism flatters the non-Jews by giving them the consciousness of belonging to an aristocratic race, a privileged class. The Jews constitute the background on which the picture of the Aryan is to be brought out in relief. The non-Jews thus get an opportunity of *looking down* on a group of men, even when they themselves are standing on the lowest step of the social ladder. For many men this is a great consolation; it is a two-fold consolation in times of economic distress, for a look downwards always gives one the illusion of being on the top. The very existence of a despised caste confers on all those who do not belong to it the right to feel themselves an aristocracy with regard to it. Anti-Semitism thus becomes the aristocratic pride of the bourgeoisie, and Anti-Semitism among the middle-classes is therefore much stronger than it is among the aristocracy which can satisfy its pride of class in another way.

The success of Zionism, too, has contributed to the strengthening of Anti-Semitism after the World War, for in Zionism a great many Jews proclaim themselves to be a separate nation. Zionism thus justifies the Anti-Semitic thesis that the Jews are not fellow-citizens of the Mosaic faith, but an alien national element, a separate nation.

This new attitude makes it easier for the Nationalists to be Anti-Semites and to turn their fight against other nations into a fight against the Jews. It makes it easier for the Anti-Semites to eliminate the Jews from the national community, to subject them to specific laws, to introduce the Numerus Clausus and to oppress them as national minorities. For the essence of the national State contains the claim of omnipotence for the dominating nation and the elimination of all foreign elements.

For the Jews, however, who are not Zionists but feel themselves to be citizens of their respective countries, this change of conception is doubly hard.

Zionism therefore became first of all a double-edged sword for the Jews. Unconsciously it helped Anti-Semitism and aggravated the position of the Jews. From

a weapon against Anti-Semitism, Zionism rapidly changed into a weapon against Western Jewry and its striving after assimilation; a weapon of which Anti-Semitism availed itself. On the other hand, Zionism has awakened the feeling of self-consciousness among the Jews. The Zionist youth to-day feels itself to be a separate nation enjoying the same rights as other nations. It is proud of the works and deeds achieved by its forebears both in Palestine and in the Diaspora. National self-consciousness has taken the place of the widespread self-contempt, and the Anti-Semites are being fought as national opponents on the same level.

By creating a Jewish nationalism, Zionism has greatly clarified the Jewish question. While diminishing the contempt of the Jews, it has increased the hatred against them. From a despised caste, Jews have changed into a hated nation.

Anti-Semitic Nationalism now attacks the Jews not only as a nation but as an *inter-nation*, as the negation of the national idea, and the Jew-hatred among the Germans is consequently of a greater dimension than is the latter's hatred of the French.

The international relations and connections of the Jews further help to make them appear as a danger to Nationalism itself, as representatives of a hated internationalism and as allies of the Socialist, Capitalist or Bolshevik Internationals.

The fight against Judaism is considered to be a struggle between the national and the international world-Philosophies, as a fight for the future of one's own nation.

Not even Zionism removes this suspicion from the Jews, for many Anti-Semites see in Zion not a national home for the Jews, but a citadel of Internationalism.

The Jews are also reproached with their pacifist attitude, a spirit which is the natural outcome of the Jewish development and situation. For nearly twenty centuries the Jews have been disarmed and ever since they have not been the subjects of war but its objects. They can no longer conquer through war, but suffer through it. Wars have been waged not for their own, but for alien ideals, while for generations they have been forced to pay

with their money and frequently with their blood for the wars of others. The last tragic example has been the Russo-Polish War, the effects of which were the terrible assassinations of the Jews in the Ukraine.

Under these circumstances no one could wonder why most of the Jews to-day show but little martial enthusiasm and prefer to champion and intercede for peace rather than for war. It is self-evident that nations who have been excluded from active military service for twenty centuries should be less martially disposed than nations to whom martial ideals have been preached since times immemorial.

And yet—it would be an injustice to reproach the Jews with cowardice on this account. Jewry has a right to treat this reproach with contempt. On the stake and in torture-chambers, Jewry has proved for centuries that whenever it is a question of its own ideals it will yield to no other nation in the world in valour and in bravery. For the sake of its faith the Jews have waged a world-war against the whole of Europe for twenty centuries, and they have acquired the right to consider themselves as an heroic nation of the first rank. All just men are bound to admit this, for war and fight are two very different things. Besides, wars are not the only touchstones of bravery. To most men it will appear easier to go out to war than to cling to their convictions in front of the stake.

The propensity, too, of Jewry to an international attitude is incontestable. Their relatives are scattered all over the world; as a commercial nation they know foreign lands and foreign countries and thus their international horizon is much wider than that of non-Jews on the same level of education. The Jews constitute a natural link between the nations and are particularly capable of serving as intermediaries between national civilizations. But it is precisely this cosmopolitanism which the nationalists reproach the Jews with.

A short time ago only it was considered a distinction to be called a cosmopolitan, but to-day the term Internationalist has been substituted for it which, however, instead of being a distinction, is considered to be a degradation. In a time of general Nationalism, Inter-

nationalism is as contemptible as tolerance used to be in the days of religious wars.

To-day Europe is swayed by the nationalist ideology, just as it had formerly been dominated by religious fanaticism. This nationalist epoch is still very young, for it arose during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars—and reached its summit in the World War. To-day it is in conflict with the social ideologies, and no one can foretell when and by what ideologies it will be replaced.

So long, however, as Nationalism predominates, it appraises cosmopolitanism and pacifism as heresies. Anti-Semitism, which in former days had come forward as a negation of the Jewish religion, appears in its new garment as the negation of the Jewish nation or of Jewish Internationalism. Biology has been drawn into this process and forced to take over the heritage of theology, for scholars can always be found who are ready to meet political wishes with the aid of their scientific formulas. Those who doubt this statement have only to turn over the leaves of the war literature where they will find the names of the most eminent European scholars who, with the whole armour of their science, tried to prove the biological and cultural inferiority of the Europeans on the other side of the trenches. The nations believed them, as they believe to-day in the Anti-Semitic theses.

6. *Christianity and Anti-Semitism*

Side by side with the loud Anti-Semitism of the nationalists, the tacit Anti-Semitism of the Christians still obtains in our days.

This Anti-Semitism is momentarily less evident, because eminent representatives of Christian world-philosophy who are opposed to the pagan racial Anti-Semitism appear as opponents of Anti-Semitism. In reality, however, their fight is not directed against Anti-Semitism pure and simple, but against the Anti-Semitism of the neo-pagans which is simultaneously threatening also the Christian *Weltanschauung*.

For an Anti-Semitism which declares the entire Jewish race to be biologically, morally and intellectually inferior is, in its essence, Anti-Christian. It is irreconcilable with a

religion whose founder belonged to the Jewish race, a race to whom it owes all the Prophets, all the Apostles and all the Evangelists. Anti-Semitism is irreconcilable with a religion whose sacred Scriptures are the work of Jewish authors and whose moral laws are derived from the same writings as those of the Jews.

Racial Anti-Semitism, too, stands in contradiction to the Christian *Weltanschauung* for another reason, namely, that of grouping men not into baptized and unbaptized but into Aryans and non-Aryans. Anti-Semitism sees in the Aryans the preferred children of God, independent of baptism, while it considers the Jews, even when they have been baptized, as inferior beings.

It is therefore quite logical for believing Christians to condemn and to fear a movement which is directed against the Jewish nation and the Jewish spirit in all its effects, because such a movement is bound to turn also against Christianity and the Bible.

Such an attitude, however, does not imply that Christianity has renounced Anti-Semitism. On the contrary, the general wave of modern Anti-Semitism has also invaded the Christian camp.

While in former days the followers of the Jewish religion were the chief objects of Christian Anti-Semitism, Christian Anti-Semitism to-day is directed less against the orthodox Jews than against the Jewish free-thinkers, no matter whether they officially acknowledge themselves as followers of Judaism or Christianity, or pretend to have no religion at all.

The free-thinkers constitute the greatest danger for the future of Christianity, an incomparably greater danger than orthodox Judaism could ever be. It was free-thought that gave birth to Bolshevism which in Soviet Russia is carrying on a life-and-death struggle against Christianity. But even in Europe and in America free-thought is trying to undermine the power and the influence of Christianity.

This free-thought was frequently recruited from Jewry, from Jews who had abjured their ancestral faith without, however, having inwardly converted themselves to Christianity. Even when they had been baptized formally,

they had only in the rarest cases accepted the Christian teaching.

It is against these Jews that Christian Anti-Semitism is directed. It is not directed against Jews who have turned Christians out of conviction, nor is it directed against descendants of Jews who have been brought up as Christians and have remained faithful to their adopted creed. On the other hand, Christian Anti-Semitism attacks with equal vigour all free-thinkers of non-Jewish origin, so that this Anti-Semitism is more indirect than direct and is a fight against the European non-Christians rather than against the Jews.

The actual fight of Christianity against the Jews has not changed. It is rooted in the question of the Messiahship of Christ. There can never be either peace or compromise between two religions one of which is convinced that Christ was the promised Messiah, while the other vigorously contests this belief.

This religious contest will last so long as the two religions will continue to exist side by side. It will weaken wherever the fanaticism of these two religions abates, and it will blaze up wherever religious fanaticism blazes up.

As men to men, Jews and Christians may and can consider each other as men of equal worth, but not as Jews and Christians.

If Christianity were to regain the power it had wielded in the Middle Ages it would now, as it has done before, carry on a fight against the Jewish religion, and had orthodox Jewry the same numerical superiority over a Christian minority, it would not be less intolerant in its persecution of Christianity. The one-sidedness of the persecutions lies not in the great tolerance of the Jewish faith, but in the circumstance that during the last centuries the Jews have always been a minority and the Christians a majority.

Christian hatred of the Jews will remain independent of all racial theories, for it is not directed against the Jewish or Semitic race, but against the Jewish religion.

In numerous cases this Christian hatred of the Jews is the father of the Anti-Semitic instinct and of racial Anti-Semitism.

The chief phenomenon of modern Anti-Semitism is the profound antipathy which the irreligious Anti-Semite of to-day feels for everything that appears to him to be Jewish. This antipathy he traces back to the knowledge that the Jews are an inferior race which he rightly fears and hates, despises and persecutes—and he mostly bases his views on the racial theories of Chamberlain, Weininger and their followers.

The Anti-Semitic instinct, however, which tries to justify itself by a racial theory of which it considers itself to be the expression, renders itself guilty of a fallacy, for cause and effect are being confounded. In the case of almost all Anti-Semites emotional and instinctive Anti-Semitism is much older than the knowledge of racial theories, and the practical Anti-Semitism is older than the theoretical hatred of the Jews. The Anti-Semitic sentiment, therefore, could not be the consequence of an Anti-Semitic conviction, but its cause.

In almost all cases the genesis of Jew-hatred precedes the Jewish question: Anti-Semitism, therefore, is not based on a judgment but on a prejudice; not on knowledge, but on instincts.

Now instincts may either be natural or artificial, inborn or acquired. Some Anti-Semites maintain that in the case of Anti-Semitism it is a question of an innate, natural, racial instinct, something perhaps comparable to the antipathy which exists between dogs and wolves. The erroneusness of this assertion is proved by the practical knowledge of the fact that no one is able to distinguish with any certainty Jews from non-Jews, and that the most extreme Anti-Semite feels no racial antipathy towards the Jews and Jewesses whom he does not know as such. Only when he becomes aware of the latter's Judaism does his Anti-Semitic prejudice awake. On the other hand, it frequently happens that the Anti-Semitism of Jewish children who have received a Christian education in no way differs from the Anti-Semitism of their comrades of Christian descent. The instinctive Jew-hatred, just like the Frenchman's hatred of the Germans, or the German's hatred of the French, proceeds from misunderstandings, misinterpretations and generalizations, from prejudices and

mass suggestion. A Jew, a Frenchman, and a German who, without being aware of their respective origins, have been brought up together as Christian Anglo-Americans could not feel either racial or national hatred one for the other.

Anti-Semitism therefore is based on an artificial and not on a natural instinct ; it is acquired and not innate.

The history of the origin of Anti-Semitism leads us to early childhood. Since Freud's discoveries it has been established beyond all doubt that the soul of the child is the retort wherein a great many of the later instincts and sentiments originate. Choked up and buried impressions and prejudices, received and acquired in childhood, sink into the subconscious mind and there turn into instincts.

The Anti-Semitic instinct, too, mostly originates in a childish prejudice.

The child sees a crucifix and asks for its meaning. It is told in reply that the man on the cross is the dear Saviour (whom the child loves and adores as the Holy Infant) whom the Jews had tortured to death. There naturally arises in the child a profound pity for the Saviour, coupled with an equally profound abhorrence of his enemies and murderers, the Jews. When the child subsequently hears or sees Jews, it spontaneously associates them with the murderers of Christ and feels towards them a well-founded antipathy. With this antipathy the child grows up, and is biased, distrustful and hostile when it comes into contact with the Jews ; this behaviour is naturally reciprocated and thus always provides new food for Anti-Semitism.

The Anti-Semite becomes an adolescent, loses the faith and the belief of his childhood and forgets his early influences which were hostile to the Jews. On the other hand, he retains his dislike for the Jews, an antipathy which, since the history of its origin has slipped from his memory, now appears to him to be the expression of an intuitive knowledge. He now looks round for new theories calculated to justify this instinctive Anti-Semitism which has lost its roots, and he has recourse to treatises on racial theories, not with a view to testing his prejudices, but to confirming them. The pseudo-scientific racial Anti-Semitism produces upon him the effect of a revelation which

he accepts without discrimination, because it coincides with his instincts, flatters his vanity and scientifically justifies his prejudices. Thus influenced by the suggestion of like-minded friends, he develops into a fanatical racial Anti-Semite whom no counter-arguments can disturb, because his instinct and his racial belief are supporting each other.

In the case of an irreligious early education and upbringing Anti-Semitic relatives, nurses or teachers, suggest to the children, without the medium of religion, their own prejudices by derisive and spiteful remarks concerning the Jews. In this case the child is inoculated with the virus of a religious Anti-Semitism, not directly, but indirectly, for when we follow back the traces of Anti-Semitism left by those teachers we sooner or later encounter the religious source described above.

Directly or indirectly, therefore, religious Anti-Semitism is almost invariably the father of racial Anti-Semitism. The religious prejudice here is primary, the antipathy secondary, and the racial prejudice tertiary.

Thanks to suggestion and instigation, Anti-Semitism has developed into a mass-psychosis. This psychosis, which in the case of many men bears the symptoms of a pathological phenomenon or of a fixed idea, can only be cured by a clear insight into its causes and by a comprehension of its origin. The recognition of a prejudice as such is tantamount to the first step towards a delivery from its power. Only when the educated Anti-Semite will have realized that both individual and historical Anti-Semitism are based upon religious fanaticism and that their scientific convictions are rooted in the religious prejudices of their nurses and nursery governesses—then only will they be able to liberate themselves from their delusions. Just as in the case of psycho-analytical therapeutics, in Anti-Semitism, too, it is a question of recalling into consciousness a hidden event or experience of early childhood in order to effect the liberation from a prejudice which has developed into an instinct.

II. NEW ACCUSATIONS

I. *The Racial Myth*

One of the results of the victory of National Socialism is the fact that a number of Anti-Semitic doctrines, which had hitherto been defended only by a few theorists, have now penetrated into the masses.

The chief theory of the racial myth is that the blond North European race is biologically, morally and intellectually superior to all other races in the world ; that this race alone creates culture and produces geniuses. The achievement of great things in any part of the world is to be attributed to the Aryan blood. Civilizations, however, where this Aryan blood has mixed and mingled with alien blood decay and go to ruin.

Biology, the history of antiquity and the history of civilization, are mobilized and called in to support this doctrine, which, in spite of everything, remains not a scientific but a religious doctrine, a dogma, a myth.

This Aryan myth is the expression of self-consciousness of the Northern race which has subdued more than half the world in the course of the last four centuries, and at the same time owns the principal share in the incomparable technical development of modern times. The theory is based on the fact that the great civilizing nations of antiquity, from the Indians to the Romans, possessed Nordic blood, and that it was the German strain which alone created the great nations of Europe during the migration. And yet—the Aryan myth of race is untenable as a scientific thesis, because there are great civilizations, like the Japanese and the Chinese, which have neither been created nor carried on by Aryans and which have nevertheless produced geniuses, heroes, and saints of the highest degree. In Europe itself the type of most geniuses was not Nordic, while the districts which mostly produced great men were inhabited by a mixed population, consisting of Nordic and inland races.

There is no proof for the superiority of the Northern Europeans over the Mediterranean peoples, of the blond

over the dark-haired Europeans. It is precisely the mixture of the great streams of blood which has produced and given rise to the European race, to European civilization and culture. Anti-Semitism does not directly follow from the Aryan myth, because there are many blond Jews of an Aryan type, just as there are a good many German non-Jews who have no Northern features at all.

On principle, the Aryan myth is bound to cling to the doctrine according to which the Northern European is supposed to incorporate a higher type of humanity than the Southern European. But there was no need to assess the Jews in this racial order differently or at a lower rate than the Italians, the Spaniards, or the Greeks.

A Jewish myth has, however, been developed as a supplement to the Aryan myth, a myth which in every respect represents the Jew as the opponent, the antagonist and the antithesis of the Aryan. This polar antithesis of Aryan and Jew seemed necessary in order to outline more sharply the vagueness of the conception or term "Aryan"; in order to substitute for the three totally different definitions of the term Aryan, viz. "Aryan-Indo-German," "Aryan Nordic," and "Aryan German," a practical definition, namely, that of "Aryan-non-Jew." Just as the picture of the Aryan has been transfigured to that of a noble being, so the picture of the Jew has been distorted and appears as the essence and sum-total of all that is low and common. The symbol of the Aryan was Siegfried, the handsome, strong, noble-minded and childlike hero, but as the symbol of the Jew it was not the highest Jewish type which was taken—not Christ, nor Spinoza, Abraham, Moses or David, but Judas, the avaricious traitor. Æsthetic and heroic values were heaped upon the prototype and the ideal of the Aryan, while the distorted picture of the Jew was permeated with physical, psychical and intellectual inferiorities.

Those Aryans who had had but little to do with Jews got to know only the Anti-Semitic caricature of the Jew. Whenever they came across noble or distinguished Jews they considered them to be exceptions, but whenever they met inferior Jews they saw in this fact a corroboration of the Anti-Semitic theory. Only few non-Jews had the

opportunity of knowing a sufficient number of Jews to enable them to put that prejudice to the test of their own experience. Two circumstances supported the Anti-Semitic instinct, namely that of the Jews being the descendants of a people which had been oppressed for centuries and of their representing for the most part the dark type of the European.

The persecution and oppression of the Jews which had lasted for ten centuries did not pass without leaving their traces on them. They have sharpened the intellect and tempered the will-power of the Jews, but, at the same time, they have been instrumental in depriving the Jews of the natural deportment and attitude of master nations. Much has been twisted by the lasting oppression, much has lost its equilibrium, much has been removed from the naturalness and the *naïveté* of happier nations. To this should be added the exile into the cities and into the Ghetto with its physical and psychical influences.

All this will change as soon as the conditions will have been altered, but the fact itself of the Jews being frequently removed from nature is one of the sources of Anti-Semitism. The more the ideal of the warrior becomes the ideal of man *per se*, the less can the Jew, who has been removed from military service for nearly twenty centuries, incorporate such an ideal. The fact that the Jews have nevertheless been an incomparable nation of martyrs—have fought and conquered in the front lines of the European spirit, plays no part in this process of valuation, because to-day the ideal of Europe is not the passive hero, not the martyr, but the active hero, the warrior; not the spiritual, but the physical fighter. A Jewish prize-fighter who approaches this Nordic ideal, will be able to shake the Anti-Semitic prejudice much easier than can the Jewish sage, the artist or the saint.

The racial myth is rooted in another instinct of the Nordic man, namely in the dualistic conception of the world, of day and night, of sun and shadow, of white and black, light and dark. This primitive conception, when it is applied to human types, results in imagining the angels to be as light as possible and the devils as dark as possible; to represent Siegfried as fair and Hagen as dark, to conceive

fair hair as the symbol of the sun and dark hair as that of night ; to find casual connections between the low cultural degree of the negroes and their blackness and between the cultural development of the Germans and their fairness. This conception supports the belief in race much more strongly than do all the pseudo-scientific arguments. For all attempts to prove a psychical, moral or biological superiority of the fair-haired man over the dark-haired have failed. They have established the fact that the great European geniuses were dark-haired, while heroes and saints, artists and statesmen of all shades of colour are found, from the lightest blond to the darkest black.

And yet—this colour chart of man represents for the believer in the race-theory a chart of valuation. The real antipode of the Aryan ought therefore to be not the Jew, but the negro, the darkest man, as the counterpart of the fairest. The circumstance alone of there being no negroes in North Europe has caused the racial hatred to be diverted to the Jews. The Jew became the deputy-negro—or negro-understudy. The circumstance that a small percentage of Jews have negroid features facilitated this association, and for the believer in the race theory the negroid Jew became the bridge between Negro and Jew.

Through this connection of ideas the Jew became a white negro in the eyes of the racial Anti-Semites, to be rejected from the great community of the white race. Thus the grotesqueness of the race-theory has reached its summit, for no serious student of the race question could deny the fact that the European Jews constitute a variety of the white race which stands nearer to the European non-Jews than all the Chinamen or Japanese, not to speak of the negroes. Nor can the fact be denied that the Jewish question does not fall within the complex of the great racial questions which overshadow the future of humanity.

It is characteristic that the universal centre of Anti-Semitism is now precisely that great power which alone among all the great nations of white humanity has no direct relations with coloured peoples. Neither in the homeland nor in her colonies does Germany harbour negroes, Indians or Malays ; nor does the country border on Mongolian nations. This circumstance, too, is a source

of Germany's racial Anti-Semitism. As the racial instincts could find no natural object, an artificial one had to be created. The Jews were therefore declared to be a separate human race, and a racial fight was preached against them. Thus Germany, which is inhabited by one race, has been artificially turned into a State of two races, the Aryans being the ruling race and the Jews the Pariah race. And thus alone could the race theory gain importance and political influence among the Germans.

In reality, however, there is no Jewish race in the sense of the great and small human races. The people of the Jewish faith belong to very different races. No racial community exists between Chinese, Indian, Abyssinian and European Jews. As for the European Jews, they are divided into two quite different species: the Spanish and Portugese Sephardim, and the Germano-Polish Ashkenazim. On the whole, the European Jews constitute a particular variety of Mediterranean men. The question as from what peoples the old Jews of Palestine had descended is still awaiting an answer. Science believes in a stronger Hittite and a smaller Amorite admixture; and since according to Aryan theories both the Amorites and the Philistines were blond and Aryan nations, a primitive cognation with the Northern Europeans already becomes probable.

But the modern Jews only partly descend from the old inhabitants of Palestine, for in the times of Christ Judaism was a world-religion which recruited its proselytes in all parts of the Roman Empire. The centre of this world-Judaism was the Hellenistic metropolis Alexandria. During the two wars of destruction which Rome had waged against the inhabitants of Palestine under Titus and Trajan the largest part of the Jewish people had been exterminated. A new national community then arose from the remnants of old Jewry which had been exiled from Palestine and from the descendants of Greeks and Romans, Spaniards and Egyptians, Germans and Gauls, who had been converted to Judaism. Jewry received the last great influx of alien blood through the conversion of the warlike nation of the Khazars in South Russia in the eighth century of the Christian era. The more the discord between Christians and Jews grew, the more the Jews clung together and

separated into a national community on the basis of religion.


The religious separation of Jewry rendered its blood affinity with the other Europeans only one degree more removed from that of the affinity which exists between these nations themselves who had continually intermixed their blood. On the other hand, all the European Jews are more closely related among each other than they are with the non-Jews in whose midst they are dwelling. But the cultural tie between a French Jew and France, of a German Jew and Germany, is incomparably stronger than the cultural bond which unites a German and a French Jew.

If the term "nation" is to be defined as a community of culture, then the French Jews belong to the French nation and the German Jews to Germany; but if, on the contrary, nation connotes community and affinity of blood, then the Jews of Europe constitute a separate nation. In the latter case, however, the European aristocracy, too, constitutes a nation, since the European aristocracies are blood-relations among themselves and have always avoided marriages with the bourgeoisie. The definition of a European caste would therefore be more suitable both for the Western Jews and the aristocracy than is the term "nation." On no account, however, is it scientifically correct to call the Jews a human race, just as it is wrong to speak of an Aryan race which comprises all the peoples speaking an Indo-Germanic language, viz. Germans and Hindoos, Romans and Persians, Slavs and Armenians. There are great racial problems in the world, the solution of which will be decisive for the future of humanity, but the Jewish question is not one of these problems.

Anti-Semitism stands to race-biology in the same relation as medieval pseudo-chemistry or alchemy stands to the chemical science of modern times.

2. *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*

Calumny has always played a prominent part in the history of Anti-Semitism, and three principal calumnies have in turn succeeded one another during the last centuries.



A GATHERING OF FRENCH JEWS IN 1846 IN THE PRINCIPAL SYNAGOGUE IN PARIS

1. The desecration and torture of holy Hosts.
2. The slaughter of Christian children for ritual purposes.
3. The conspiracy against humanity for the purpose of establishing a Jewish world-dictatorship.

During the Middle Ages there could be no more heinous crime than that of desecrating Hosts. With the beginning of the age of enlightenment this accusation disappeared from the Anti-Semitic repertory. The calumny of ritual murder continued until our own days. There is nothing better calculated to excite mothers, and there is nothing that can excite men more than the suggestion of a murder committed on an innocent child. This accusation has therefore frequently appeared in history. The first Christians were accused of ritual murder, and so have in our own century the Christian missionaries in China been accused, in order to stir up popular fury against them. To-day the accusation of ritual murder is disappearing, and we find it more and more seldom in Anti-Semitic literature. It moreover corresponds less to the spirit of modern racial Anti-Semitism, in view of the fact that this accusation is raised against the Jewish religion and not against the Jewish race. Add to it that the last great actions for ritual murder which were brought at the beginning of our century have helped to invalidate this calumny to such an extent that the after-war Anti-Semitism prefers to rely on new accusations.

Since the World War there is something else which to millions of men has become more sacred than religion, more sacred than the family, namely, the nation and its independence. Nationalism has received a new stimulus which has never been dreamt of. There is nothing in the twentieth century which is more calculated to excite the passions than the idea of another human group plotting and conspiring to deprive one's own nation of its independence. This accusation has now been levelled against the Jews. The Anti-Semites maintain that a Jewish world-conspiracy exists for the purpose of establishing a Jewish universal dictatorship. No calumny could hit the Jews harder than this, for it created the fiction of a lasting state of war between Jews and non-Jews. It challenged to a fight against the Jews, to a fight with all weapons and with

all means. The calumny turned the fight against the Jews into a war of national liberation, into the holiest war of humanity. To accuse a people which comprises less than one per cent of humanity of striving after world-dominion is grotesque—fifteen million against two thousand million ! The mere admission of such a possibility implies not only the highest over-estimation of the Jews, but the greatest insult to the non-Jews. The idea becomes even more grotesque if we remember that this small Jewish group of men does not even possess a country of its own as a basis for its plans of world conquest, for it is scattered all over our planet. As long as the Jews were confined in the Ghetto this accusation has never been raised against them, because it would only have brought derision to the calumniators. It is only in our own century that this accusation has become the chief argument of Anti-Semitism. The reason of this change lies, on the one hand, in the altered situation of the Jews, and on the other, in the question of world-dominion which is becoming more and more topical.

It is a fact that in a good many countries the Jews have attained a prominent and influential position quite out of proportion to their number as compared to that of the entire population. The Jews occupy such positions in finance and in the Press, in politics, science and art, but the majority of these prominent Jews have long ago abandoned their religion and therefore officially no longer belong to Judaism. This fact alone ought to have sufficed to prove the impossibility of an alleged world-conspiracy. The majority of the baptized Jews will know nothing of Judaism, but are anxious to be assimilated as speedily and thoroughly as possible, while the majority of non-baptized Jews consider the baptized as renegades whom they would on no account initiate in any Jewish "secret." Now the vast majority of the internationally influential Jews are baptized or related to Christians by marriage ; in any case, they are not orthodox, and on no account would they appear to the orthodox Jews as trustworthy. Should, however, the alleged conspiracy be restricted to the orthodox Jews, then the idea becomes absolutely senseless, for the orthodox Jews constitute only a poor, uninfluential and powerless



AN ANTI-SEMITIC PICTURE PRETENDING TO REPRESENT THE BLOOD-RITUAL

minority in a few Eastern European States and in the Union of Soviets.

Upon those Anti-Semites who are unacquainted with the inner division of Jewry and who see in the Jews a vast private community, the idea naturally obtrudes itself that, thanks to their connections all over States, countries and continents, these Jews must constitute a unique and powerful factor.

From this idea to the phantom of a Jewish world-organization with a common political programme and a common international leadership is only one step. The unbiased, however, who look at things as they are and not as they would wish them to be, will admit that there can be no question of such a Jewish universal community. The war has proved that the English Jews have fought for English world-dominion just as the German Jews have fought for German and the American Jews for American power. This fact did not prevent the Anti-Semites in the allied countries from reproaching the Jews with having been friendly disposed towards Germany, and the German Anti-Semites to accuse their Jews of friendliness towards the countries of the Entente. The number of Jews who fell on both sides prove the contrary.

When the struggle between Bolshevism and Capitalism flared up, the Jews once more found themselves in both camps. With unbounded hatred Jewish Communists attacked the Jewish Capitalists and vice versa the Jewish Capitalists were opposed to Communism and its Jewish representatives. Not even Zionism has been able to create a unique Jewish front. The struggle between Zionists and Anti-Zionists is as keen as the contest between the various groups within the Zionist ranks.

There is only one united Jewish front: the front of common defence against Anti-Semitism which grows the stronger the more frequent the attacks of Anti-Semitism become. Were Anti-Semitism, however, to disappear, this species of Jewish solidarity would also disappear. But even this solidarity is fragile, for there are Anti-Semites even in the ranks of the Jews themselves.

In spite of the political and social divisions existing in world-Jewry, the idea of Jewish plans for world-dominion

could nevertheless easily find credence, because the imagination of the European nations had been nourished with plans for world-dominion by the political propaganda of the war period. For several years the whole of Germany considered the war to be the result of a world-conspiracy against Germany, a conspiracy plotted by King Edward VII for the purpose of encircling and removing the most dangerous competitor, and thus paving the way for England's world-dominion. At the same time William II appeared to the English as the man whose aim was German world-dominion. Besides, China, too, has reproached Japan with plans for world-dominion. A practical attempt to gain world-dominion by means of a world-conspiracy and a world-revolution was actually made by the Union of Soviets between 1917 and 1927.

This belief in a world-conspiracy had prepared the European minds for the belief in a Jewish world-conspiracy for the purpose of establishing a Jewish world dominion, for without this psychological preparation the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" could never have attained such an importance all over the world as they have actually done.

The "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" appeared for the first time in 1905 as an appendix to a book written by a certain Sergius Nilius and entitled: *The Great in the Small, and the Anti-Christ as a near political possibility*. Among the witnesses of the crown there was no unanimity with regard to the authenticity of the Protocols. They differed on the questions of the original language, the date of publication and the mode of discovery. The declarations even differed on the point whether it was a question of secret sessions of the Zionist Congress convened at Basel in 1897, or of simultaneous sessions of a Freemasons' Lodge in France. What is firmly established is the fact that according to a declaration of the British Museum the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" had appeared in 1905 in Russia and that the Library of the Museum had acquired a copy of this edition in 1906.

The "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" contain an elaborate war-plan for the conquest of world-dominion through Jewish Freemasons' Lodges. This world-dominion

culminates in the absolute hereditary monarchy of the House of David. The first principle of this world-conspiracy is the thesis that the end justifies the means, that the bulk of non-Jews are weak, cowardly and stupid, that all liberal ideas enfeeble, wear away and mislead the nations; that terror and bribery are the most effective methods calculated to influence and to dominate mankind. The "Protocols" show how the world-dominion is to be established by means of merciless violence, severity, cruelty, lies, treachery and demagogism; by means of wars, massacre and revolutions, epidemics and bombs. They also show what gifts and capacities of wisdom and strength the ruler of the world must possess in order to maintain his rule. The "Protocols" mercilessly criticize the ideas of the French Revolution—of liberty, equality and fraternity, as well as parliamentarianism and democracy. They constitute an apology of autocracy and of the extremest despotism.

When this publication appeared in 1905 it passed unnoticed, and this fact, too, is somewhat suspicious. Universal public opinion, at least in so far as it was Anti-Semiticly disposed at the time, would undoubtedly have seized upon this Zionist document, had any serious personality guaranteed its authenticity and made it credible. More incredible, however, is the theory of Professor Nilius that the "Protocols" were known for many years without the Russian authorities having troubled to publish and examine such world-shaking documents.

This insignificant work suddenly became very topical when Bolshevism in Russia came into power and made an attempt to subdue the whole world. The methods of the Bolshevist rulers resemble those which the "Protocols" recommend for the conquest of world-power, namely: terror, dictatorship, universal conspiracy, world-revolution, iron discipline and the most stringent demagogical rule. There was also the fact that several of Lenin's closest collaborators were Jews: Trotzky, Sinoviev, Kamenev, Litvinoff and Radek. Lenin, who was as little a Jew as Djerjinsky, the founder and head of the Tsheka, as Stalin, Kalinin, Lunatsharski, Tshitsherin, Krassin, and many more Bolshevist leaders, was simply transformed into a Jew by

the Anti-Semites by means of a lie. It was intended thus to produce the impression that the Jewish and Bolshevist world-conspiracies and world-revolutions were identical, and that the Elders of Zion had brought about both Bolshevism and the World War in order to unsettle and throw into confusion the non-Jewish world and to establish Jewish world-dominion.

With a view to proving this Anti-Semitic interpretation of contemporary history, those forgotten "Protocols" were suddenly dragged into the light of universal publicity by German Anti-Semites. The proof of their authenticity which had originally been lacking seemed to have been subsequently furnished by the political events and their false interpretation. And yet—the doubts about the authenticity of the "Protocols" could not be dispelled, for in the course of the fifteen years which had elapsed since the first publication of the work, it had been impossible to discover and identify even a single member of those alleged Elders of Zion. All the tortures resorted to by the Tzarist police and the pogrom mongers had proved of no avail and were unable to lift even a corner of the veil which hid this Jewish world-conspiracy. No member of the conspiracy had been betrayed, no plan or secret orders discovered. Either the initiates who guarded the secret were supermen, possessing extraordinary moral courage and power of reticence, or the whole conspiracy had never existed. The persecutions, too, to which the Jews were being subjected by the Bolshevist rulers and the latter's avowed Anti-Zionist attitude were calculated to arouse doubts as to any connection existing between Judaism and Bolshevism. As for the Freemasons, they had known long ago that the "Protocols" were a forgery, since no connection whatever existed between their Lodges and Judaism; on the contrary, some of the Freemasons' Lodges were decidedly Anti-Semitic. Equally grotesque, as far as the Marxists were concerned, was the thesis that the aim of the Communist revolution was the re-establishment of an absolute, hereditary monarchy. The candidature of a king who was a scion of the House of David also seemed incredible, as there was no one to-day who could boast of such a descent. It was to the Jews in particular that the

propaganda for a dynasty long ago extinct must have appeared as utterly senseless.

In the meantime the Anti-Semites continued to uphold the authenticity of the "Protocols." The work, translated into numerous languages, had a rapid sale, for all the half-educated and uneducated people found it particularly attractive to discover in the confusion of universal politics a coherent plan and secret connections of which official diplomacy did not seem to have the slightest notion. The "Protocols," moreover, established a natural alliance alleged to exist between Anti-Semitism and Anti-Bolshevism which subsequently gave rise to National-Socialism. Both Anti-Bolshevism and Anti-Semitism derived some advantage from this amalgamation. To the Anti-Semites every Jew was a secret Bolshevik, while to the Anti-Bolsheviks every Communist was a disguised Jew.

And yet, in spite of all this, the "Protocols" would never have attained such a world-wide fame had not a man, who had been extraordinarily successful in his own sphere, come forward as a witness for the accusation and brought forward the proof of the authenticity of the work. This witness was the motor king, Henry Ford. Thanks to the world propaganda launched by Henry Ford and to *The International Jew*, a book published under his name, the discussion concerning the authenticity of the "Protocols" reached its summit. A great many decent and reasonable men, lost in the confusion of this propaganda and the contradictory opinions, were inclined to admit the authenticity of the "Protocols" and thus also the existence of the Jewish world-conspiracy. In this critical moment, however, an irrefutable proof was furnished that the so-called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" were nothing but a gross and clumsy forgery.

By a mere chance Philip Graves, *The Times'* correspondent in Constantinople, had come across a book which had been out of print for a long time. It was a work published in 1865 at Brussels, written by the Parisian lawyer and author Maurice Joly and entitled *Dialogues aux Enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu, ou la Politique de Machiavel au 19^{ième} siècle*.¹

¹ Dialogues in Hell between Machiavel and Montesquieu, or the policy of Machiavel in the nineteenth century.

The book contains a very ingenious and witty dialogue in the nether-world between the two great representatives of the ideas of might and right.

The theoretical discussions in the dialogue concealed a polemic against Napoleon III, his Machiavellism and his alleged plans for world dominion. This tendency Napoleon's police had also noticed in the book, and Joly was arrested and imprisoned for fifteen months.

When Graves read the book he discovered, to his amazement, that not only the trend of thought but also the text of many sections of the "Protocols" was exactly the same as in Joly's work. He compared the two publications and produced the irrefutable proof that the so-called "Protocols" were a gross and superficial plagiarism of Joly's dialogues. The result of this literary comparison was published by *The Times* in its issues of August 16th, 17th and 18th, 1921. Graves adduced a clear proof that the principal parts of the "Protocols," alleged to be dating from 1897, the year of the first Zionist Congress, had already appeared in print in 1865. The forger of the "Protocols" had revised the original pamphlet which discussed Napoleon's plans for world-dominion in such a way as to put the Jews in the place of Machiavel-Napoleon, although the original, the *Dialogues in Hell*, had nothing whatever to do with the Jewish question. Graves' assertions were put to a severe test and confirmed by all those who had compared the two texts. Even the most fanatical Anti-Semites could no longer deny the fact of plagiarism.¹ This revelation had settled the case of "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" as far as all loyally thinking men were concerned. There were no "Protocols," nor was there any conspiracy or plan for world-conquest; there were only a clear plagiarism and a gross forgery.

Thereupon Henry Ford settled the matter as a gentleman. A few years later he wrote as follows to Louis Marshall, one of the leaders of American Jewry: "I feel very deeply ashamed of having allowed this paper (the *Dearborn Independent*, edited by himself) to be a party to the spreading

¹ The two texts are found side by side in a pamphlet of 32 pages entitled *The Protocols of Zion*, by B. Segel, Philoverlag, Berlin, and also in the periodical *Paix et Droit*, Paris, September, 1921.

of lies with regard to the so-called 'Protocols of the Elders of Zion,' which are a gross forgery. As a man of honour, I consider it as my duty to repair the injustice which I have committed against the Jews, my fellow-men and brethren, by retracting, as far as I can, the lies which I have helped to spread through these publications." Ford further forbade the circulation of the book *The International Jew*, which had appeared under his name and consisted of essays published in the *Dearborn Independent*. The clear proof that the "Protocols" were a mere plagiarism of Joly's *Dialogues in Hell*, stamped as a lie, in the face of the whole world, the assertion of the Anti-Semites that the book was dealing with the minutes of Jewish meetings in 1897.

The Anti-Semites, however, did not abandon their fight. Another lie was to take the place of the first. It was asserted that the "Protocols" contained very ancient Jewish ideas which had been collected by the Jew Maurice Joly who had been circumcised under the name of Moses Joël. The *Dialogues in Hell* were therefore themselves a product of the Jewish mind, and the "Protocols," although copied from that work, were, in spite of the plagiarism, a Jewish creation. This apology for the "Protocols" is absolutely illogical, for even if the *Dialogues*, which were aimed at Napoleon III, had been the work of a Jewish author, they had nothing whatever to do with the question of a Jewish world-conspiracy, and the "Protocols" would therefore still remain what they are, viz. a plagiarism and a forgery. But even this last trick of the Anti-Semites, namely, the assertion that Maurice Joly was a Jew, was based on a new forgery, for it had in the meantime been proved beyond all doubt that Maurice Joly descended from Catholics, had been born and brought up as a Catholic. Maurice Joly was born on September 22nd, 1829, at Lons-le-Saulnier and was baptized in the local parish church of St. Désiré on December 17th, 1829. This certificate of baptism was entered in the baptismal register for the year 1829 under No. 59.

The establishment of this fact shows that the assertion of the Anti-Semites alleging that the prototype of the "Protocols" was the work of the Jew Moses-Joël-Joly is as untenable as their thesis about the authenticity of the

“Protocols” themselves. Thus the second forgery, intended to support the ruins of the first lie, also crumbled down. Nothing therefore remained for the propagandists in favour of the authenticity of the “Protocols” than to kill by silence the revelation made in *The Times* which stamped the “Protocols” as a plagiarism and to substitute the usual calumnies for the mystification.

The assertion of the authenticity of the “Protocols” has thus been definitely disproved, the work having been unmasked as a plagiarism. The assertion that the “Protocols” were of Jewish origin has also been definitely disproved by the non-Jewish descent of Joly. The fiction according to which the “Protocols” were supposed to be the essence of a very ancient trend of Jewish thought is, therefore, dispelled by the establishment of these two facts. The spiritual genealogical tree of the “Protocols” has nothing whatever to do with either Jews or Judaism. Their spiritual fundamental constituent parts are due to the Italian political philosopher Nicolo Machiavelli. Even in the diluted version by a third hand the genius of Machiavelli shines through the “Protocols” and psychologically lifts them above other pamphlets.

The ingenious ideas of Machiavelli were remodelled by the witty Frenchman Joly in his *Dialogues in Hell*, and the counsels given to the despots of the Renaissance were turned into a skit on the French Dictator Napoleon III. The everlasting ideas of Machiavelli were adapted to the contemporary politics of the nineteenth century. The name of the third reviser who was really nothing but a gross plagiarist is unknown. What is certain is that he was a Russian Anti-Semite, and in all probability must have been a member of the Okhrana, the secret police of the Tsar, with which Nilus and his authorities must have entertained very close relations. This third reviser, too, can certainly not be claimed as a Jew. Just as Joly’s version of Machiavelli’s fundamental thoughts and ideas was intended to describe the unscrupulousness and the ambition of Napoleon, so the version of the Okhrana laid down in the “Protocols” pursued a twofold aim, viz. Anti-Semitic and Anti-Liberal. The description of the “Jewish and Freemasonic” world-conspiracy was to induce the Tsar,

his entourage, and public opinion in Russia, to render more severe the Anti-Semitic policy. The Jews should be made responsible for the catastrophes which had befallen Russia in 1904-1905. At the same time the personalities suspected of having connections with the Freemasons should be removed from Court and Government.

This, however, did not yet exhaust the tendencies and aims of the "Protocols." It is somewhat inexplicable that a pamphlet intended to describe the Jewish world-conspiracy should be so prolix and so positive in its explanations of the future rôle of the Jewish autocrat and of the advantages of autocracy over all other political systems and modes of government. The explanation of this second tendency will be easily found when one considers the moment when the "Protocols" were composed. At that time the Tsar was wavering between Absolutism and Parliamentarism, between the most rigorous suppression of the first revolution and a partial concession to its claims. Apart from their Anti-Semitic tendency, the "Protocols" were calculated to incite and to encourage the Tsar against the Revolution, against Liberalism and Parliamentarism. From the spiritual armoury of Machiavelli arises the figure of the wise, strong-willed, unscrupulous autocrat. Machiavelli's directions were intended to serve the Tsar as a model and guide for a successful policy and for an overthrow of the Revolution.

On account of this absolutist tendency connected with a coarser Machiavellism, the "Protocols," apart from their Anti-Semitic colouring, constitute a primer or a handbook for despots.

"Il Principe" was destined for the Italian Renaissance dictators; the *Dialogues in Hell* described the alleged plans of the French dictator, while the "Protocols" contained Machiavellian doctrines for the Imperial dictator of Russia. In the entire genealogy of the "Protocols" there is not a single Jew, but an ingenious Italian, a witty Frenchman and an anonymous Russian.

The second despotic tendency of the "Protocols" explains in the most natural manner the parallelism which exists between the governmental principles of this pamphlet and those of Bolshevism. In his political methods Lenin,

too, was an intelligent disciple of Machiavelli. The spiritual relationship, therefore, which exists between the principles of the "Protocols" and Bolshevism does not permit the slightest conclusion *a posteriori* with regard to any connection between the two. Tyrants and dictators of all times have acted after the political principles of the "Protocols" with more or less ability, from the Asiatic despots to Louis XI, King of France, Richard III, King of England, Ivan the Terrible, Tsar of Russia, down to our own times. This common spirit of dictatorship, of violence and unscrupulousness, is the spirit of Machiavelli, the grandfather of the "Protocols."

The conclusive result of the discussion on the subject of the so-called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" may be summed up as follows :

It is apodictically certain that this plagiarism is an Anti-Semitic forgery from the beginning to the end, without any connection whatever with Jewish personalities, groups, organizations or conferences. The publication is in no wise, whether directly or indirectly, a product of the Jewish spirit, of Jewish tradition or of Jewish sentiments and opinions. In the entire fraud committed against humanity which the "Protocols" represent, the Jews are merely innocent objects, while the Anti-Semites were the guilty agents. Thousands of Jews have been massacred, maltreated, plundered and imprisoned in the Ukraine and in Germany on account of this forgery. At the same time many millions of non-Jews have been deceived by the "Protocols"; they have been induced to commit deeds and to utter words which they would most deeply regret, were the facts of the forgery known to them. No book and no event in the history of modern Anti-Semitism has played such an important part as this plagiarism; it constitutes the *pièce de résistance*, the choice morsel of after-war Anti-Semitism.

It is, therefore, the duty of all decent men in the world, be they non-Jews or Jews, Anti-Semites or Philo-Semites, to work with all their might and to see to it that this shameless lie, forgery and calumny, disappears from the world.

It ought to be made clear to all those who know the

“Protocols” that the publication is a plagiarism of fatal world-importance. The work of enlightenment is not only a duty to the calumniated Jews, but also to truth, for it is no exaggeration to say that the so-called “Protocols of the Elders of Zion” are both one of the most insolent forgeries of all times and one of the meanest calumnies which have ever existed in universal history.

III. THE JEWISH QUESTION

I. *Jews as Minorities*

Apart from all questions of right and wrong, of truth and lies, Anti-Semitism is a topical subject of politics and crowd-psychology. It is a fact which cannot be dismissed with the formula of: “There is no Jewish question.” There *is* a Jewish question, a double question addressed to all Jews and to all non-Jews and the answer to which is of general importance for the destiny of humanity. The Jewish question must proceed from the fact that the overwhelming majority of non-Jewish Europeans to-day are more or less Anti-Semiticly disposed.

Most of these Anti-Semites have never come into close contact with Jews. They only know the caricature of the Jew, but not the Jew himself. In their childhood they have heard that the Jews had betrayed and crucified Christ and later on they heard and read the spoken or written echo of Anti-Semitic propaganda.

It is clear that most men will look with antipathy on an individual about whom, from their earliest childhood, they have heard nothing but evil reports, even if this individual has done them no personal harm. Thoughtlessly they will repeat the slanders until they themselves begin to believe them. Thus Anti-Semitism spreads and thus it keeps alive. When such an average Anti-Semite, say a peasant, comes into personal contact with a Jew, say a village shopkeeper, and from his experience forms a good opinion of the latter, he will usually arrive at the conclusion that Anti-Semitism generalized too much and that there

were also decent Jews in the world who, as rare exceptions, confirmed the rule. Should he, however, happen to be an inveterate Anti-Semite, he will not arrive at such a conclusion, but will interpret the honesty and affability of the Jew as mere cunning and wile.

A non-Jew, however, who has had a bad experience with Jews sees in it the confirmation of his Anti-Semitic instincts, applies his particular case to Judaism in general and becomes a convinced propagandist of Anti-Semitism. In the case of many non-Jews it does not even require such an experience, for it is sufficient for them to let their imagination dwell on some rich and influential Jew on whom their hatred, their envy, or their political enmity are concentrated. The image of this Jew, whose caricature is continually before their mind's eyes, widens into that of a Jew *per se*, of the representative of entire Jewry. A revisal of Anti-Semitism on the grounds of a personal experience is extremely rare. It presupposes an unusual independence of judgment and also the practical possibility of comparing a sufficient number of Jews with their non-Jewish fellow-citizens of the same rank and position. The Anti-Semitic prejudice is too deeply rooted in the European masses to make its eradication by means of logical arguments possible. One cannot discuss sympathies and antipathies, even when they are the result of preconceived opinions.

What can be done, however, and what must be done in the service of truthfulness, is to put a stop to Anti-Semitic calumnies. Just as the belief in the well-poisoning by Jews, once a principal weapon in the Anti-Semitic armoury, has now disappeared, and the belief in ritual murder is disappearing—just so a pertinent, objective, loyal and scientific criticism can and should exterminate other Anti-Semitic calumnies and lies. Such calumnies and lies are: the so-called world-conspiracy of the Elders of Zion; the identification of Judaism with Bolshevism, of Judaism with Capitalism, of Judaism with corruption; the lie of Jewish cowardice, of Jewish materialism, of the biological and intellectual inferiority of the Jews, and of the pseudo-scientific racial theories of the Anti-Semites. To be sure, even when these lies will have been dispelled, remnants of Anti-Semitism will still exist, but the remnants will not be

stronger than the prejudice harboured by the majority of believing Catholics against Protestants and vice versa, not stronger than the prejudice of most nations against their national minorities, the prejudice of the majority of Germans against non-Germans, or of the Americans against the Japanese. Among the educated people Anti-Semitism will disappear; among the half-educated and the uneducated it will lose its venom until other problems will take its place.

The Jewish question is after all a question of minority. Whether the Jews are considered to be a religious community, a nation, a race or a caste, they are, in any case, a minority all over the world, and minorities of all sorts are always and everywhere being oppressed by majorities. In antiquity the Jews were hated and persecuted because they were a religious minority opposed to the polytheistic majority, because they were the only minority which refused to worship the Roman gods and the Emperor. With the rise of Christianity the Christian minority shared this fate, and only when the Christians became a majority, the persecutions of the Christians came to an end. The persecutions of the Jews, however, have continued until now, because they have remained a minority. Had the Jewish religion succeeded in conquering the Roman Empire, and had the Christian creed remained in a minority, the Christians would have become the victims of persecutions through the succeeding centuries. All through the Middle Ages the Jews were not only a minority, but *the* minority. They were a living proof that one could be a man even without being a Christian, because in those days the whole of Europe constituted one Roman Catholic nation with the Pope as its head-shepherd. The Jews alone refused to be merged in this vast Christian community, and they were persecuted because they were a minority.

These persecutions are not due to the Jewish character, but are the effect of their fate, for the same fate befell the Christians in Western Asia when they were faced by the Moslem majority. The massacre of the Armenians and the expulsion of the Greek Christians from Asia Minor constitute the counterpart to the persecutions of the Jews: the fate of the Christian minorities. With the split of Christianity

in Western Europe, new religious minorities were formed : those of the heretics who, just like the Jews, were persecuted, tortured and burnt alive on the stake. It was only when they had grown into a majority in several countries that they set about to treat the Catholic minorities as the Catholics treat their Protestant minorities. The Christian majority in Spain persecuted and expelled not only the descendants of the Jewish race, but also of the Moslem minority, viz. the Moors.

When Nationalism had entered upon the heritage of the religious ideal, the oppression of national minorities began, not because the latter were inferior, but on account of their being minorities and standing in the way of national equalization. Among these national minorities the Jews, too, are partly counted and therefore share the fate of the other oppressed minorities in Europe. In the United States, where the origin, history and structure did not admit of a religious national minority question, a new minority problem arose, viz. a racial question. The white majority turned against the coloured minorities. On account of its connection with the slave question the negro question is a special problem, but the enmity against the Japanese and the Chinese in California is nothing else than a new aspect of the minority question. The Japanese are not being oppressed on account of their inferiority, but because they are in a minority. Previous to their immigration in California the Japanese were popular in America, and only since they have become a minority there they are being oppressed.

The racial question, too, has affected the Jewish question because Anti-Semitism has stamped the Jews not only as a national, but also as a racial minority. Finally, the Jews, as descendants of the former Ghetto-inmates, remain a minority even when they are considered as a caste. They share the fate of other oppressed minorities as, for instance, the Pariahs in India, the Eta in Japan, and the children of the bourgeois classes in the Union of Soviets.

The persecution of a minority by a majority is not merely a political phenomenon but is all-human. And it is not only all-human, but is also found in the animal world. It is a special case of the law of the struggle for existence and

the survival of the fittest. A canary is being persecuted by sparrows because the latter do not forgive the former its being different, because it is a minority. If a peasant in some European village were to let grow a pigtail, he would soon become the object of general derision and be persecuted by all the village folk. The same fate would have befallen a Chinese peasant in pre-war times had he cut off his pigtail. The persecution therefore is not directed against the hair-dress, but simply against that "being different" or "unlike others," that is to say, against the minority. If ten peasant-lads in that village were all to let grow pigtails, the hatred against the minority would increase, and on every occasion the short-haired majority would assail the long-haired minority. The minority would have been degraded and calumniated on account of its being a minority.

The Romans took it as a provocation when the Jews alone refused to pray to their gods and to eat pork with them. The Christians in the Middle Ages took it as a provocation when the Jews alone denied the Messiahship of Christ and sanctified the Sabbath instead of the Sunday. The mere fact of the Jews frequently personifying an alien type is felt as a provocation by many non-Jews. Every "being different" is a tacit criticism of "being-thus." This fundamental psychological law requires it of a gentleman to dress as little showily and to behave as little differently from others as possible, for every attempt to be different is considered by our contemporaries as a provocation and as a criticism of those who do not attract attention. But the characteristic trait of the minority is not that of trying to be included in the majority, but of calling attention to and exhibiting its distinctiveness. It is therefore being persecuted and oppressed, irrespective of its being better or worse than the majority.

The position of the Jews as a minority has four aspects, viz. that of a religious community, a nation, a race, and a caste. That the Jews who have remained faithful to their creed constitute a religious minority is an incontestable fact. Equally incontestable is the fact that the Jews in Eastern Europe with their Yiddish language and literature, their particular customs and traditions, constitute a national

minority. More difficult is the question in Western Europe. Here the majority of the Jews do not consider themselves as a separate nation but as belonging to the respective nations in whose midst they live, whose language they speak and whose patriotism they share. And yet, the Anti-Semites in these countries take the point of view that the Jews are not their co-nationals, but form a separate nation, and that in Western Europe, too, they constitute a national minority.

The definition of the Jews as a racial minority is based on a new version of the idea of race which itself has an Anti-Semitic colouring. Until only a few decades ago there was no doubt about it that the European Jews and the non-Jews belonged to the same human race, namely, the white Caucasian race. Later on the contrast between the Aryan and the Semitic races was demonstrated and the original definition of the human race was thus abandoned. In reality the European Jews are not a separate race, but a variety of the white race in general and of the Mediterranean race in particular. This variety was formed in the course of the last twenty centuries through a religious separation. The Western-Asiatic element is stronger, the Nordic element weaker than in the other varieties of the European race. If, therefore, the term race is meant to indicate one of the great branches of humanity, then the Jews constitute no race, above all no racial minority in Europe. And if, on the other hand, by the term race we are to understand a group of men allied among themselves, then again the Jews constitute a minority of men who, thanks to their community of religion, have intermarried, mixed and mingled among themselves for over fifteen centuries. The conception of the Jews as the descendants of a separate caste is also justified, for until a few decades ago, Jewry in Europe lived as a separate caste, as a horizontal and not as a vertical group in the sense of nations. Since the establishment of the Third Reich the German Jews, too, have been reduced to the position of an oppressed caste, of a social minority.

It is an incontestable fact that the European Jews constitute minorities in relation to the European non-Jews and that they are being considered as minorities under one

aspect or another. But it is equally incontestable that this minority constitutes one of the most distinguished branches of humanity. By their martyrdom which has lasted for twenty centuries the Jews have ascended to their present greatness. Debarred from most professions, living under extreme difficulties, they were forced to sharpen their intellects a ten-fold in order to be able to save their bare existence during the Middle Ages. Those who were lazy, neither gifted nor talented, could not resist against this acute struggle for existence and went to ruin. Only the most efficient were able to maintain themselves and to propagate. Those who were characterless, lacking in will-power, or cowardly, let themselves be baptized in face of the stake and the implements of torture and thus left the Jewish community. The bravest alone, endowed with the greatest force of will, were able to perform the miracle of a struggle which has lasted for twenty centuries. In every modern Jew, therefore, flow streams of martyr's blood, of men who had preferred to be burnt alive rather than renounce their God, their creed and their ideal.

Those who believe in heredity must therefore see in the Jews a particularly precious branch of humanity, a branch of humanity which has been steeled and hardened in suffering and in thought. While most of the Europeans have emerged from a state of illiteracy only a few generations ago, the forebears of the Jews were already able to read and to write thousands of years ago and had grappled with and explained intellectual problems. Those who, instead of listening to catchwords, consider these facts, will obtain a picture of Judaism which is quite different from the caricature created by Anti-Semitism. If the greatness of a people can be measured by the relative number of its prominent and distinguished children, Jewry to-day undoubtedly ought to stand in the front rank. An instance is furnished by the relatively high proportion of Jewish Nobel-prize-winners. These prominent intellectual gifts, to which the world is indebted not only for a number of great inventions, but also of ingenious creations in the domains of art and philosophy, have been developed at the expense of the physical strength of Jewry. The great sporting successes achieved by Jewish teams and champions

in Europe and in America speak in their case in a louder tone than do all the adverse arguments of Anti-Semitism. On the ground of Jewish achievements every impartial criticism of Jewry must admit that there can be no question of any intellectual, mental or physical inferiority of the Jews.

And yet, it would be a biased assertion to say that the unique fate which has befallen Jewry had produced only good results for its development. It is quite certain that the persecutions and oppressions which had lasted for a millennium must have brought with them a number of harmful effects, and that the nerves and the physical harmony of the Jews must have suffered under the constant oppression and the lasting strain and stress. Oppressed men and groups of men assume attitudes towards their surroundings which differ from those of free and ruling men. Instead of themselves deciding their fate, they become the objects of a foreign will and of a foreign arbitrariness. This strengthens their contradictory and critical attitude as opposed to the positive; it furthers resentment and hypersensitiveness and also a wavering between presumption and feelings of inferiority. The attitude and conduct towards men and things easily gets a touch of unnaturalness and artificiality, and originality, simplicity and *naïveté* suffer in consequence.

All the peculiarities and traits which originated in the effects of oppression and developed into minority complexes will disappear as soon as the conditions of life will have become normal for Jewry. Many of these traits have already disappeared. They will again rise to the surface, should the new wave of Anti-Semitism conquer, but they will disappear for ever if the emancipation of the Jews definitely succeeds.

The particular tragedy of the Jewish minority lies in the fact of the Jews being a minority without any cover in the rear. Almost all national minorities have somewhere fellow-countrymen who possess their own State which is ready to help their exiled brethren in case of need. Almost all religious minorities know that beyond the frontiers there are States where their co-religionists are in a majority and who, if needs be, are able to stop the religious persecutions to which they are being subjected. The Jews alone

lack this national or religious support. They know that they cannot command anywhere. They know that nowhere do they detain in their hands the political power and that everywhere they are thrown on the good will and the loyalty of the majority nations. They are not only a minority in the State where they reside, but a minority all over the world. This fact, while lending the Jewish fate its particularly tragic character, shows, at the same time, the way leading to the solution of the Jewish question.

2. *Zionism*

When an alien body penetrates into an organism it is either eliminated or assimilated.

When the gates of the ghetto were opened, the Jewish alien body penetrated into the European organism, and the crisis which thus arose will last until the Jews will either have left Europe or been assimilated by the remaining Europeans. It will last until one portion of the Jews will have chosen one way and another the other way, that is to say, until the Jews will have ceased to be minorities. The two radical ways leading to this goal are Zionism and Assimilation. Zionism aims at the creation of a national home for the Jews where they will one day become a majority instead of being a minority. Assimilation, on the other hand, is anxious to efface the differences and contrasts which exist between Jews and non-Jews to such an extent that the Jews will no longer be considered as minorities, but as equivalent fellow-countrymen.

Zionism is anxious to preserve and to renew the Jewish nation, while Assimilation wishes the Jews to relinquish this claim. Zionism endeavours to change Jewry into a nation with equal rights, while Assimilation is aiming at citizenship with equal rights. The success of the Zionist solution depends in the first place upon the Jews themselves! If they wish it, they can become a majority in some part of the world and put an end to their state of a minority which has lasted for twenty centuries. The success of Assimilation, on the other hand, depends entirely on the non-Jews, for this solution cannot be brought about by the Jews feeling themselves as members of other nations, but only when the

nations will consider their Jewish fellow-citizens as fellow-countrymen and not as minorities. The problematical character of the second solution is the strongest stimulus for Zionism.

Zionism is the most consistent retort to Anti-Semitism. It accepts the latter as a fact and endeavours to render the fate of the Jews independent of the consent of the non-Jews. It wishes the Jews to take their destiny into their own hands and to shape it by means of an historical deed. Instead of preaching morals, reason and humanity to non-Jews, Zionism prefers to water deserts, drain marshes, found its own State in order to become a power. It is anxious to secure a home and their own soil to the Jews of all countries who refuse to bow to the oppressions, humiliations and persecutions of the Anti-Semites. This aim Zionism has been pursuing for over a generation with a wonderful perseverance and directness. The movement has already scored an international historical success: the Balfour Declaration and the creation of a Jewish national home in Palestine. The constructive work which the Zionists have achieved in Palestine deserves universal admiration. Apart from the political importance of Zionism, this moral and technical work has enhanced the universal respect for Jewish energy and Jewish ready devotion. A new generation of Jews has arisen in Palestine which is mightily proud of its Judaism and which has freed itself from the humiliation of being tolerated. It is a generation which is being attacked, but is no longer despised, a generation which has resumed and continues the chain of a great national tradition which a terrible catastrophe had broken two thousand years ago.

In spite, however, of this great achievement, the credit for which is due to the great prophet of Zionism, Theodore Herzl, to his successor Weizmann and to the numerous nameless pioneers of the new Jewish land, the future of this creation is still very uncertain. The Zionist idea in itself is still right and consistent, but the choice of Palestine as the new home was dictated by romance rather than by reason. There is the danger of the Jewish exodus to Palestine sharing one day the fate of its Christian predecessors, viz. the Crusaders; there is the danger of the



JEWISH WORKMEN IN MODERN PALESTINE

strength of the Arabic world on Syrian soil proving much stronger than all the plans of the Western world. Strategically it is difficult to defend Palestine against any attack by land. The Pan-Arabian idea is on the increase and it will never voluntarily renounce this coast and Jerusalem which for the Mohammedans, too, is a holy city. A clash between the Zionist and Pan-Arabian ideas is threatening.

The second objection to the choice of Palestine is the fact of its being too small a country to offer shelter to the Jews in the event of a catastrophe in Europe. Should, for instance, a nationalist Anti-Semitic régime succeed the Communist rule in the Soviet-Union, the question of immigration will become a vital one for two and a half million Jews. Should Anti-Semitism be victorious in Poland, the existence of another three million Jews will be at stake. Much as the Zionists may hope that such a catastrophe will never occur, their old and new experiences ought to tell them to be prepared for the worst. The problem of six million unassimilated Jews in the East is the most serious problem of Jewry. The shadow which has fallen over the Jews in Germany is a warning, for no one knows whether it is the last act or a mere prelude to a more poignant drama.

To-day already Palestine is no longer in a position to receive all the Jewish fugitives from Germany, for in Palestine, too, the Jews are neither a majority nor a power. *Even in their new national home the Jews have remained a minority.* The Jews, therefore, who entertain great misgivings with regard to the future of Jewry, are in search of a second country capable of meeting the national requirements better than Zion. They are on the look out for a land where there is room enough for millions of Jews and where they can be sure of being able to constitute the majority of the population without any difficulty. The tablelands of the Great Portuguese Colony of Angola seem best fitted to meet these requirements, and the latest plans for Jewish settlements on a large scale are directed towards this country, the Government of which is inclined to support the enterprise. Whether the choice will fall on Angola or on another part of Africa, of America or Australia, the idea of a Jewish home has anyhow been launched by

Zionism and will not rest until the great goal will have been attained.

3. *Assimilation*

While some form of Zionism remains the solution of the Jewish question for the seven million of Eastern Jews who are clinging to their national ideal and to their rigid religious laws, the solution of the Jewish question for West and North Europe is called assimilation. In these European States, to the west, the north and the south of Germany and of Austria (including Great Britain and Italy), there are about three-quarters of a million of Jews who live in the midst of a total population of about 200 million non-Jews, which means a percentage of one-third. The majority of these Jews are thoroughly assimilated. They speak the same mother-tongue as their non-Jewish fellow-countrymen, have the same customs, the same education, the same moral and social ideas and conceptions. They feel themselves French patriots in France, English in England, Italian in Italy and Dutch in Holland. They are more closely bound up with their non-Jewish fellow-countrymen than with the national Jews in Poland or in Palestine. In spite of the Anti-Semitic prejudice from which not one European nation is exempt, they are considered and treated as fellow-countrymen by the overwhelming majority of their fellow-citizens. A remnant of Anti-Semitism does, of course, still exist, but every individual is able to dispel this prejudice by his personal qualities and actions. The number of fanatical Anti-Semites is relatively small.

These Jews have no cause to leave their respective native lands for the sake of the Zionist idea. Nor have they any inclination to profess themselves members of the Jewish nation, for they feel themselves to be Frenchmen, Englishmen, or Italians of the Jewish persuasion. They have no double nation, but only one. They feel themselves thoroughly French in France, just as the descendants of the French Huguenots who immigrated into Prussia feel themselves to be Germans. The majority of these Jews look askance at Zionism, for the constant stress laid on Jewish nationalism facilitates to the Anti-Semites the task

of identifying the Jewish religion with the Jewish nation, in order to consider the Jews and to treat them as aliens.


Such an attitude towards Zionism is, however, unjust, for it is in the interests of entire Jewry to find a satisfactory solution of the Eastern Jewish problem. Should Zionism succeed in finding the solution, the assimilation of the Western Jews, instead of being rendered more difficult, will, on the contrary, be facilitated. The will of the Jews to be assimilated is not yet sufficient to bring about their assimilation; it requires also an atmosphere of religious tolerance and a respect for human rights. In Western and in Northern Europe these conditions exist, and although the recognition of the Jews as full fellow-citizens has retrogressed in consequence of the new German propaganda, the march towards this goal has been traced out. As soon as these Europeans cease to consider the Jews as a minority, the Jewish question will be solved in this part of the world, while the prejudice still weighing on the Jews in France will die out, just as the prejudice against the Huguenots which once led to the St. Bartholomew night has finally died out. Calumnies alone can revive Anti-Semitism in these countries, and it is the duty of all decent men to nip this peril in the bud. The legislations in all civilized countries ought to see to it that collective calumnies and insults to human groups should be punished at least as severely as calumnies and insults to individuals. A publication like the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" could then not be circulated a day longer in any civilized State.

While Western Europe is trying to solve the Jewish question through Assimilation, and the Zionist road is opening for Eastern Europe, Germany has taken a third road, a road leading to pre-emancipation days, the road of the ghetto. The Third Reich refuses to admit both Zionism and Assimilation. It spurns the idea of equality of Civil rights between Jews and non-Jews and considers the Jews as being outside the German nation. At best the Jews are tolerated within the confines of the Reich as a lower caste. But their safety is in jeopardy, their economic position is rendered difficult, numerous professions are closed to them, and partly also the higher education of

their children. These legal measures are supplemented by an intensive propaganda of defamation. The Jews are being accused of belonging to an inferior race, of organizing the Bolshevist world-conspiracy, of being responsible for the War and for Germany's defeat, and for all this they are being insulted, maltreated, boycotted and humiliated in every way. Among the Jews, however, are counted not only the followers of the Jewish religion, but all the former Jews, half-Jews, and quarter-Jews. Thus the figure of 600,000 German Jews rises to several millions.

This persecution of the Jews is not the concomitant of the German Revolution, but its essence. By means of an unscrupulous agitation against the Jewish minority the National-Socialist propaganda has enlisted the open and latent Anti-Semitism of the majority and thanks to this manoeuvre, it has usurped the political power in the State. After this unique success, National-Socialism hoped to mobilize Anti-Semitism all over the world and thus assume the leadership of a great universal movement. At first this agitation led to an increase of Anti-Semitism even beyond the frontiers of Germany; obscure Anti-Semitic leaders everywhere harboured the hope of emulating Hitler's political career with German aid. Germany thus became the ally of world Anti-Semitism, but it was precisely this alliance which has compromised Anti-Semitism in the world. Just as many Jews do not notice the Anti-Semitism around them, so the Third Reich did not notice that the universal hatred against National-Socialism was stronger than the universal Jew-hatred. The universal protest raised against the Third Reich has brought the Jews more friends in their struggle for existence than the Anti-Semitic world-propaganda has brought them enemies. In the contest between the Third Reich and Jewry the overwhelming majority of public opinion all over the world is on the side of the Jews; not out of sympathy for them, but as a protest against the Anti-Semitism of Germany. Thus the planned blow to world-Jewry may turn out to be a final knock-out blow to world-Anti-Semitism, its catchwords and its methods.

The unfortunate victims of this contest between German propaganda and world opinion are the German Jews, one



A VICTIM OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALISTS IN THE THIRD REICH

of the most valuable, cultured and gifted branches of Jewry. With rare exceptions these Jews have always been loyal German patriots and nationalists. They have never doubted their German nationality and are now being faced by a cruel conflict of conscience. This conflict, however, will not last, because the German attempt to solve the Jewish question by violent means cannot last. Here, too, only two possibilities are open, viz. Zionism or Assimilation. Either the German Jews will leave Germany, should the humiliations and persecutions continue, or else Germany will revise her Jewish policy and take the road of Western Europe. The setback which extreme contemporary Anti-Semitism has suffered will perhaps pave the way for a final reconciliation between the German Jews and non-Jews—just as the horrors of the Thirty Years' War had led to a religious reconciliation in Germany. The outburst of Anti-Semitism in the Third Reich has opened the eyes of the world and shown to what an extent the Jewish question is bound up and connected with the general questions of human progress, of Western culture and civilization. The treatment of minorities in general and of the Jews in particular is a barometer for the degree of culture of an epoch, a nation and a State. For every minority and, above all, a defenceless minority is a living appeal to justice, to the chivalry and loyalty of the majority, and the answer to this appeal is a sentence not against the minority but against the majority.

The Jewish question is a question of humanity. Every step in advance has ameliorated the lot of the Jews, while every step backwards has made it worse. The Jewish question is bound up with the questions of tolerance, human rights and individualism; with the questions of respect for the personality and its achievements, of the free course for the most efficient and the most gifted, irrespective of either race or religion. From the national point of view the Jewish question will be solved the more promptly the sooner the comprehension will ripen that a nation is a Kingdom of the Spirit and not of blood; that the nations in Europe are intermixed to such an extent that there could be no question of a pure race. As great schools and by means of great doctrines, the nations have therefore

united the peoples in spiritual communities, and everyone who is participating in this mysterious communion of the spirit is an equal and full member of the nation.

When such thoughts will have become general, Anti-Semitism will disappear. The descendants of the Jews will be proud of the great and romantic past of their forebears, just as the progeny of the aristocratic families are proud of their ancestors. But just as the latter have now joined the great current of nations, so the Jews, too, will be merged in the stream of the nations which they have joined. The Jewish question will then be a subject for historians and not for politicians, while Anti-Semitism will fall, because truth will be triumphant.

INDEX

A

Aba-Zebra, 190
 Abdul-Medjid, Rabbi Abraham, 170
 Abu-Afak, 159
 Abu, Hussejim Joseph, 164
 Abyssinia, 155
 Abyssinia, Negus of, 118
 Acosta, Uriel, 195
 Adler, 233
 Aga-Mohammed Khan, 119
 Agdes, Council of, 128
 Agobard, Bishop of, 131
 Agrippa, Herod, 79, 80
 Ahmed Bey, Nawab, 118
 Alcandete, Canon Pedro Fernandez de, 145
 Alexander the Great, 64
 Alexander, Pope, 97
 Alexander II, Pope, 98
 Alexander III, Pope, 97
 Alexander, Prince, of Bulgaria, 192
 Alexander, Tiberius, 75
 Alexandra, Queen, 68, 70
 Alfonso X of Spain, 138
 Allah, Seyed Rihan, 170
 Allebrandus, Bishop, 133
Alliance Israélite, quoted, 170
 Amina, 117
 Amolo, Bishop, 132
 Ananias, 86
 Antigonus, 76
 Antioch, Abbot Isaac of, 107
 Antioch, John Chrysostom of, 53, 125
 Antiochus, King, 79
 Antiochus III, 64-5
 Antipas, 77
Anti-Semiten Hammer, The (Schrattenholz), 192
 "Anti-Semitic Catechism," *quoted*, 24-6, 109
 Antonius Pino, Emperor, 58, 83
 Antony, 76
 Archelaus, 77
 Aryan-Semitic Cultural Regulations, 46
 Ascher, 207
 Astor family, 236
 Asumção, Fra Diego de la, 149
 Auer, 207
 Auerbach, 207

Augustus, Emperor, 77
 Augustus, Philip, 136
 Aurelius, Marcus, 114
 Austria, Archduke Albert of, 142
 Aziz, Sultan Abdul, 167
 Azura, Pinchas Ibn, 159

B

Bajazet II, Sultan, 167
 Bar-Kochba, 82
 Bauer, Abbé, 115
 Baum, Professor J., 60, 176
 Beaconsfield, Lord, 182, 195, 208, 231
 Bebel, 233
 Bela Kun, 226
 Benedict XIII, Pope, 142
 Benedict XIV, Pope, 95
 Bergson, 208 n.
 Bernhardt, Sarah, 207
 Bertheau, 38
 Béziers, Church Convocation of, 138
 Bibo, Otto, 191
 Bismarck, Prince von, 14, 192
 Bizet, 207
 "Black Death, The," 140
 Blumenbach, 35
 Boca, 35
Bolshevism and Anti-Semitism, 229
 Bonnait, T. von, 67 n.
 Bonosus, 126
Book of Judges, 87
Book of Kings, 87
 Börne, 207
 Bossuet, 116
 Bostanai, 162
 Bouillon, Godfrey de, 134
 Brandes, 208 n.
 Brandt, Herr von, 173
 Breuning, 166
 Brüll, 207
 Bruno, Giordano, 25
 Burgundy, Boso, King of, 132
Byzantium, 122

C

Cæsar, Julius, 72, 73, 77
 Caligula, 72, 78
 Caliphate, the Arabian, 162
 Caliphate, the Spanish, 164

Calixtus, Pope, 97
 Camanus, 79
 Capistrano, 143, 167
 Capsali, Mose, 167
 Carp, M., Roumanian minister, 190
 Casimir IV, Prince of Poland, 143
 Cassiodorius, 128
 Celestin, Pope, 97
 Celsus, 106
 Cerisier, 47
 Chamberlain, Housten, II, 225
Chaldeans, The, 39
*Characterization of the Away-from
 Rome movement* (Coudenhove), 15
 Charlemagne, 131
 Charles VIII, 147
 Charles the Simple, 132
 Chilperic, King, 128
 China and India, 171
 Chintilla, King, 129
 Chisdai, Rabbi Daniel ben, 162
 Chmielnicki, Zinwii Bogdan, 150
 Chopin, 13
 Chosroes Parviz, King of Persia, 118,
 126
Chronicles, 28
 Church :
 The Roman, 90
 The Protestant, 103
 The Orthodox, 100
Church Fathers, Library of the (Dr.
 Valentin Thalhofer), 105
 Chwolson, 40
 Clairvaux, Bernhard de, 177
 Claudius, Emperor, 78
 Clement, Pope, 97
 Clement V, Pope, 98
 Clement VI, Pope, 98
 Clement XIV, Pope, 98
 Clemente, Don Lope de Vera y Alarcon
 de San, 151
 Cleopatra, 74
 Clugny, Peter of, 135
 Cologne, Herman IV, Bishop of, 134
Conflict between Science and Religion
 (Draper), 50
 Consalvi, 94
 Constant, Pater, 90-6, 97
 Constantine, 122, 127
 Constantius, 123
 Cordova, Hosius, Bishop of, 123
 Coudenhove, Heinrich, 13-20
 Cremieux, Adolphe, 169, 208
Crusades, The, 132
 Cyril, Bishop, 124
 Cyrus, 63

D

Dagobert, King, 127, 128
 Daus, Saul, 191
 David, 87

Dawison, 207
 Dérenbourg, 207
Dialogues in Hell (Joly), 262
*Die Semiten in ihrem Verhältniss Su
 Chamiten und Japhetiten* (Müller),
 quoted, 38
 Dio Cassius, 52
Disbelief, Stubborn, 111
 Disraeli, Benjamin, *see* Lord Beacons-
 field
 Djerjinsky, 259
 Dositheus, 75
 Draper, J. W., 50
 Dreyfus, 206, 219
 Drumont, Edouard, 184
 Drusila, Queen, 79, 80
 Dühning, 25

E

Ebert, 233
 Edward VII, King, 258
 Egica, King of Spain, 130
 Ehrlich, 208 *n.*
 Ehrenreich, Rabbi, 180
 Eichhorn, Professor, 31, 51
 Einstein, 208 *n.*
 Elijah, 87
 Emin Pasha, 207
 Emmanuel, King of Portugal, 147
Encyclopædia Britannica, 50, 51
 Engels, 233
 Ensmingen, Gottfried of, 139
 Ephaone, Council of, 128
 Ervig, King of Spain, 130
Essence of Anti-Semitism (Couden-
 hove), 15, 20
 Eugen, Pope, 97
 Evitus, Bishop, 128
Ezekiel, 174
 Ezra, 52, 64, 69
Ezra, Book of, 186

F

Fadus, Cuspius, 79
*Famous Jewish Men and Women in
 the History of Civilization of
 Humanity* (Kohut), 208
 Felix, 80
 Ferdinand of Spain, 94, 107, 143
 Ferraris, 91
 Festus, 80
 Feuerbach, 25
 Firuz, King of Persia, 171
 Flad, Martin, 190
 Flavius, Josephus, 52
 Florus, 80
 Ford, Henry, 236, 261, 262
Foundations of the XIX Century
 (Chamberlain), 225
 Frederick, Duke, afterwards Emperor
 of Germany, 142

Freud, 208 n.
 Fritsch, Theodor (Thomas Frey), 25
et seq.
 Fulvia, 72

G

Ganganelli, Cardinal, *see* Pope
 Clement XIV
 Gautier, Theophile, 14
 Geiger, 207
Genesis, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 41, 218
 Gesenius, 38
 Goebbels, Dr., 10
 Goering, General, 10
 Goethe, 117
 Goldmark, 207
 Goldziher, 207
 Gonzani, Pater, 172
 Graetz, Professor, 123 *et seq.*, 127, 129,
 132, 137, 144, 152, 165, 207
 Graves, Philip, *Times correspondent*,
 261
 Gregory I, Pope, 128
 Gregory IX, Pope, 97, 137
 Gregory X, Pope, 98
 Gregory of Tours, 53
 Gregory the Great, Pope, 97
 Grünhut, 207
 Gudemann, Rabbi, 180
 Guidi, 43

H

Habus, King, 164
 Hadrian, 66, 82, 123, 127, 199
 Halevi, Jehuda, 164
 Halévy, 155-6, 207
 Hammer-Purgstall, 45
 Hamy, 57
 Hannibal, 41
 Hassan, Sultan Muley, 171
 Haupt, Professor, 11
 Heine, Heinrich, 14, 207
 Henderson, Mr. Arthur, 233
 Henry II, 132
 Henry IV, 136
 Heraclius, Emperor, 118, 126, 127
 Herder, 155
 Herod, 69, 76-7
 Herzl, Dr. Theodor, 179, 200, 207
 Hildesheimer, Rabbi, 180
 Hirsch, Rabbi, 180
 Hirschmann, Alexander, 191
 Hislop, A., 46
*Histoire Générale et système comparé
 des langues sémitiques* (Renan),
 36-7
History of Arabic Literature (Hammer-
 Purgstall), 44
History of Babylonia (Hommel), 39
History of the Civilization of the East
 (Kremer), 162

History of the German People
 (Janssen), 176
History of Israel (Renan), 62
History of the Parsis (Karaka), 118
History of the Peoples of Israel
 (Stade), 88
*History of the Rise and Influence of
 the Spirit of Rationalism in
 Europe* (Lecky), 153
 Hitzig, 38
 Hommel, Professor Fritz, 31-2,
 39 *et seq.*, 43, 45
 Horowitz, Rabbi, 180
 Horowitz, 207
 Hussein, grandson of Mohammed, 118
 Huxley, Professor, 35
 Hyrean, 76

I

Iddhar ul Hakk (Ullah), 117
 Ignatieff, Count, 101
Il Principo, 265
 India and China, 171
 Innocent III, Pope, 97, 136, 137
 Innocent IV, Pope, 98
Inquisition, The, 144
 Inquisition, Jews subject to the, 96
International Jew, The (Ford), 261
Isaiah, 41
 Israel, Beni, 191
 Ivan the Terrible, 266
 Izades, King, 87

J

Jablonsky, 38
 Jacobs, 207
 Janæus, 68
 Janssen, Johannes, 176
Japhethites, 30
 Jaures, 233
 Jehuda Ben Jecheskel, Rabbi, 54
 "Jew-Slayers, The," 140
JEW, THE :
 language and race, 33
 as a mixed nation, 50
 first persecution of, 64
 religious roots of Greek persecu-
 tion of, 67
 religious roots of Roman persecu-
 tion of, 74
 Romans and, 83
 proselytes, 85
 fanaticism, 86
 stubborn disbelief, 111
 gradual detachment, 114
 and Parsis, 116
 Crusades and, 132
 later Middle Ages, 140
 and the Inquisition, 144
 expulsion from Spain, 146
 modern times, 149
 accusations raised against, 174

- JEW, THE :**
 usury and, 174
 and wealth, 178
 world mastery, 181
 further reproaches, 188
 and emancipation, 201
 and Zionism, 206, 275
 Anti-Semitism after the World War, 225
 and a universal dictatorship, 225
 and migration to the West, 226
 and Bolshevism, 229
 as minorities, 267
 and assimilation, 278
 Jezdedjerd, King of Persia, 118
 Jezdegered III, King of Persia, 171
 Joachim, 207
 Joceus, 136
 Joël, Moses, *see* Maurice Joly
 John, King, 136
 John II, King of Portugal, 147
 Joly, Maurice, 261, 263
 Josephus, 72, 79
Judaism as a Proof of Christianity
 (Bauer), 116
 Julian the Apostate, Emperor, 124
 Junker, 207
 Justinian, Emperor, 126
- K**
- Kaab, Ibn Asharaf, 159
 Kahn, Rabbi Zadoc, 180
 Kalergis (Kalergi), Johann, 14
 Kalergis, Maria (Madame von Muchanoff), 13
 Kalinin, 259
 Kamenev, 259
 Kant, 215
 Kaufmann, 207
 Koirenski, 102
 Kollman, T., 35
 Krassin, 259
 Kremer, 43, 162
 Kreuger, Ivor, 236
 Kiranda, 208
- L**
- Language and Wisdom of the Indians*
 (Schlegel), 51
 Lasker, 208
 Lassalle, 208, 233
 Lassen, 38
 Lazarus, 207
 Lecky, 153-4
 Lenin, 229, 233, 259, 266
 Lenz, Herr, 107
 Leo the Isaurian, 131
 Leo the Philosopher, 132
 Leo XIII, Pope, 160 n.
 Leroy-Beaulieu, Anatole, 33, 51
Les Juifs devant l'Eglise et l'histoire
 (Constant), 90
- Les Parsis* (Ménant), 118
 Liebermann, 207
 Liebknecht, 233
 Linné, 35
 Liszt, 13
 Litvinoff, 259
 Lombroso, Professor, 56, 58
 Lorsbach, 38
 Louis IX, of France, 138
 Louis X, of France, 139
 Louis XI, of France, 266
 Ludendorff, 10
 Ludwig, Emperor, 131
 Lunatsharski, 259
 Luschan, Dr. Felix von, 51, 54-5, 57
 Luther, 103-4, 147, 178, 192
 Lysias, 66
- M**
- Maçon, Council of, 128
 Mahler, 208 n.
 Maimi, Simon, 147
 Maimonides, Rabbi, 71
 Maimuni (Maimonides), Rabbi, 164-6
 Manakji, Sir Dinsha, 121
 Mandelslo, 121
 Manetheo, 83
 Mar-Isaac, 134
 Marshall, Louis, 262
 Martin V, Pope, 98
 Marx, Karl, 208, 233
 Maspero, 34
 Maximilian, Emperor of Austria, 147
 Medjid, Sultan Abdul, 167, 168
 Mello, Juan de, of Lisbon, 148-9
 Mellon, Mr., 236
 Mendelssohn, 207
 Meshah, King, 87
 Messianic prophecies, 112-13
 Meyer, Eduard, 39
 Meyerbeer, 207
 Michiavelli, Nicolo, 264
 Midjid, Seyed Abdul, 170
 Milan, St. Ambrose of, 124
Minotaur of Honour (Coudenhove), 15
 Mizraim, 34
 Modestus, the Patriarch, 127
 Mohammed, 117 *et seq.*, 158-62
 Mohammed II, Sultan, 168
 Molcho, 148
 Molon, Apollonius, 68
 Moltke, Count von, 193
 Montmorency, Countess of, 137
 Montefiore, Sir Moses, 169
 Morgan, J. Pierpont, 236
 Morton, 36
 Müller, Frederick, 35, 60
 Müller, Max, 51
 Müller, Professor J. G., 38, 42, 58
 Murad I, Sultan, 167
 Murad II, Sultan, 167, 168

N

Naaman, 87
 Nadir-Shah, 119
 Napoleon III, 14, 262
 Nassi, Joseph, *later* Duke of Naxos,
 167
 Nassreddin, Shah, 120
National Review, The, 10
 Neander, 207
 Nero, 72
 Nesselrode, Count, 13
 Nicholas, Czar, 265
 Niebuhr, Karsten, 44
 Nilius, Professor Sergius, 258, 264
 Nordau, 207

O

Octavianus, 76
 Offenbach, 207
Of the Jews and their Lies (Luther),
 103
 Olligoyen, Pedro, 140
 Omar, Caliph, 134, 161, 162
 Onias, 75
 Ooyama, Mitsu, 14
 Oppenheim, 207
 Orkham, Sultan, 167
 Orleans, Council of, 128
 Osarsiph, Prince, 83
 Osius, Bishop, 124
 Othman, Caliphate of, 118
 Otto the Great, 132
 Otto II, 132

P

Palgrave, W. Gifford, 43
 Pantz, Dr. Otto, 45
 Papacy, The, 97
Parerga, 75
 Parsis and the Jews, 116-122
 Passau, Bishop of, 144
 Paul, 72
 Paul III, Pope, 98
 Paul IV, Pope, 149
 Pedro, Don of Spain, 141
 Persia and Morocco, 169
 Persian Zoroastrian Amelioration
 Fund, 119
 Petronius, 78
 Pfefferkorn, 147
 Philo, 72, 85
 Philip, 77
 Philip IV (le Bel), of France, 139
 Philip IV, of Spain, 151
 Phocas, Emperor, 126
 Phœnicians, The, 41
 Pilate, Pontius, 78, 110
 Poitiers, St. Hilary Bishop of, 107
Political Study of Austria-Hungary
 (Coudenhove), 14
 Pompey, 75
 Poppæa, 72

Poppæa, Empress, 80
 Posidonius, 68
 Possart, 207
 Press, the Jewish, 185
 Pritchard, 36
 Protestant Church, the, 103
 Protocols of the Elders of Zion, 258
et seq.
 Ptolemy Lagus, 54
 Ptolemy, vi, 74

Q

Quatrefages, 57

R

Rabbinism and Zionism (Wahrmund),
 205
Race Inférieure, 45
 Races, confusion of, 56
 Radek, 259
 Raphinus II, 125
 Rappoport, Dr., 180
Realm of Negation (Coudenhove), 15
 Reccared, King, 129
 Receswinth, King, 129
 Reich, G., 60
 Reinach, Theodor, 88
 Reinhardt, Dr., 45
 Reményi, 207
 Renan, 36-8, 39, 41, 43, 44, 51, 62,
 64, 67, 82, 114, 194, 199
 Reus, Edward, 196
 Retzins, 35
 Reuchlin, 147
 Reuss, 31, 34
 Ricci, Pater, 172
 Richard III, King, 266
 Rindfleisch, 139
 Robert, 207
 Rockefeller, John D., 236
 Roderick, King of Spain, 131
 Roman Church, the, 90 *et seq.*
 Roman Period, the, 71
Romance of Martyrdom among the
Jews in the Middle Ages
 (Schleider), 177
 Roscher, W., 114
 Rosenberg, 10
 Roth, Theodore, 38, 124
 Rothmüll, 207
 Rothschild family, 236
 Rottinger, Sir H., 119
 Rousseau, 201
 Rubinstein, 207
 Runik, 38

S

Sadagara, Rabbi of, 186
 Saphir, 207
 Satik, 117
 Saul, 87

Saulcy, F. de, 38
 Scherr, Johannes, 25, 47
 Schlegel, Frederick, 51
 Schleiden, Dr. M., 177
 Schopenhauer, 25, 75, 197, 215
 Schroeder, 186
 Schurer, 72
 Schwarz, Peter, 109
 Schweiger, 166
Selections from the best Patristic works in the German language (Thalhofer) 105
 Selim II, Sultan, 167
 Sem, 28 *et seq.*, 59
 Semites, 31
Semites, The (Chwolson), 40
 Semitic Languages, 32
Semitic Nations and Languages, (Hommel), 40, 45
 Sens, Ansegisus, Archbishop of, 132
 Severus, Bishop, 124
 Seville, Isadore of, 129
 Sharbarza, 126
 Sichel, 207
Siege of Mayence (Goethe), 13
 Sinovier, 259
 Sisebut, King, 130
 Solomon, 87
 Soncino, Rabbi Samuel, 167
 Sonenthal, 207
 Sprenger, 43
 Stade, Dr. Bernard, 89
 Stalin, 229, 233, 259
 State, Downfall of the Jewish, 80
 St. Augustine, 116
 Stinnes, Hugo, 236
 St. Jerome, 125
St. John, 109
 St. John Chrysostom, 53, 125
St. Luke, 28
St. Mark, 109, 110
St. Matthew, 11, 85, 109, 110
 Stobbe, 177
 St. Paul, 115
 Strabo, 72
 St. Vincent, Bory de, 36
 Stylites, Simon, 125
 Suleyman, Sultan, 166, 167

T

Tacitus, 83, 84
 Tarik, 131
 Tartas, Marrano Isaac de Castro, 152
 Taxil, Leo, 14
Teaching of Mohammed on Revelation, (Pautz), 44
 Techiel, Samuel ben, of Neuss, 134

Textes d'auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme (Reinach), 88
 Theobald, Count, of Blois, 135
 Theodoric, of the Ostrogoths, 127
 Theodoros, King of Abyssinia, 155
 Theodosius II, Emperor, 124-5
 Theudas, 79
 Thiers, 14
 Thomas, Pater, 168
 Tiberius, Emperor, 72
Times, The, 262, 264
 Titus, 66, 81, 199
Toldoth Jeschu, 186
 Toledo, Council of, 129
 Topinard, 35, 57
 Torquemada, Thomas de, 145
 Trajan, 82
 Trigaltius, 172
 Trotzky, 208*n*, 229, 233, 259
 Tshitslerin, 259
 Tuch, 38
 Tudela, Benjamin of, 162
 Tugai bey, 150
 Turkey, 166
Two Babylons, The (A. Hislop), 46

U

Ullah, Hadji Rahmet, 117

V

Vambéry, 207
 Vanderbilt family, 236
 Vannes, Council of, 128
 Varigny, M. C., 178
 Vespasian, Emperor, 115
 Villars, Marquise de, 152
 Voltaire, 25

W

Wagner, 13, 14
 Wahrmond, Prof. Dr. Adolf, 206
 Weininger, 246
 Weizmann, Dr., 276
 Welcker, H., 35, 57
 William I, of Germany, 14
 William II, of Germany, 258
 Winer, 38
 Witzia, King of Spain, 131
 Wolff, Herr, 207

Z

Zelazewska, Catherine, 149
 Zeno, Emperor, 125
 Zevi, Shabetai, 168
 Zinkeisen, 167
 Zionism, 206

