

# THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

VOLUME XL : NUMBERS 1 and 2 : 1998

## CONTENTS

Philosemitism in Britain and in the English-speaking  
World, 1840-1939: Patterns and Typology  
W. D. RUBINSTEIN and HILARY L. RUBINSTEIN

The Nation of Islam and the Jews  
ROBERT A. ROCKAWAY

Hassidism Reappraised  
JACQUES GUTWIRTH

Essential Outsiders: Chinese and Jews  
HAROLD POLLINS

Book Reviews

Chronicle

Editor: Judith Freedman

ISSN 0021-6534

## OBJECTS AND SPONSORSHIP OF THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

*The Jewish Journal of Sociology* was sponsored by the Cultural Department of the World Jewish Congress from its inception in 1959 until the end of 1980. Thereafter, from the first issue of 1981 (volume 23, no. 1), the Journal has been sponsored by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Limited, which is registered as an educational charity by the Charity Commission of England and Wales (no. 326077). It has as its main purposes the encouragement of research in the sociology of the Jews and the publication of *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*. The objects of the Journal remain as stated in the Editorial of the first issue in 1959:

'This Journal has been brought into being in order to provide an international vehicle for serious writing on Jewish social affairs . . . Academically we address ourselves not only to sociologists, but to social scientists in general, to historians, to philosophers, and to students of comparative religion. . . . We should like to stress both that the Journal is editorially independent and that the opinions expressed by authors are their own responsibility.'

The founding Editor of the *JJS* was Morris Ginsberg, and the founding Managing Editor was Maurice Freedman. Morris Ginsberg, who had been Professor of Sociology at the London School of Economics, died in 1970. Maurice Freedman, who had been Professor of Social Anthropology at the London School of Economics and later at the University of Oxford, succeeded to the title of Editor in 1971, when Dr Judith Freedman (who had been Assistant Editor since 1963) became Managing Editor. Maurice Freedman died in 1975; since then the Journal has been edited by Dr Judith Freedman.

*Applications for subscriptions* and enquiries regarding back numbers should be addressed to:

THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY  
187 GLOUCESTER PLACE  
LONDON NW1 6BU  
ENGLAND

TELEPHONE: 0171 262 8939

---

---

# THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

---

---

Volume XL : Numbers 1 and 2 : 1998

---

---

## CONTENTS

Philosemitism in Britain and in the English-speaking World, 1840-1939: Patterns and Typology W. D. RUBINSTEIN and HILARY L. RUBINSTEIN	5
The Nation of Islam and the Jews ROBERT A. ROCKAWAY	48
Hassidism Reappraised JACQUES GUTWIRTH	79
Essential Outsiders: Chinese and Jews HAROLD POLLINS	87
Book Reviews	97
Chronicle	107
Books Received	111
Notes on Contributors	113

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd  
(Published by the World Jewish Congress 1959-80)

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION  
INSTITUTIONS: £20.00 (U.S. \$35.00)  
INDIVIDUALS: £15.00 (U.S. \$26.00)  
SINGLE COPIES: £10.00 (U.S. \$18.00)

---

---

Applications for subscriptions should be sent to **The Jewish Journal of Sociology**,  
187 Gloucester Place, London NW1 6BU, England. Telephone: 0171-262 8939

EDITOR Judith Freedman

ADVISORY BOARD

R. BACHI ( <i>Israel</i> )	JACQUES GUTWIRTH ( <i>France</i> )
LORD BELOFF ( <i>Britain</i> )	S. J. PRAIS ( <i>Britain</i> )
S. N. EISENSTADT ( <i>Israel</i> )	MARLENA SCHMOOL ( <i>Britain</i> )
LLOYD P. GARTNER ( <i>Israel</i> )	NORMAN SOLOMON ( <i>Britain</i> )
NATHAN GLAZER ( <i>USA</i> )	B. WASSERSTEIN ( <i>Britain</i> )

© MAURICE FREEDMAN RESEARCH TRUST LTD 1999

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN  
BY W. S. MANEY & SON LTD, LEEDS

## BOOKS REVIEWED

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Titles</i>	<i>Reviewers</i>	<i>Page</i>
C. C. Aronsfeld	<i>Wanderer From My Birth</i>	Harold Pollins	97
Jean-Christophe Attias and Esther Benbassa	<i>Israël Imaginaire</i>	Max Beloff	98
Daniel Chirot and Anthony Reid, eds.	<i>Essential Outsiders: Chinese and Jews</i>	Harold Pollins	87
Sylvia Kedourie, ed.	<i>Elie Kedourie CBE, FBA 1926-1992</i>	Judith Freedman	100
Bonnie J. Morris	<i>Lubavitcher Women in America</i>	Jacques Gutwirth	101
Ada Rapoport- Albert, ed.	<i>Hasidism Reappraised</i>	Jacques Gutwirth	79
Milton Shain	<i>Antisemitism</i>	Harold Pollins	103

## NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

Papers submitted to *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* should be addressed to the Editor at 187 Gloucester Place, London NW1 6BU, England. The papers must be original. They should not have been published previously, or be committed to publication elsewhere, in any language. When a paper has been accepted for publication, the author may not publish it elsewhere in any language, without the written consent of the Editor of the *JJS*.

Articles (please send at least two copies) should be typewritten on one side only and double-spaced with ample margins. Pages (including those containing illustrations, diagrams, or tables) should be numbered consecutively. All quotations should be within single inverted commas; quotation marks within quotations should be double inverted commas.

Notes should follow the style of this *Journal* and should be given at the end of the article in numerical sequence according to the order of their citation in the text.

### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

#### A. *Books*

Give author, title, place of publication, year, and page reference. Underline all titles of books.

#### B. *Articles*

Place titles of articles within single inverted commas. Underline the title of the book or journal in which the article appears. In the case of a journal, cite numbers of volume and part, and year of publication.

**PROOFS.** An author making major revisions in proof will be required to bear the cost. Unless proofs are returned to the Editor promptly, authors' corrections will not be incorporated.

# PHILOSEMITISM IN BRITAIN AND IN THE ENGLISH- SPEAKING WORLD, 1840-1939: PATTERNS AND TYPOLOGY

W. D. Rubinstein and Hilary L. Rubinstein

**T**HIS paper has two aims. The first is to bring to the attention of historians and other scholars of modern Jewry the existence of a persisting — but almost unknown — tradition of philosemitism which manifested itself in Britain and elsewhere in the English-speaking world during every significant international outburst of antisemitism during the century from 1840 to 1939. The second aim is an attempt to offer a typology of philosemitism, distinguishing between varieties of Gentile support for the Jewish people.

We define philosemitism as support and/or admiration for the Jewish people by non-Jews. We regard it as the other side of the coin of antisemitism (hostility to, or dislike of, Jews). We believe that — especially in the English-speaking world and probably elsewhere — philosemitism has been a significant force whose importance has been astonishingly neglected in most historical accounts of modern Jewry. Although tens of thousands of books and articles have been published in modern times about antisemitism (including the thousands about the Holocaust), almost nothing has been printed on philosemitism. To the best of our knowledge, there have been only two books on the subject written in English in recent decades: one by Solomon Rappaport (1980) and another by Alan Edelstein (1982).<sup>1</sup> While both (especially Edelstein's) are valuable and wide-ranging, neither analyses the modern period in detail or uses primary sources. Moreover, neither is well-known and the viewpoints they express remain largely outside the mainstream of modern Jewish historiography.

We believe that much more attention should be paid by scholars to philosemitism than has hitherto been done. A thorough and detailed account of the history of the Jewish people in modern times which focuses on antisemitism but ignores philosemitism (as is so often the case) in our view is as one-sided as a history of capitalism which chronicles its

depressions, exploitations, and bankruptcies but ignores the affluence and technological innovation it created.

There are various ways of approaching this topic; one of them is a discussion of the careers of leading philosemites or their writings, but a more fruitful way is to survey the reactions of some non-Jews in defence of Jews during well-known incidents of antisemitism in modern times. In this paper, we examine philosemitic responses to eleven significant antisemitic episodes in the century from 1840 to 1939, focusing on Great Britain — but also citing the case of other countries, such as the United States and Australia and to a lesser extent, Canada. We have specifically considered rallies and petitions organised by philosemites because since 1840, these were the most frequently encountered modes of philosemitic protest against those who persecuted Jews. Further, there were philosemitic books and pamphlets among the various means of demonstrating solidarity with oppressed Jews. Most readers, in our opinions, probably know little or nothing of these philosemitic activities, since they are seldom mentioned in histories of the Jews in Britain or in the United States and have never been explored in detail in Western publications.<sup>2</sup>

### *I. Philosemitic Activities During Well-Known Antisemitic Incidents, 1840–1939*

The subject of non-Jewish support for Jewish political emancipation in the United Kingdom has been examined by many historians and we shall not therefore deal with the subject here. That support was manifested in civic rallies and in petitions to parliament by town councils until in 1858 Jews were admitted to parliament.<sup>3</sup> In this paper, we will examine the rallies and petitions which were the main philosemitic response by Gentiles to the persecution of Jews in the Middle East and in Europe during the period under review.

#### *The Damascus Affair, 1840*

It would appear that the earliest public rally in Great Britain on behalf of Jews persecuted overseas occurred in 1840 in the wake of the imprisonment and torture of Jewish leaders in Damascus following the disappearance of a Capuchin priest and his servant and assumptions of ritual murder. Under torture, requisite 'confessions' had been obtained and three detainees had died. The French consul in Damascus was instrumental in inciting this persecution.

Resolutions condemning events in Damascus, the blood libel, the use of torture to extricate confessions, and expressing sympathy for the Jewish victims, were passed at a meeting which, like so many of its successors, took place at the Mansion House in London under the chairmanship of the Lord Mayor, its convenor. As with successive meetings, it was a gathering of members of the elite — City of London



## PHILOSEMITISM

bankers, brokers, and merchants — and whatever role Jews might have had in organizing it, it was conducted by non-Jews. Other business prevented the City's four MPs, all Reformers, from attending, but there was no shortage of influential movers, seconders, and other speakers. These were the banker and Liberal MP John Abel Smith; army physician Sir Charles Forbes; Quaker banker and future Liberal MP Samuel Gurney; East India merchant and future Liberal MP George de Larpent; distinguished diplomat Lord Howden; banker and future Conservative MP John Masterman; linguist, traveller, *Westminster Review* editor and future radical Reformer MP Dr John Bowring; the Hon Rev Baptist Wriothlesley Noel, minister of St John's Church, Bedford Row, a prominent Low Churchman related to Lord Byron; banker and Conservative MP Matthias Wolverley Attwood; ironmaster and ship-owner Alderman William Thompson, also a Conservative MP; reform-minded solicitor Alderman David Wire; and solicitor and Reformer MP Daniel O'Connell, the Irish 'Liberator'.<sup>4</sup>

The Damascus Affair also aroused the American public. Secretary of State John Forsyth wrote that President Van Buren fully shared the general feeling of 'horror', expressing 'equal surprise and pain, that in this advanced age' such a charge should be made and such 'barbarous measures' perpetrated. The American Consul in Alexandria was requested to help in extending 'justice and humanity ... to these persecuted people'.<sup>5</sup>

### *Continental Edicts, 1843*

Two edicts, one promulgated by the Papal States and the other by the Czar in 1843 were widely condemned by non-Jews in Britain and elsewhere. The first, the eleven-point Ancona decree, ordered Jews to discharge Christian employees and apprentices, to refrain from friendly contact with Christians, to get rid of all property they owned or rented outside the Jewish quarter, and to have a licence to travel outside that quarter. They were forbidden to reside or do business in places without a ghetto, to participate in the book trade, and under penalty of heavy fines and corporal punishment, to conduct ceremonial funerals.<sup>6</sup>

Non-Jewish sympathizers condemned this decree as a reversion to medieval persecution and a threat to the livelihoods of Jews in the Papal States. The Anglo-Jewish press found itself 'literally overwhelmed' with expressions of outrage from Gentiles, and there was much forthright commentary in general newspapers and periodicals. Daniel O'Connell, MP, one of the most eloquent speakers at the Damascus rally (who is ironically remembered for a perhaps apocryphal racial jibe at Disraeli), promised to use his influence as a prominent lay Catholic to get the decree revoked, once he was convinced of its veracity. But it was suddenly suspended owing, it seems, to the international outcry.<sup>7</sup>

The Russian *ukase* liquidated more than 60 *kehilot* (Jewish self-governing communities) and ordered Jews residing and trading on the Prussian and Austrian frontiers to go further inside the Pale. Many faced ruin. Again, there was outrage among many non-Jews. A document entreating compassion for Russian Jewry, signed by 'Bishops, Peers, Privy Counsellors [*sic*], Members of Parliament' and other influential men, was presented by Lord Ashley (the famous seventh Earl of Shaftesbury) to Czar Nicholas the First during the latter's private visit to London in 1844. A committee of prominent Gentiles offered itself to the Board of Deputies of British Jews as the forerunner to a society of non-Jewish auxiliaries which would, under Jewish direction, assist Jews in their efforts to ameliorate the situation of their oppressed co-religionists abroad. For reasons which are not entirely clear, but apparently related at least in part to fear of surreptitious conversionist activity, the offer was rejected.<sup>8</sup>

*The Mortara Affair, 1858-59*

On 24 June 1858, a seven-year-old Jewish boy in Bologna, Edgar Mortara, was kidnapped by members of a Catholic order and secretly taken to a convent in Rome. (He had been secretly baptized by his Catholic nursemaid, without the knowledge of his parents, six years earlier; to Catholics this provided legitimacy for his kidnapping.) The Mortara Affair led to world-wide protests and was remarkable for the fact that while there were a number of major rallies held in Britain by Christians on behalf of the kidnapped boy, the Jewish community of the United Kingdom did not organize any public demonstrations to condemn the kidnapping.

There may have been a number of reasons for this. Anglo-Jewry placed its faith centrally in the legendary negotiating abilities of Sir Moses Montefiore (President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews) who, on behalf of the Board, in April 1859 visited the Pope in Rome to seek the boy's release. (The Pope declined to act.) British Jews also seriously feared the influence of conversionist Evangelicals in any organized interfaith activity on behalf of the boy; at that time the influence of missionary Evangelicalism within Anglicanism was certainly at its peak.<sup>9</sup> The Anglo-Jewish community might also have believed that British liberals had already done yeoman service for the cause of Jewish parliamentary emancipation, successfully secured in 1858, and that to ask for more help was excessive. For these reasons, Anglo-Jewry relied mainly on Montefiore's own activities on behalf of the Mortara boy.

Moreover, the Mortara Affair coincided with the zenith of both mid-Victorian liberalism and of an aroused Protestant anti-Catholicism in Britain, and the Mortara case witnessed unprecedented activity by influential British Protestants for the release of the kidnapped boy. Some

## PHILOSEMITISM

of the Mortara activists may have been motivated by conversionism, but most were simply outraged by the injustice done to a Jew, especially by the Catholic church and apparently with its full approval.

The main vehicle of British protest was a mammoth petition condemning the Mortara kidnapping, perhaps only the second time that a petition, signed by influential Christians, had been used to protest against antisemitism abroad.<sup>10</sup> Addressed to the French Ambassador (apparently as the leading Catholic diplomat in London), it noted the failure of Sir Moses Montefiore to effect Mortara's release, and stated:<sup>11</sup>

Whereas it is a dishonour to Christianity in the eyes of Jews among all nations that the seizure and detention of Edgar Mortara should be supposed to be consistent with the principles of the Christian religion.

Now we, the undersigned British Christians, do hereby protest and declare that the proceedings of the Pope of Rome in taking away the Jewish child Edgar Mortara from his parents, and educating him, contrary to his parents' will, in the Roman Catholic faith, are repulsive to the instincts of humanity, and in violation of parental rights and authority, as recognised in the laws and usages of all civilized nations, and, above all, in direct opposition to the spirit and precepts of the Christian religion.

It will be seen that the petitioners protested at the 'dishonour to Christianity in the eyes of Jews' represented by the kidnapping — a most extraordinary conception for its time — as well as regarding the kidnapping as 'repulsive'. The fact that the Mortara boy was to be saved in the next life through his baptism (however equivocally, as a Catholic) formed no part of the petitioners' reasoning. The petition was signed by literally hundreds of influential Britons — *The Times* in October 1859 took up three full columns of small print in listing their names. Among the signatories were the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin; four dukes and 23 other members of the peerage; 19 Anglican bishops; 50 other senior Anglican and many Non-conformist clergymen; 36 members of Parliament; the Lord Mayor of London and the mayors of 78 other cities; the heads of five Oxbridge colleges; the Provost of Eton; and several dozen leading City businessmen.<sup>12</sup>

Apart from this protest, a delegation was organized to express its concern to Lord John Russell, the Foreign Secretary, in early November 1859. It was led by Sir Culling Eardley who was an Anglican landowner and a remote descendant of the Jewish financier Sir Sampson Gideon. The delegation consisted chiefly of leading City businessmen like the Quaker banker Samuel Gurney, R. N. Fowler, and Benjamin Scott, the Chamberlain of the City. Noting that 'all Europe rang with' the 'infamy' of the kidnapping, it urged the British government to 'bring the subject of the Papal treatment of the Jews' to the notice of any international conference on the future of Italy, and that 'the long-oppressed and down-trodden race of Israel might be released from their religious oppression'.<sup>13</sup>

Russell stated that 'the real justice of the case needed no argument' but that the British government could do little to influence the Papal states.<sup>14</sup> Further meetings and rallies were held in London and Liverpool. While conversionist Evangelicals may have been among the protesters most were liberals who were outraged by this particular case. The man who was most centrally concerned in organizing the petition of protest at the Mortara affair was David Wire, an Anglican City solicitor and Lord Mayor of London at that time, who took part in numerous pro-Jewish rallies and demonstrations throughout his life. Wire seems to have been a liberal philosemite, without any conversionist impulse whatever, a man who simply deplored the persecution of the Jews, admired them as a people, and was close to the London Jewish community. With the Lord Mayor of Dublin and the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, Wire undertook to head a delegation to Napoleon III, whose troops occupied Rome, seeking his intervention. The three civic leaders, probably anxious to allay Jewish communal fears that they were making capital for Protestantism out of the affair, sought representatives of the Board of Deputies of British Jews to join their delegation. However, the Board refused to co-operate, and the proposal fell through.<sup>15</sup>

Apart from liberal philosemites, many of those active in the Mortara agitation were certainly motivated by anti-Catholicism. Several rallies were organized by Protestant groups (such as the National Protestant Society and the South-west London Protestant Institute) condemning the 'direct violation . . . of the principles of civil and religious liberties' — in this case, closely associating the Catholic church with religious bigotry and the denial of religious freedom, a freedom to which the Jews were entitled no less than others.<sup>16</sup>

Many protest meetings were also held over Mortara in the United States. While some were specifically organized by the American Jewish community (which then numbered probably about 150,000), many were organized and attended by non-Jews, despite the utter remoteness of the Mortara case from America and its affairs. For instance, it was noted that 'probably no public meeting in San Francisco, political or otherwise, had ever been so numerically or more respectably attended' as at the protest over Mortara.<sup>17</sup> 'Many Roman Catholics were observed' at that meeting. A resolution adopted by the American Protestant Association deplored the fact that 'a child of Hebrew parents has been deprived of the care and protection of its natural parents . . . we recognise an act of despotism paralleled only by the persecutions and atrocities committed by the same power during the dark ages . . . in common with our fellow-citizens of the Hebrew faith [we] extend to the family of young Mortara our best wishes for his speedy restoration to the home of his parents'.<sup>18</sup> In a protest rally in Chicago, an unidentified American public official observed that 'the prejudice against the Israelite has been the deepest and most universal that has ever been fastened upon mankind', but also claimed that 'here,

## PHILOSEMITISM

in our land, Israel finds repose for the first time; here, after the lapse of ages, his wearied and trembling limbs walk with a more free and bold tread. Here he first finds the consummation of the struggles of ages, the universal right of civil and religious liberty to Israelite and Gentile.<sup>19</sup>

### *The Roumanian Disturbances, 1872*

When violence erupted against Jews in Roumania in 1872 (following the arrest and sentencing of a rabbi and four other Jews on a trumped-up charge of stealing the Easter wafer), a large protest meeting convened by the Lord Mayor of London was held at the Mansion House following an approach from the recently established Anglo-Jewish Association (AJA). Those Jews who still opposed public meetings were effectively eclipsed: distrust of the intentions of professed friends had receded, and it was recognized that demonstrations of concern by influential non-Jewish opinion might prove advantageous.

Like the relief fund for Roumanian Jewry set up by the AJA, the meeting received generous support from non-Jews. Participants included at least 34 MPs (of all affiliations), peers and other titled persons, representatives of City firms, bankers including the governor and other officials of the Bank of England, aldermen and other City officeholders. The three major resolutions — condemning the occurrences in Roumania and recording sympathy for the victims, demanding damages for those afflicted and a guarantee of Roumanian Jewry's civil rights, and thanking the British government for already doing what it could for the victims, but pressing for a European intergovernmental initiative — were passed and seconded by non-Jews. These were the Earl of Shaftesbury; the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (C. J. Ellicott), the Conservative MP, R. N. Fowler; the Reformer MP, R. W. Crawford; and the Liberal MPs Kirkman Hodgson and Edward Baines. With the exception of Baines, a veteran of the fight for Jewish political emancipation, these parliamentarians had business interests in the City. Other speakers were the future Liberal MP Alderman William Lawrence and the former Liberal MP Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton; they were joined by several other non-Jews (mainly MPs of all parties) on a delegation appointed to convey the meeting's recommendations to Foreign Secretary Earl Granville.<sup>20</sup>

### *Russian Pogroms, 1881–82*

The protests which greeted the notorious Russian pogroms of 1881–82 exceeded anything seen hitherto. The central rally against this anti-Jewish violence in Russia was held at the Mansion House in February 1882, chaired by the Lord Mayor of London. It was requisitioned by 38 distinguished non-Jews, including five who had been active in the 1872 protest: Lord Shaftesbury, Bishop Ellicott, and William Lawrence, MP,

had spoken at that year's rally, while the Liberal (later Liberal Unionist) Sir John Lubbock, MP, and the radical Liberal MP Henry Richard had been delegation members. Among the other 1882 requisitioners were the Archbishop of Canterbury (A. C. Tait), the Catholic Archbishop of Westminster (Cardinal Manning), and the famous Unitarian divine Dr James Martineau. There were prelates, several peers, and MPs of all parties, as well as Charles Darwin, the writer Matthew Arnold, and the celebrated Master of Balliol, Dr Benjamin Jowett.<sup>21</sup>

As with comparable protest meetings, Jewish notables attended but non-Jewish public figures dominated proceedings. In the crowded hall were peers and peeresses, MPs of all parties, Anglican clergymen, and religious ministers of various denominations. The major resolutions — deploring events in Russia and the degraded legal situation of Jews there, hoping that the British government would get an opportunity to exert 'friendly' pressure on the Czarist regime, and opening a relief fund — were moved and seconded by non-Jews: Shaftesbury; Manning; Liberal MP and author James (later Viscount) Bryce; the Conservative MP, J. G. Hubbard; the Bishop of London (John Jackson); Canon F. W. Farrar; the aristocratic Liberal MP, E. L. Stanley; and the Liberal MP, William Fowler.

By June 1882, one month after the passage of Russia's antisemitic May Laws, more than £75,000 had been received by the relief fund — mainly, it seems, from Gentiles. There were some 40 public protest meetings in towns and cities around the country, including Birmingham, Liverpool, and Manchester.<sup>22</sup>

A number of Oxford graduates called for a public protest meeting under university auspices. They included Matthew Arnold; Robert Browning; Sir George Bowyer; the Liberal MP, Sir Horace Davey, QC; the Archbishop of Canterbury; and the Lord Chief Justice (Lord Coleridge). But resident members of the university determined instead upon a memorial of solidarity to Chief Rabbi Dr Nathan Adler. The initiators of this document were Dr Edwin Palmer — Archdeacon of Oxford, Canon of Christ Church, and former Professor of Latin — who framed it and President of Trinity College Dr John Percival, a future Bishop of Hereford. It expressed sorrow and amazement at events in Russia and the earnest hope that equality before the law would soon be the lot of every citizen of every land, regardless of 'race or creed'.<sup>23</sup> The document was signed by a remarkable number of resident members of Oxford University, including the Vice-Chancellor, 18 heads of colleges, 25 professors, and numerous fellows and tutors. It carried 245 names, famous ones among them, such as C. L. Dodgson (Lewis Carroll), Benjamin Jowett, T. H. Green, and Max Müller. Rather than entrust it to the post, Palmer insisted on carrying it to London himself. A protest against the pogroms, signed by 1,589 Oxford undergraduates, was sent

## PHILOSEMITISM

to the Lord Mayor of London and the Mansion House relief fund committee.<sup>24</sup>

Protests by Gentiles at the Russian pogroms extended throughout the English-speaking world, even in the unlikeliest places. A striking example of the ubiquity of public speech and action on behalf of persecuted Russian Jewry may be found in remote Australia, whose six colonies comprised a total population of two million, with about 9,000 Jews. Outrage regarding the pogroms was quick to manifest itself, and public meetings were held in Melbourne, Adelaide, and Sydney in August 1881 — months before their London counterpart. At each meeting, motions were passed deploring events in Russia, establishing a relief fund, and appointing a committee to administer it. Resolutions at the Melbourne meeting were moved almost exclusively by well-known non-Jews: barrister/politician Sir George Verdon; a parliamentarian; a professor of history; two physicians; and the Mayor. The latter had convened the meeting and presided; he was also appointed co-treasurer of the relief fund committee, whose other members included Verdon and two further parliamentarians, one of them a future premier of the colony of Victoria.<sup>25</sup>

This pattern of mainly non-Jewish sponsorship of resolutions was repeated in Adelaide and Sydney. In Adelaide the four non-Jews concerned were the South Australian Minister of Education, a Presbyterian Hebraist and Biblical scholar, a prominent physician who was also a leading Catholic layman, and the politically conservative Attorney-General John Downer, who would later serve as premier of the colony. Chairing the meeting as well as the relief fund committee was the Mayor. Other non-Jewish committee members were Downer, Chief Justice Sir Samuel Way, and two parliamentarians.<sup>26</sup>

Liberal elder statesman Sir John Robertson, who delivered an emotional speech and was already known for his philosemitism, chaired the Sydney meeting. The platform was packed with prominent parliamentarians, including the politically conservative Sir George Reid, a future prime minister of Australia. Non-Jewish sponsors of resolutions were the eminent Catholic liberal barrister/politician William Bede Dalley, whose zealous eloquence was the highlight of the gathering; Thomas Buckland, a prominent Anglican businessman/pastoralist; a senior Anglican clergyman; and a leading Presbyterian minister. Members of the relief fund committee included Robertson, Dalley, Buckland, and six senior parliamentarians.<sup>27</sup>

All three relief funds were generously subscribed, from rural as well as urban areas, and with the opening of Britain's Mansion House Fund in January 1882 Australian fundraising recommenced. A number of public meetings, addressed by parliamentarians, clergymen, and other non-Jewish local notables, took place in country towns. Funds were liberally forthcoming.<sup>28</sup>

*Russian Persecution, 1890-91*

With an intensification of anti-Jewish measures in Russia in 1890-91, involving mass expulsions of Jews from Moscow and St Petersburg with the consequent impoverishment of many, came a great public protest meeting in December 1890 at London's Guildhall with the Lord Mayor presiding. This meeting was requisitioned by 85 distinguished non-Jews: peers, senior clergy, representatives of the arts and academia, military figures, and MPs of various political allegiances. Several, such as Sir John Lubbock, James Martineau, Benjamin Jowett, Cardinal Manning, Archdeacon (formerly Canon) Farrar, and Baron Addington (formerly J. G. Hubbard, MP), had been among the requisitioners of the 1882 meeting. Some of the others, such as Matthew Arnold and the wealthy heiress/philanthropist Baroness Burdett-Coutts, had attended that meeting while yet others — like popular Baptist preacher Rev C. H. Spurgeon and the Duke of Westminster, Britain's richest landed proprietor — would have done so if not prevented by other matters. Among the 85 requisitioners were the Archbishop of Canterbury (E. W. Benson) and such household names as poet laureate Lord Tennyson; artist Sir Frederic Leighton; novelist Walter Besant; Professor Thomas Huxley; John Bright MP (along with his parliamentary son); and the future Viceroy of India Lord Curzon, then a Conservative MP.<sup>29</sup>

The major resolutions deplored the harsh disabling legislation aimed specifically at Jews in Russia and proposed that a respectful memorial signed by the Lord Mayor on behalf of the citizens of London be addressed to the Czar requesting repeal of such legislation. All were proposed and seconded by non-Jews: the Duke of Westminster; the Earl of Meath (founder of Empire Day); industrialist, railway magnate and Liberal MP Sir Joseph Pease; the Bishop of Ripon (William Boyd Carpenter); the Conservative MP Sir Robert Fowler; and that tireless advocate of Imperial Federation, Sir John Colomb.<sup>30</sup>

A month earlier, 1,200 people had attended an open-air demonstration in the East End organized by the International Working Men's Educational Club. This rally, which passed a resolution condemning Russia's treatment of Jews, was chaired by James Beal of the London County Council. It was addressed by the advocate of free thought Dr Edward Aveling; by his wife (Karl Marx's daughter) representing female trade unionists; and by William Morris, the celebrated Oxford-educated poet, interior designer, and socialist; and three Russian dissidents.<sup>31</sup>

In the United States, numerous influential non-Jews were among more than 400 signatories to a petition addressed to President Benjamin Harrison and Secretary of State James G. Blaine asking them to intercede with Czar Alexander III, Queen Victoria, the Sultan of Turkey, and other foreign rulers, for convening an international conference on the condition of 'the Israelites, and their claims to Palestine as their ancient



## PHILOSEMITISM

home; and to promote in all other just and proper ways, the alleviation of their suffering condition'. Drawn up on the initiative of Chicago businessman W. J. Blackstone, a devout Christian who had recently returned from the Holy Land, the petition was signed by congressmen, governors, mayors, judges, publishers, industrialists, financiers, philanthropists, and clergymen. Signatories included future president William McKinley; J. Pierpont Morgan; John D. Rockefeller; Supreme Court Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller; famous evangelist Dwight L. Moody; and Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore.<sup>32</sup>

### *The Dreyfus Affair, 1894-99*

The Dreyfus Affair is often seen as one of the most significant progenitors of right-wing nationalist antisemitism in modern European history and is, of course, often credited with converting Theodor Herzl to political Zionism, with momentous long-term results. Yet the Dreyfus Affair can be seen not only as evidence of the growth of antisemitism in its modern racial-nationalist form even in western Europe, but as a demonstration of the strength of philosemitism and of the forces opposed to the arrest and conviction of Dreyfus. It should not be forgotten that in France itself the Dreyfus Affair led to a major electoral victory for the French left and for the champions of Dreyfus, resulting, among other things, in the disestablishment of the Catholic church in 1904.<sup>33</sup>

It is no exaggeration to say that throughout the English-speaking world public opinion was overwhelmingly, indeed almost unanimously, in favour of Dreyfus once it became clear that he was almost certainly a victim of a terrible injustice based to a significant degree on the antisemitism of the French military officer class, backed by much of the Catholic church and the extreme right. This pro-Dreyfusard mood appeared most strongly in September 1899 when, despite overwhelming evidence of Dreyfus's innocence, a Rennes court-martial upheld the original 1894 guilty verdict, adding only that the captain had acted 'in extenuating circumstances'. In Britain, the 1899 verdict was condemned in countless editorials, letters to the press, and sermons. A wave of anti-French hostility swept over Britain: retaliatory acts ranging from manufacturers withdrawing or threatening to withdraw from the Paris Exhibition of 1900 to French actors and musical compositions being hissed off the stage.<sup>34</sup> Resolutions condemning the French court were passed by many institutions — from the Cambridge University Union to the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants.<sup>35</sup> Virtually the whole of the British establishment supported Dreyfus and deplored his treatment at the hands of the French military. Hilaire Belloc (1879-1953) — the author and poet who was later closely associated with G. K. Chesterton as a champion of right-wing social Catholicism and who was certainly a pronounced antisemite — attributed his failure to secure a fellowship of

All Souls College in Oxford in the late 1890s to the fact that he was a vocal *anti*-Dreyfusard, perhaps the only one prominent at Oxford at the time.<sup>36</sup> Even some often seen by historians as fountainheads of antisemitism *supported* Dreyfus and condemned the French verdict — for example, Leopold Maxse's monthly journal of opinion, *National Review*, which was generally viewed as one of the main sources of right-wing British nationalism with an anti-alien, antisemitic edge. Maxse himself eloquently pleaded that Dreyfus was innocent and carried several detailed articles arguing that Dreyfus had been wronged.<sup>37</sup> Many in Britain pointed to the reactionary French Catholic church as crucially blameworthy in the Dreyfus case, *The Times* editorializing in 1899:<sup>38</sup>

The French Church . . . has allowed the mantle of its moral authority to be cast over every passion that skulks under the name of Anti-Semitism and Nationalism . . . a hideous recrudescence of medieval passions has made [the French] incapable of doing justice to a Jew.

There is also considerable evidence of mass support for Captain Dreyfus. An address of sympathy to Madame Dreyfus drawn up by the London *Daily Chronicle* obtained more than 112,000 signatures, while a Sunday demonstration in Hyde Park in support of Dreyfus attracted a crowd of 80,000.<sup>39</sup>

The motivations for this widespread support for Dreyfus virtually across the political spectrum were complex, and certainly included such factors as anti-Catholicism, especially among Evangelicals and Low Church Anglicans (then undergoing a discernible revival), imperial and nationalistic rivalries with France, and a widespread perception, perhaps fanned by Queen Victoria's 1897 Jubilee, that British justice was inherently superior to that meted out elsewhere and that a travesty of justice like the Dreyfus Affair 'can't happen here'.<sup>40</sup> These reasons for the surprisingly unanimous degree of support given to Dreyfus in Britain must be balanced against philosemitism as such (although they are frequently difficult to separate), widespread outrage that a harmless Jew had been wrongly imprisoned, and a strong sense that antisemitism was a relic of medieval barbarism. Nevertheless, it is striking that, to British public opinion, all these factors were strongly present and all pointed to the same end: support for Dreyfus.

Very similar patterns can be found throughout the English-speaking world. In Australia, major public meetings in support of Dreyfus were held in Melbourne, Sydney, and Perth as well as in many smaller centres.<sup>41</sup> The Melbourne meeting, convened by the Lord Mayor and chaired in his absence by a parliamentarian who when Mayor in 1881 had chaired that year's protest meeting, had been advocated by University of Melbourne academic and militant anti-Catholic Dr Alexander Lecper. Extraordinarily, both houses of the Victorian legislature had cabled Madame Dreyfus expressing sympathy, and several

## PHILOSEMITISM

parliamentarians joined prominent clergymen and other leading citizens on the platform. Speakers were the city's Anglican canon, a prominent businessman, a well-known historian, two parliamentarians, and one future parliamentarian (all non-Jews).<sup>42</sup>

Sydney's Lord Mayor declined to preside at his city's protest meeting, claiming that it would be improper for him to officially participate in an event held to condemn a foreign nation's treatment of one of its own citizens. He also refused to make the Town Hall available, so the Masonic Hall was used instead. Among the most zealous advocates of a meeting was the distinguished conservative politician J. C. Neild, and the ensuing function, characterised by the usual range of speakers and sympathizers, passed typical resolutions condemning the Rennes verdict, expressing the utmost sympathy for Dreyfus, his wife and family, appealing to the French nation to insist that full justice be done, and expressing admiration at the heroic efforts of Madame Dreyfus, Picquart, and Zola.<sup>43</sup>

Fully one year before the Rennes verdict, the Western Australian Chief Justice, Sir Alexander Onslow, had spoken in favour of Dreyfus. The colony's public meeting proceeded under the chairmanship of Perth's Mayor, parliamentarian Alexander Forrest, brother of a Western Australian premier. As at comparable meetings elsewhere, local non-Jewish notables, including clergymen and a parliamentarian, played prominent roles.<sup>44</sup> In Australia, as in Britain, the Dreyfus Affair was widely seen as an indication of the re-emergence of medieval barbarism and the horrors of the Inquisition.

### *The Russian Pogroms, 1905*

The Russian pogroms of 1905, the culmination of a period of intense antisemitic violence throughout the Czarist empire, led to numerous protests by non-Jews in Britain. The timing of these protests is especially noteworthy in that 1905 also saw the enactment of the Aliens Act which limited Russian Jewish immigration (and immigration from other countries) to Britain by a perceptible extent.<sup>45</sup> The central form of agitation on behalf of the persecuted Jews of Russia at that time was a now-familiar one: a mammoth protest rally, which deliberately included many influential Gentiles from the British establishment as well as leading British Jews. The protest meeting was held in London at Queen's Hall, Langham Place, on 8 January 1906. It was presided over by Lord Rothschild and included a galaxy of prominent Gentiles: the Bishop of Ripon; the Dean of Canterbury; the Archdeacon of Westminster; the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster; the President of the Free Church Council of Britain; Lord Milner; the Lord Mayor of London; and numerous peers, MPs, and leaders of the bar and of commerce.<sup>46</sup> Most Jewish notables were also present, including the Chief Rabbi, most London rabbis, Sir Samuel Montagu, and Claude Montefiore. A letter

was read out from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was unable to be present, but who asserted that 'the sympathy which England feels for the members of the Jewish race who have recently suffered so terribly is wide and deep, and it is of the very essence of our Christianity to express it by word and act'.<sup>47</sup> Telegrams of support were also read out from the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Leader of the Opposition, Arthur Balfour, and from Joseph Chamberlain and the Duke of Devonshire.<sup>48</sup> Balfour stated that 'the treatment of their Jewish citizens by European nations, from medieval times onwards, is certainly the darkest blot on the history of Christendom', while Chamberlain termed the pogroms 'an indelible disgrace upon our Christian civilisation'.<sup>49</sup> Letters were also read out from numerous other supporters of the rally who were unable to be present — among them the Lord Chief Justice, the Bishop of London, the Headmaster of Eton, the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University, George Bernard Shaw, and Sir Edward Poynter (the President of the Royal Academy).<sup>50</sup>

Again following a now-familiar pattern — protests, meetings, and resolutions were also held throughout the English-speaking world. In Australia, a wide range of individuals and organizations joined in the condemnation of Czarist persecution. New South Wales state parliamentarian and future health minister Dr Richard Arthur, head of the newly formed Immigration League of Australia, advocated Jewish refugee settlement in the country. As a result of several high-level approaches, Australian Prime Minister Alfred Deakin cabled Whitehall that Australian public condemnation of the Russian atrocities was unanimous, and that all state premiers were united on the issue.<sup>51</sup> Deakin's action stopped plans by the respective lord mayors for public protest meetings in Melbourne and Sydney. However, the relief funds for survivors of the pogroms opened in both cities attested to the strength of Gentile sympathy, and many distinguished names were among the donors. A meeting in Sydney organized by the Jewish community received expressions of solidarity from non-Jews, and the city's Anglican Archbishop convened and chaired a protest meeting addressed by senior clergymen of various denominations.<sup>52</sup>

Perth and Adelaide had already held public protest meetings, convened and chaired by their respective (non-Jewish) mayors. At Perth the many non-Jewish dignitaries who packed the platform heard forceful speeches from local non-Jewish notables: the city's Anglican Archbishop, two other clergymen, four parliamentarians, one ex-parliamentarian, and the mayor-elect.<sup>53</sup> Adelaide's Mayor was supported by several famous people in condemning the outrages: South Australia's socialist Premier, Thomas Price; Liberal opposition leader Richard Butler; Roman Catholic Archbishop O'Reilly; the city's Anglican Honorary Canon; the president of the colony's Council of Churches; and a prominent merchant, philanthropist and Congregational lay leader. Price, who moved the

## PHILOSEMITISM

resolution for the mood of the meeting to be transmitted to British Prime Minister Arthur Balfour, was one of those who convinced Alfred Deakin to cable Whitehall.<sup>54</sup>

### *The Beilis Case, 1912-13*

The last of the great pre-1914 outpourings of Gentile, especially establishment, protest at an instance of Jewish persecution occurred following the arrest in Kiev in 1912 of the Jewish clerk, Mendel Beilis, charged with the ritual murder of a Christian peasant boy. A revival of the medieval 'blood libel' at its most egregious, the Beilis case led to an unprecedented range of protest by Gentiles throughout the world, and even in Russian liberal and professional circles.<sup>55</sup> In Britain, the size and depth of protest, especially by British establishment figures, probably exceeded anything seen before, and the sheer volume of the influential Gentiles who went on record to protest against the Beilis case is so extraordinary that it must surely, in and of itself, call into question the image of Edwardian England as a time of heightened antisemitism.

The main British protest was another monster petition presented to the Russian government in May 1912.<sup>56</sup> Denouncing the 'Blood Accusation' as a 'relic of the days of Witchcraft and Black Magic, a cruel and utterly baseless libel on Judaism, an insult to Western culture, and a dishonour to the Churches', it claimed that 'among the ignorant and inflammable populace of Eastern Europe, the "Blood Accusation" has often given rise to terrible outbreaks of mob violence against the Jews'. The protest was signed by several hundred influential persons, including the Archbishops of Canterbury and York; the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster; Field Marshal Lord Roberts; former Prime Ministers Lord Rosebery and Arthur Balfour; Sir Edward Carson; Austen Chamberlain; Ramsay MacDonald; nearly 100 Oxford and Cambridge professors; many judges; dozens of leading writers, editors, and cultural figures (among them Thomas Hardy, Conan Doyle, A. V. Dicey, Rider Haggard, John Masfield, George Bernard Shaw, G. M. Trevelyan, and H. G. Wells); the presidents of the Royal Society, the British Association, the Royal College of Physicians, the Royal College of Surgeons, and the Royal Academy; the Poet Laureate Alfred Austin; and the editors of 16 leading newspapers and magazines. Significantly, several of the notables who signed the petition have been sometimes seen as flirting with antisemitism, such as the eugenicist Professor Karl Pearson.<sup>57</sup> That petition on behalf of Beilis was followed in October 1913 by an enormous protest meeting, under the auspices of the English Zionist Federation, presided over by Lord Rothschild, at which Dicey and other Gentile notables spoke and dozens of telegrams of support from British leaders were read out.<sup>58</sup> There were also overflowing protest meetings held up and down the country, not only in cities with a

significant Jewish population like Leeds and Glasgow, but also in places such as Portsmouth, Plymouth, and Nottingham. The Glasgow meeting was attended by 3,000 and was exclusively addressed by non-Jews, including the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Glasgow and the Dean of Glasgow Cathedral.<sup>59</sup>

As with previous instances of antisemitism, very similar protests occurred throughout the English-speaking world. In the United States, an open letter to Czar Nicholas II, dated 31 October 1913, was signed by 74 eminent clergymen of various denominations and regional locations. They included Cardinal Farley of New York, *Catholic Encyclopedia* editor-in-chief Charles G. Herbermann, Catholic and Episcopal prelates, leaders of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches (including Syracuse University chancellor James R. Day), of the Congregational church and the Church of Christ, as well as the Georgia-based Bishop J. S. Flipper of the African Methodist Church. They feared an outbreak of antisemitic violence triggered by the impending trial, and implored the Czar to have the case against Beilis abandoned. The charge of ritual murder, they assured the Czar, was 'unfounded'; it had been declared 'a baseless and wicked invention' in four papal bulls and had been condemned by several former Central and Eastern European rulers. Thorough investigations by theologians and other scholars had entirely discredited it.<sup>60</sup>

In Canada also, there was widespread sympathy for Beilis. Protest demonstrations were held in a number of centres. 'As usual, in most liberal actions, the West leads the way', was one explanation for why Winnipeg was first off the mark. More than 6,000 people, including parliamentarians and civic officials, attended a rally there, which passed a resolution declaring the blood accusation baseless. Similar resolutions were passed by Toronto civic officials on the motion of a non-Jewish alderman and in a mass meeting in Montreal.<sup>61</sup>

#### *Antisemitism in the Wake of the First World War*

The First World War is generally believed by historians to have significantly heightened antisemitism around the world. The outbreak of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, in particular, greatly strengthened extreme right-wing antisemitism, with Jews being seen as the main progenitors of Communism and leading an international conspiracy aimed at world domination. The publication of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in Britain in 1920 certainly fanned the flames of extreme right-wing antisemitism.<sup>62</sup>

The rise in antisemitism in Britain was paralleled by increased nativism and social antisemitism in the United States while, throughout Central and Eastern Europe, antisemitism often became an overt part of state policy even before Hitler. The First World War certainly resulted in a number of subtle attempts to diminish much of the philosemitism of the

## PHILOSEMITISM

pre-1914 period. The incalculable destruction and death brought by the conflict made it very difficult to continue to believe in limitless progress or ever-upward human evolution. In such a climate, antisemitism was no longer condemned as an atavistic relic of the Dark Ages. The war weakened all religious belief, making religious conflict (including the conflict between Protestants and Catholics) less important, while it heightened the forces of extreme nationalism; it also greatly weakened the cosmopolitan capitalism, founded in international free trade, which was closely associated with nineteenth-century liberalism and from which Jews had greatly benefited.

However, it is certainly also a mistake to view antisemitism as invariably heightened and invariably victorious during the inter-war years, especially in the English-speaking world and particularly once a modicum of post-war normality had been restored. This was most strikingly evident during the Nazi era, but it was also true of the 1920s. Indeed, the evidence for a philosemitic response to significant instances of antisemitism during the 1920s is probably just as clear as before the war, although there was now a very different international climate.<sup>63</sup>

One of the most significant demonstrations of philosemitic opinion in the post-war period occurred in the United States in 1920, as a response to what was termed 'the appearance in this country of what is apparently an organised campaign of anti-Semitism, conducted in close conformity to and [in] co-operation with similar campaigns in Europe'.<sup>64</sup> This 'organised campaign' clearly included the propagation in America of the *Protocols* and of its further dissemination in Henry Ford's *Dearborn Independent*. As a result, a mass petition of prominent Americans was organized to condemn antisemitism; it stated: 'Anti-Semitism is almost invariably associated with lawlessness and with brutality and injustice. . . . We believe it should not be left to men and women of the Jewish faith to fight this evil, but that it is in a very special sense the duty of citizens who are not Jews by ancestry or faith'.<sup>65</sup> The petition was apparently organized entirely by non-Jews: 'no Jewish person or society had anything to do with its preparation or publication'.<sup>66</sup> Signatories included former Presidents Woodrow Wilson and William Howard Taft, former Secretaries of State William Jennings Bryan and Bainbridge Colby, and dozens of influential politicians, clergymen, professors, professional leaders, and writers, among them Robert Frost, Nicholas Murray Butler, Clarence Darrow, Rev John Haynes Holmes, and W. E. B. Dubois.<sup>67</sup>

There were also public demonstrations of philosemitism at that time in Britain. A furore over a sculpture by Jacob Epstein unveiled in Hyde Park in 1925, provoked overtly antisemitic comments in the *Morning Post* and these were countered by the artist Muirhead Bone and 50 prominent individuals. They wrote a letter to *The Times* defending Epstein; signatories included Ramsay Macdonald, George Bernard Shaw, Arnold

Bennett, Sir Michael Sadler, and Frank Dobson. And 255 students at the Slade School and the Royal Academy issued a protest of their own.<sup>68</sup>

*The Nazi Era, 1933-39*

The rise of Nazi Germany, with its unprecedentedly brutal and extreme antisemitism, produced innumerable examples of philosemitic support for Jews. Many readers today, who often perceive the 1930s in terms of widespread support for the Nazis leading to the 'abandonment of the Jews' during the Holocaust, may be surprised to learn of the depth of empathy with the persecuted Jews of Germany and the genuine detestation of Nazi antisemitism. Only a few of the larger or more significant rallies or demonstrations of support for German Jews by non-Jews can be noted here.

In Britain the earliest such example occurred in the Queen's Hall, London, to express abhorrence of Nazi antisemitism and sympathy for the victims. 'Every section of British public life, lay and spiritual, distinguished representatives of all political parties, of all the professions, leaders of present-day British opinion and outstanding members of every section of the great British public . . .' attended the meeting in June 1933. Among them were Margot Asquith; Sir Wyndham Deedes; the royal physician Lord Dawson of Penn; Sir Ernest Benn; H. A. L. Fisher; G. P. Gooch; C. E. M. Joad; Hugh Seton Watson; and Wickham Steed. The meeting was chaired by former Solicitor-General Lord Buckmaster, and unanimously endorsed the sole resolution, moved by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Cosmo Gordon Lang), who was supported by Dr J. Scott Lidgett, representing the Free Churches, and the Earl of Iddesleigh, representing Britain's Catholics.<sup>69</sup> Scott Lidgett had been a signatory of the protest about the Beilis case.

Civic protest meetings featuring prominent non-Jewish speakers, clerical and lay, were held at numerous locations throughout Britain and appear to have been as enthusiastically supported in centres where the Jewish population was small or practically non-existent as in centres where it was large. Typically, these meetings had the backing of MPs of all parties and clergymen of all denominations, and united public opinion across political and sectarian lines. For instance, at a crowded meeting in Nottingham, chaired by the Principal of the University there, the platform was filled with 'representatives of the Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Free Church bodies, and of the professional, industrial, and commercial life of the city'.<sup>70</sup>

A rally in the mining town of Pontypridd saw 3,500 people fill the Town Hall, with 'a still larger number' milling outside. 'Undoubtedly the whole of the Welsh Valleys were aroused in sympathy with the German Jews' — this is an area better remembered for the anti-Jewish riots of 1911, which were in any case perhaps not as antisemitic in flavour as is



## PHILOSEMITISM

commonly believed.<sup>71</sup> Apart from civic demonstrations, and the concern which was voiced in both houses of parliament, resolutions of protest were passed at that time by an assortment of non-Jewish organizations.

Similar protest meetings occurred throughout Australia. One at Melbourne Town Hall in April 1933 attracted 2,000 people, who passed a resolution 'deploring the revival of religious intolerance' in Germany and a month later another meeting opened a relief fund for German Jewish refugees (which netted £8,000). The attendance included an impressive cross-section of the Victorian establishment, and a letter from Victorian State Attorney-General (and future Australian prime minister) Robert Menzies was read, in which he praised the contribution of Jews to Australian life and associated himself with the opponents of 'the barbaric and medieval persecution'.<sup>72</sup>

There were several state Cabinet ministers, the state Leader of the Opposition, the Speaker of the Victorian Legislative Assembly, the President of the Victorian Legislative Council, key local businessmen, the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, the presidents of the state branch of the Returned Servicemen's League and of the local Rotary Club, the Anglican Archbishop of Melbourne, the President of the Baptist Union of Victoria and the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Victoria, the President of the Australian Women's National League, a future lord mayor of Melbourne, several suburban mayors, and literally dozens of other eminent citizens. A great many of them were on the conservative wing of politics, proving yet again that antisemitism had no more appeal for mainstream right-wingers than it did for those on the mainstream left.<sup>73</sup>

An equally distinguished array of local notables, including the Premier of New South Wales and the Lord Mayor of Sydney, attended the protest meeting held in May 1933 at Sydney's Great Synagogue. An appeal for German Jewish relief raised £10,000. Comparable rallies were held in Brisbane — where Roman Catholic Archbishop Duhig denounced Nazi antisemitism as a disgrace and a return to a barbaric age — and in other Australian cities.<sup>74</sup>

In Washington, the American National Conference against Racial Persecution, organized by the United States' former ambassador to Germany, James W. Gerard, urged President Roosevelt to intercede with the Nazi government. Speakers included well-known senators, congressmen, Christian clergymen, and other non-Jewish public figures.<sup>75</sup>

Concern mounted throughout the 1930s. Apart from prominent individuals — such as the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Hensley Henson), Rev James Parkes, Conservative MP Oliver Locker-Lampson, Independent MP Eleanor Rathbone, and Labour MP Colonel Josiah Wedgwood — there were others whose philosemitism has been less well documented. They wrote letters to the press, signed petitions, and attended forums of

protest. They included such assorted individuals as Margot Asquith, George Lansbury, J. B. Priestley, and Sir Evelyn Wrench.<sup>76</sup>

During 1938, with the *Anschluss* and *Kristallnacht*, there was an increase in manifestations of concern for Jews under Nazism, seen in protests by individuals, various non-Jewish bodies both religious and secular, as well as endeavours on behalf of refugees. At an anti-Fascist demonstration in June by the Association of Writers for Religious Liberty, featuring addresses by established literary figures such as C. Day Lewis, Rose Macaulay and Sylvia Townsend Warner, the 'greatest impression' of the 16 speakers was made by Compton Mackenzie. Speaking as a Roman Catholic, he made a 'fiery, impassioned protest and call for action against Fascist persecution, which was seen in its most bestial form in the persecution of the Jews'.<sup>77</sup>

Sunday 17 July 1938 was set aside for intercession services at British synagogues to express solidarity with the Jews of the Reich. Eminent non-Jews in their hundreds attended those services, and churches of all denominations held parallel intercession services of their own. At Birmingham Parish Church, Jews and Christians held a joint service attended by about 2,000 people. The services at Leeds were followed by a mass protest rally at which the principal speakers were Bishop Henson of Durham and Sir James Baillie, Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University.<sup>78</sup>

In the wake of *Kristallnacht* there were numerous displays of outrage. A major protest meeting of 8,000 was held in the Royal Albert Hall under the presidency of former Lord Chancellor Viscount Sankey. The Conservative MP Leo Amery (a lifelong philosemite), the Labour MP Herbert Morrison, and the Liberal leader and MP Sir Archibald Sinclair (who also addressed a civic protest meeting in Northampton), were united in calling for a relaxation of restrictions on Jewish immigration into Palestine. Other speakers included the Archbishop of York (Dr William Temple), the Archbishop of Westminster (Cardinal Hinsley), the Moderator of the Free Church Council (Rev Dr Robert Boyd), and the Liberal Lady Violet Bonham Carter.<sup>79</sup>

Leading barristers including Stafford Cripps and future judge Lord Burkitt issued a protest. A Commons cross-party amendment regretted that the British Government failed to respond to *Kristallnacht* by allowing increased Jewish immigration from the Reich to Palestine over the ensuing six months; it was signed by 38 MPs, all but one non-Jewish: 17 Labour, seven Conservative, seven Liberal, four Independent, and three Liberal National (the latter were allied with the Conservatives).<sup>80</sup>

Undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge representing a range of university clubs and societies drew up statements of outrage, calling for an increase in Britain's intake of refugees.<sup>81</sup> A similar statement was issued by a meeting of the Principal, staff and 400 students at Bedford College for Women, University of London. Students at the University of Glasgow put sectarian and political differences aside to pass unanimously

## PHILOSEMITISM

a resolution expressing 'horror and disgust at the barbarous treatment' of Jews in the Reich and questioned appeasement 'while such atrocities continue to outrage the conscience of the world'. At the request of representative citizens, the Lord Provost of Glasgow sent a message to Prime Minister Chamberlain denouncing Germany's persecution of Jews and requesting that the British government make official representations; he also convened a protest meeting 'representative of the town council, the University, and the Churches'. Similar demonstrations were held elsewhere.<sup>82</sup>

Special services of intercession for Jews under Nazism were held in synagogues throughout Britain and again saw large attendances of non-Jews. For example, at Edinburgh the congregation was 900-strong owing to such participation; at Cardiff the synagogue was so full of people of both faiths that many sympathizers could not gain admittance; the service at Liverpool was attended by the non-Jewish Lord Mayor in official regalia, along with other members of the Corporation.<sup>83</sup>

Resolutions of protest were passed by a variety of ecclesiastical bodies. Leading clergymen, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, unequivocally denounced the persecution. A number of senior clergymen and laity reflecting diverse shades of opinion within the Church of England detected an increase of anti-Jewish prejudice at home; they sent a letter to Neville Laski, the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, roundly condemning antisemitism and praising the contribution of Jews to British public life, as a symbolic 'expression of the feeling of Christian English people, that, in whatever form and however modified it may be, anti-Semitism remains wicked folly . . .'. Lay signatories included the novelist Dorothy L. Sayers; the actress Sybil Thorndike; *Church Times* editor Sidney Dark (author of two pro-Jewish books); Labour MP George Lansbury; Lord Wolmer; Sir George Arthur; and H. L. Goudge, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.<sup>84</sup> In 1942, as a result of increased interfaith initiatives during the Holocaust, the Council of Christians and Jews was established in Britain. Similar developments were discernible in Australia.<sup>85</sup>

Immediately following *Kristallnacht*, 35 meetings featuring well-known non-Jewish speakers were held across Canada to express outrage at the Nazi treatment of Jews: 'not for so many years has Canadian sentiment been so deeply stirred'.<sup>86</sup> In Toronto 17,000 people crowded into a city park for a protest which saw thousands more turned away; the speakers were a nonagenarian former Chief Justice of Ontario, a former President of the University of Toronto, and a distinguished painter. A similar meeting in Halifax, Nova Scotia, had among its speakers the Chief Justice and the President of Dalhousie University. In Kingston, the chief speakers were a Roman Catholic titular archbishop and the Principal of Queen's University.<sup>87</sup>

Rather surprisingly, considerable indignation was also manifested in French Canada, generally depicted as a backwater of antisemitism.<sup>88</sup> What percentage of the protesters were of French extraction is unclear; certainly few of the speakers appear to have been. A huge meeting took place in Montreal, chaired by a Chief Justice of Quebec Superior Court. Another in Quebec was addressed by the Minister of Commerce, a judge, and an Anglican archdeacon. Students of McGill University in Montreal raided the premises of a private German club, screaming abuse and wreaking havoc.<sup>89</sup>

The war itself saw a continuation of these rallies throughout the Free World, especially when knowledge of the mass murders began to filter back to the West. It was neither indifference, antisemitism, nor anti-Zionism which made it all but impossible for the Allies to rescue the Jews of Nazi-occupied Europe, but the fact that these Jews until 1945 were the unreachable prisoners of a dictator whose aim was to kill all of them.

## *II. A Typology of Philosemitism*

Why was philosemitism so frequently encountered throughout the English-speaking world during the century from 1840 to 1939, and who was likely to be an active philosemite? In this section, we would like to distinguish between four leading types of philosemites during that period, probably the types most commonly encountered among those active in philosemitic rallies, demonstrations, and petitions. Plainly they overlap, and plainly, also, one individual might be assigned to different types at different times. Nevertheless, we believe that the categories outlined here are the most significant.<sup>90</sup>

### *Liberal Philosemitism*

Perhaps the most frequently encountered form of philosemitism is that which supported full rights for Jews, and deplored the persecution of Jews, as a component of a liberal ideological world-view which regarded all men as equal, religion as a purely private matter, and ethnic distinctions (at least among persons of European descent) as irrelevant. Hans Kohn, the political scientist, usefully distinguished between two types of nationalism: that found in the English-speaking world (and, in his view, also in France) and that found in continental Europe. In the former, all residents of the country were regarded as equal citizens and were equally entitled to be loyal patriots of a country; the latter saw nationality as essentially ethnic/religious in nature, with minority groups in a country (especially Jews) as always suspect, if not alien.<sup>91</sup> Kohn's distinction may well be exaggerated, but certainly, for example, the purely secular bases of the American Constitution provided a definition of citizenship which in no way excluded Jews. Internalized by generations

## PHILOSEMITISM

of Americans as the very touchstone of political morality, the secular liberalism was perhaps the most powerful motivating force behind philosemites in the English-speaking world (especially in the United States and to a lesser extent Australia) who protested against the persecution of Jews by antisemitic regimes, especially against Russia.

Liberal philosemitism was based on the premise that citizenship in the modern state did not depend on a person's religion, which was a private matter of conscience. At the nineteenth-century rallies in Britain, there were numerous liberal-minded persons who had allied themselves with the struggle to secure Jewish political emancipation. Many of them also regularly donated to various secular Anglo-Jewish institutions, and attended Jewish secular functions. Because most of the major British rallies occurred under official auspices in the City of London, liberal opinion within the City was particularly well-represented.<sup>92</sup> David Wire was an archetypal liberal philosemite who described the City's support for Jews thus:<sup>93</sup>

London has become the emporium of commerce, . . . the teacher of nations, and the promoter of universal love, universal happiness, and universal peace . . . it appeals to our best sympathies . . . to support . . . our elder brothers in the faith . . .

A sworn foe of 'bigotry and intolerance', Wire at the 1840 rally about the Damascus Affair specifically mentioned 'liberality' as a principle which brought the protesters together.<sup>94</sup> The same principle induced him to organize the 1859 Mortara protest, and liberals were apparently as well represented among its signatories, if not more so, than militant Protestant activists.<sup>95</sup>

At the 1882 rally about the Russian pogroms Shaftesbury, while acknowledging the 'deep and special feeling towards the Hebrew race' he and many others had, observed to loud cheers that the 'one grand universal principle' uniting the protestors was 'deep regard for the rights of the human race . . . it is the desire of every true Englishman that every one should be as free and happy as he is himself'.<sup>96</sup> At the comparable Sydney rally the liberal statesman Sir John Robertson remarked: 'It is difficult to believe that . . . in great civilized countries, any section of the people should be so insulted, outraged, and persecuted, for their religious opinions', — a view widely echoed.<sup>97</sup>

This liberal outlook was clearly articulated in the opening resolution at the 1890 rally, which declared that 'religious liberty is a principle which should be recognized by every Christian community as among the natural human rights'.<sup>98</sup> It was widely endorsed in other statements, for example in messages of support from the Duke of Argyll, a confirmed humanitarian ('There can be but one feeling among all parties and among all Churches in these islands against every form of persecution on

account of religious belief') and Lord Tennyson ('I . . . loathe every kind of persecution . . .').<sup>99</sup>

It was given broad expression in the Kishinev protests of 1903, for example, by New York's Mayor Seth Low at his city's rally: 'We are here to respect one another; whatever be the creed, whatever the race, whatever the belief, we are of one blood, one before God and humanity'.<sup>100</sup> And it was a cornerstone of the protests in 1905-6, as enunciated, for example, by Adelaide's Mayor Theo Bruce at his city's rally (they protested 'as members of the human family, and . . . because they had the advantage of living under the British Crown and of enjoying . . . religious freedom and tolerance') and by Canadian Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier in Ottawa:<sup>101</sup> Jewish immigrants to Canada, he said, would find 'a hearty welcome' in a land with institutions

in which there are equal rights for all, and under which every man, no matter what his origin, his creed or his race may be, is sure to find an equal share of liberty, of justice, of equity, and of sunshine. I am here as a citizen of Canada because I believed it my duty to be here, when as a Canadian and a British subject one must be proud to assert the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

Lord Buckmaster described the 1933 major anti-Nazi rally as essentially one by 'independent and fair-minded' non-Jews 'against the cruelty and wrong of an injustice the burden and bitterness of which they will never be called upon to share' and declared that his feelings would be as strong if the world owed no debt to the 'genius of Jews'.<sup>102</sup> Notwithstanding all this, several liberal philosemites had a close interest in Jews and Judaism. The affinity with Jews on the part of the poet Robert Browning, who attended the 1882 rally, is well-known.<sup>103</sup> Less well-known, perhaps, is the 'friendly interest in Jewish affairs' taken by Lord Leighton, a requisitioner of the 1890 rally, who was an honoured guest at Jewish communal functions,<sup>104</sup> and the fact that Lord Tennyson, who constantly expressed sympathy for persecuted Jews, derived inspiration for some of his poems by reading the Old Testament in Hebrew, and studied Spinoza.<sup>105</sup>

Matthew Arnold counted several Rothschilds and Montefiores among his personal friends, which was said to have influenced his positive attitude towards the importance of Hebraism as a factor in modern civilization. He, too, read the Bible in Hebrew, and the eagerly sought opinions of E. O. Deutsch, Talmudic scholar at the British Museum, made an impact on him.<sup>106</sup> Thomas Huxley was justly described as 'an agnostic with a strong leaning towards Judaism'.<sup>107</sup> He stated: 'the only religion that appeals to me is prophetic Judaism' and he attested to that — and his admiration for Jews — several times in his writings. In 1882 he demonstrated his solidarity with persecuted Jewry by attending the consecration of the St John's Wood Synagogue, an occasion which

## PHILOSEMITISM

deeply impressed him, and he would have spoken at the 1890 rally, of which he was a requisitioner, but for the state of his health.<sup>108</sup>

Sir Walter Besant, another requisitioner of the 1890 rally, stated:<sup>109</sup>

Poet, lawyer, painter, actor, statesman, physician, musician — there is not a branch of learning, art, or science, in which the Jew is not in the front rank. The thousand years of oppression have left no mark upon his mighty spirit . . . Other races have been persecuted and despised. What have they done? Nothing! Parsee, Czech, Basque, Wend, Celt, Cagot [a people in the Western Pyrenees] — what have they done? Nothing! Nothing!

A liberal outlook regarding Jews did not necessarily mean a liberal outlook regarding other peoples. Many of the speakers and other participants at the Australian pro-Jewish rallies, for example, were active campaigners and apologists for a White Australia. Almost all acquiesced in the exclusion of Asians and other coloureds.<sup>110</sup> In the United States, especially in the South, it was one thing to champion Jews, quite another to champion blacks:<sup>111</sup>

The cases are so dissimilar that it is hardly necessary to argue the point. In nearly all cases where lynchings take place in America it is an expiation of some terrible crime; the Jews in Russia were murdered for no reason other than they were frugal and industrious among a sodden and idle peasantry, who were jealous of their prosperity.

One important element — indeed, almost a defining characteristic — of liberal philosemitism was the conviction that examples of antisemitism in modern times represented an ‘atavism’, a ‘throw-back’ to an earlier, more primitive, and barbaric stage of civilization. Antisemitism was in particular strongly associated in the minds of many philosemitic liberals with the horrors of the Inquisition, and the Catholic church was often viewed as the chief progenitor of antisemitism. To many liberal philosemites, the persecution of Jews was seen as only a component of a much wider persecution of both Protestantism and free thought by the Catholic church and was to be condemned as part of a much wider attack upon religious ‘superstition’.

The atavistic nature of antisemitism was integral to condemnations of the blood libel. Thus the 1840 Damascus rally expressed ‘deep regret that in this enlightened age a persecution should have arisen against our Jewish brethren, originating in ignorance and inflamed by bigotry’ and condemned torture as a ‘relic of a barbarous age’.<sup>112</sup> And part of the indictment in the 1912 Beilis protest was of the ritual murder accusation as ‘a relic of the days of Witchcraft and Black Magic’.<sup>113</sup> But condemnation of antisemitism as anathema to the spirit of the age was voiced at all the protests. Lord Bryce, for example, remarked at the 1882 rally: ‘It is, indeed, enough to make one blush for modern civilization to think that a people like the Jews . . . in the nineteenth century should be subjected to such terrible persecutions’.<sup>114</sup> Sir Joseph Dimsdale at its 1906 counterpart

expressed 'abhorrence and shame at these horrible events which have disgraced the 20th century'.<sup>115</sup> At his city's great protest meeting in 1933, the *Manchester Guardian* editor (W. P. Crozier) declared it 'immeasurably shocking that Germany should be turning its back on the whole principle of equality between races and religions, and should apparently be marching back into the Dark Ages'.<sup>116</sup>

Such words found many echoes, among all types of philosemites. But for a number of people the atavistic nature of antisemitism was seemingly the primary force behind their championship of persecuted Jewry, and some at least can best be described, to use Gladstone's phrase, as 'anti-anti-Semitism'.<sup>117</sup> Such sentiments inspired people who harboured ambivalent feelings towards Jews but who nonetheless denounced their persecution. These include Arnold White and George Bernard Shaw, who lent their written support to the 1906 rally; H. G. Wells, who like Shaw signed the Beilis protest; and Wickham Steed, who condemned Nazi persecution. Indeed, during the 1930s many people, like G. K. Chesterton, Agatha Christie, and Dorothy L. Sayers, thoroughly repented of their previous anti-Jewish prejudice and some tried actively to make amends.<sup>118</sup> It has been claimed that diplomat Sir Horace Rumbold is a case in point, but that interpretation ignores his efforts on behalf of Jews well before the Nazi era. In the late nineteenth century, when stationed in Vienna, he joined forces with Lord Rothschild and two prominent Roman Catholic laymen, the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Russell of Killowen, in attempting to stamp out the ritual murder myth, and to that end had talks with the papal nuncio in Vienna. Immediately after the Kishinev massacre he proposed that the Pope and the Czar should jointly make a public disavowal of the myth, so that it would be laid to rest once and for all.<sup>119</sup>

### *Protestant Philosemitism*

While Roman Catholics were represented in most of the pro-Jewish initiatives — they were virtually mute during the Damascus, Mortara, and Dreyfus affairs when Roman Catholicism seemed under siege<sup>120</sup> — much philosemitism flowed from Christian believers, especially of the Calvinist Protestant kind. The latter tradition was frequently, perhaps regularly, philosemitic.<sup>121</sup> At its most basic, Christian support for persecuted Jews — from both Roman Catholics and Protestants — was rooted in the Jews' common humanity and the obligation of Christians to support the oppressed. But there was also a profound consciousness of the links between the two faiths, and the desire to atone for the dark deeds of the past. Canon Farrar, addressing the 1882 Mansion House rally, said 'It is to the Jewish nation that humanity owes the deepest debt of gratitude, and it is on that nation that humanity has inflicted the deepest wrongs'.<sup>122</sup> An Australian lay Presbyterian, donating to the



## PHILOSEMITISM

Kishinev appeal, observed that Christians 'should not forget the debt of gratitude which we owe to the children of Abraham — God's chosen people — for are we not indebted to them, not only for our Old Testament Scriptures, but also for our Messiah?'<sup>123</sup> Again and again, throughout the period under review, clergymen and other practising Christians made similar statements.

Ever since its translation into the vernacular in the reign of Henry VIII, and especially since the publication of the Authorized King James version, the Bible had exerted a powerful influence upon English-speaking peoples. Thomas Huxley described it as 'the national epic of Britain', so closely did Britons identify with the story of Israel in its pages.<sup>124</sup> Josiah Wedgwood explained:<sup>125</sup>

The Anglo-Saxon, more than any other race, wants to sympathise with the Jews . . . no doubt we understand the Jew better than those to whom the Old Testament is not familiar from infancy. To the foreigner the word Jew is a hissing in the street; to us the word suggests Solomon and Moses, and a thousand cradle stories. So often have we used their names for our own children that they seem now to be our fathers, especially our Puritan forefathers . . . Towards such a people one has a feeling almost of awe, they are so well known, and yet so old and eternal.

Cardinal Manning, in a soul-stirring passage at the 1882 rally which was recalled for decades afterwards, spoke of the 'bonds of brotherhood' forged by the Bible between Christians and 'the imperishable people which . . . trampled into the dust and yet never combining with the dust into which it is trampled — lives on still a witness to us . . .'.<sup>126</sup> Countless Christians felt the tug of a special relationship with Jews as 'People of the Book'; they identified with the ancient Israelites against Pharaoh and Haman and with the descendants of the ancient Israelites against their modern persecutors.

But it was perhaps upon Nonconformists, especially those belonging to Calvinist-derived sects such as the Presbyterians, that the Biblical heritage of the Jews made its greatest impact. For Old Testament-oriented Christians, identification with the Jewish cause often ran so deep as to be almost symbiotic. The Unitarian Rev Dr James Martineau, for example, participated in a number of pro-Jewish initiatives, and his famous sister Harriet championed Jews in her writings.<sup>127</sup> Sydney Unitarian Rev George Walters wrote at the time of Kishinev of his 'very deep reverence for the religion and ethics of Judaism . . . The branches of that national tree might . . . have been rudely shaken, but by that very shaking the seeds of the living Faith had been wafted far and wide over the whole earth'.<sup>128</sup>

President William Taft, whose philosemitic stance was acknowledged in 1912 with a gold medal from the Berlin headquarters of B'nai B'rith, was brought up as a Unitarian. He recalled that as a boy in Cincinnati the seed of his lifelong regard for Jews was sown when he sat in church

listening to sermons by the celebrated Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, who often exchanged pulpits with the Unitarian minister.<sup>129</sup> Another illustrious supporter of Jews, David Lloyd George, from a chapel-going background, declared in 1933:<sup>130</sup>

I feel grateful in my heart to the gifted race which became the agents for transmitting this Book to the world . . . It is not their only contribution to human civilisation, but it is their greatest. It is the greatest any race has ever made to human civilisation.

The Rev Charles Voysey, who constantly supported the Jewish cause, was an Anglican cleric who in 1871 had founded the heretical Theistic Church: 'though he did not share our ideas of scriptural inspiration, [he] never tired of acknowledging his debt to the Hebrew Bible, to the Psalms and the Prophets more especially. His doctrine was one long glorification of Judaism, expressed or implied'.<sup>131</sup>

The Presbyterian Rev Dr David Paton of Adelaide, who spoke at his city's 1881 rally and supported Jews at other times of persecution, had written his doctoral thesis on the relation of the Old Testament to the New. He acknowledged that the world owed much to ancient Greece and Rome, but he believed that it had a still greater obligation to the Jews, who had given it 'more important things, as they had done more than tongue could tell for the religious feeling of all humanity'.<sup>132</sup> His Ballarat-based colleague, Rev Mathew Hart, declared at the time of the 1903 Kishinev massacre: 'the day was coming when the whole world would follow the Jews. If he had his choice as to what nation he should be born into, he would say, "Let me be a Jew"'. . . .<sup>133</sup> Rev Madison Peters, a Presbyterian-turned-Baptist who spoke at several protest meetings about Kishinev, was a tireless publicist for the Jewish cause.<sup>134</sup>

Nonconformists were often impelled to support Jews owing to empathy: they too had suffered discrimination. Dissenters such as Edward Baines MP had supported Jewish political emancipation in Britain. The Rev R. F. Horton told the 1906 rally that Free Churchmen had never persecuted Jews, because they had learnt 'the horror and the absurdity of persecution by suffering severely from it'. His friend, the famous Jewish minister Rev A. A. Green, had once said in his own church 'that he looked upon the Jews as . . . the great nonconformist nation of history; and I feel sympathy for them on that account, and I feel a resolution growing in my heart that the [Russian] Jews shall also enjoy those privileges of equality and justice which we enjoy here in England'.<sup>135</sup>

In Britain, particularly, Quakers and Jews were often perceived as akin to one another, and were regularly given similar exceptional rights: for instance, to conduct their own marriages. As with other dissenting sects, they shared with Jews a basic identity with the Old Testament, and their philosemitic impulse was reinforced by their left-liberal approach and

## PHILOSEMITISM

their opposition to any form of religious persecution (from which they themselves had suffered). At the Damascus rally in 1840 the Quaker banker Samuel Gurney expressed his 'great pleasure' in assisting 'the cause of civil and religious liberty'. He, and his firm Overend Gurney, regularly donated to Jewish domestic charities; he was also a business associate of N. M. Rothschild and of Sir Moses Montefiore. He shared the compassionate, humanitarian outlook of his sect, being active in the campaign against the slave trade, in which Thomas Fowell Buxton (a participant at the 1840 Damascus rally) played a prominent part. Sir Fowell Buxton, who addressed the 1872 rally, was the latter's grandson.<sup>136</sup>

Henry Richard, who followed a denunciation in the House of Commons of Roumanian antisemitism with attendance at the 1872 rally, and who was a requisitioner of its 1882 counterpart, was the son of a Welsh Calvinistic Methodist minister. Richard was a long-serving secretary of the London Peace Society, founded by the Quaker Joseph Sturge, whose biography he wrote. Charles Gilpin, MP, who also attended the 1872 rally, was Sturge's son-in-law.<sup>137</sup> The Quaker Sir Joseph Pease told the 1890 rally that just as persecution had not destroyed the Society of Friends, it would not destroy the Russian Jews.<sup>138</sup>

A similar identification with the Jewish cause, owing partly to consciousness of shared persecution, is discernible among persons of Huguenot descent. George de Larpent, who spoke at the 1840 rally, came of Huguenot stock, and the involvement of the Roman Catholic French consul in inciting the ritual murder frenzy in Damascus undoubtedly reinforced his sympathy with the victims.<sup>139</sup> London's Lord Mayor, Sir Joseph Savory, considered his chairmanship of the 1890 rally especially fitting since religious intolerance had forced his Huguenot forebears to flee their native land.<sup>140</sup> The Conservative MP Victor Cazalet, one of the first to condemn Nazi persecution from the floor of the House of Commons, urged that Britain welcome refugees from Germany as it had his Huguenot ancestors.<sup>141</sup>

Something should be said here about conversionism as a factor in Christian philosemitism. Overall, there were only a few conversionists among the supporters of Jews. In the mid-nineteenth century, the Anglo-Jewish press was wary to the point of contempt of professed 'lovers of Israel', suspecting the majority of them to have conversionist motives. During the Mortara Affair, for instance, when the Jewish cause was espoused forcibly and conspicuously by (the part-Jewish) Sir Culling Eardley and his supposedly conversionist Protestant Evangelical Alliance, the *Jewish Chronicle* railed in 1859 against 'these pretended friends of the Jews, who never cease to shed crocodile tears at the wrongs suffered by the lost sheep of the house of Israel, who never forego an opportunity for displaying their feigned love for God's ancient people' the better to lure them into the conversionist net.<sup>142</sup>

During the Damascus and especially the Mortara episodes, when anti-papal feeling ran high, Protestant champions of the Jewish cause were accused of seeking to prove to the intended converts the superiority over Catholicism of their own brand of Christianity. Particular hostility was directed against the Rev Alexander McCaul, who in 1840 had written a pamphlet defending Jewry against the ritual murder allegation, but who had been engaged in missionary work among the Jews of Poland. He was believed to have spread a sinister influence over his son-in-law, James Finn, British consul in Jerusalem.<sup>143</sup> McCaul headed a brief list of arch-‘conversion-mongers’ identified by the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1850. He was followed by Lord Ashley, who had presented the 1844 petition to the Czar and who as Earl of Shaftesbury played a central role in the 1872 and 1882 public rallies.<sup>144</sup> Like that notorious opponent of Jewish political emancipation, Sir Robert Inglis (who was also on the list), Shaftesbury had opposed the claims of Jews to sit in Parliament also on conscientious grounds: he believed in the concept of a Christian state.<sup>145</sup>

Shaftesbury was a long-serving president of the Anglican-connected London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews. Other known associates of that body were John Abel Smith, a frequent contributor to Jewish charities, who spoke at the 1840 rally; Rev Baptist Noel, who also spoke at that rally and signed the Mortara protest; Rev Hugh McNeile, widely regarded as the most eloquent Evangelical of his generation, who similarly signed that protest; London banker R. C. L. Bevan, another signatory, attended the 1882 rally and subscribed £100 to the relief fund; the Conservative MP W. T. Charley, who attended the 1872 rally; and Arthur (Baron) Kinnaird, a vice-patron of the society who invariably aligned himself with the cause of persecuted Jewry. Various prelates who attended the rallies, including several colonial bishops such as Saumarez Smith of Sydney, were added to the Society’s list of patrons during an expansion drive. But like the laymen named they seem to have made no real attempt to encourage Jews to apostasize. One of the few who did pursue conversionism actively was the Bishop of Stepney, who signed the Beilis protest; he set up a fund devoted to missionary work among the Jews in the East End.<sup>146</sup>

According to their own lights, the conversionists were the ultimate philosemites. If Jesus was mankind’s redeemer, and if to reject him entailed eternal damnation, then it was, as McNeile explained, ‘God-like love to tell them plainly the dreadful situation in which they were placed’. Conversion to Christianity was ‘the greatest possible good that can be done to any people’.<sup>147</sup> The salient point here, however, is that conversionists, who as stated appear to have constituted a distinct minority among philosemites, did not make their espousal of the Jewish cause conditional upon the Jews’ acceptance of Christianity. That unconditional support was a principle clearly laid down in the early 1840s when the future Lord Shaftesbury and others who had offered

## PHILOSEMITISM

their services to the Board of Deputies of British Jews on behalf of persecuted Jews had solemnly undertaken to make no attempts to proselytize.<sup>148</sup>

Shaftesbury would hardly have been asked by representatives of the Anglo-Jewish Association in 1872 to be the chief speaker at the Roumanian protest rally, nor would he have been so rapturously received at the 1882 rally, had he displayed unrestrained conversionist tendencies. The same is true of Kinnaird and the others. Whatever private hopes and expectations the conversionists entertained for the religious future of Jewry, they fought for the rights of Jews as Jews. There was widespread Christian admiration for Jewish tenacity in holding fast to Judaism whatever the penalty. The Rev R. F. Horton struck a chord with many when he observed that Jews who converted for the sake of social and political advancement were not worth having: 'As a Christian minister I look upon them with a sense of shame and pity that they should desert their persecuted Jewish comrades'.<sup>149</sup>

### *Zionist Philosemitism*

The existence of 'Gentile Zionists' has long been known and documented by historians.<sup>150</sup> Such people favoured the restoration of a Jewish homeland on a variety of grounds. Millenarian Zionists regarded the conversion and return of Jews as fulfilment of prophecy, which would herald the Second Coming. Others believed, like many Jewish Zionists, that Jews had been unfairly displaced from Palestine, and were morally, perhaps legally, entitled to repossess it. Yet others saw in the re-establishment of a Jewish state, with its concomitant Jewish migration, a realistic means of relieving Jewish oppression in Russia and elsewhere. Some Gentile Zionists of the latter two kinds believed a Jewish-held Palestine to be in Britain's strategic interests.

Lord Shaftesbury was the outstanding example of a millenarian Zionist who participated in the rallies. He envisaged the mass conversion of restored Jewry under the auspices of the Anglican church and to that end was instrumental in achieving an Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem.<sup>151</sup> Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna, influential editor of the *Christian Lady's Magazine*, and a most zealous defender of Jews, who organized the 1844 petition to the Czar, had been a millenarian Zionist and crusading conversionist. But by 1844 she had considerably modified her attitude, as a result of exposure to the Jewish viewpoint. She decried conversionist activity by the Jerusalem bishop, and argued that converted Jews remained a unique, covenanted people. It is very likely that the undertaking of Shaftesbury and the other would-be 'auxiliaries' in the Jewish cause not to proselytize was largely due to her influence.<sup>152</sup>

As the nineteenth century wore on, millenarian Zionism diminished. It did live on among the Christadelphians, established in 1847, who in

various English-speaking countries were frequently found among contributors to funds for persecuted Jews and for the Zionist movement.<sup>153</sup> The Zionism of diplomat and writer Laurence Oliphant, who in 1882 became the Mansion House Fund Committee's commissioner in Brody and Lvov, perhaps owed its genesis to an acute consciousness of biblical prophecy, but it took a practical, humanitarian turn. Having witnessed the plight of Roumanian Jewry at first hand in 1879, he had in 1880 proposed Jewish colonization of Palestine east of the Jordan, under Turkish sovereignty and British protection, and he continued to advocate the cause of Zion as a refuge with its neutrality guaranteed by the powers.<sup>154</sup>

The American 'Blackstone Memorial' of 1891 declared:<sup>155</sup>

We believe this an appropriate time for all nations, and especially the Christian nations of Europe, to show kindness to Israel. A million of exiles, by their terrible sufferings, are piteously appealing to our sympathy, justice, and humanity. Let us now restore to them their land, of which they were so cruelly despoiled by our Roman ancestors.

W. Holman Hunt, the great British pre-Raphaelite whose art had taken him to Palestine and who attended the 1905 rally, had in his concern for oppressed Jewry narrowly anticipated Herzl with a proposal in 1896 for Jewish settlement in a Palestine purchased from Turkey.<sup>156</sup> Major-General Sir Alfred Turner, who signed the Beilis protest, wrote that he had

always been in the deepest sympathy with the Jewish race, admiring their wonderful tenacity of purpose, their robust vitality and vigorous growth, despite the endless persecution they have undergone at the hands of Christians from time immemorial . . . extirpated either by the tide of time or the cruelty of Christians, they will never be.

He also believed that Jews should have refuge in a state of their own, and in 1905 'readily accepted' Israel Zangwill's invitation that he should join the Jewish Territorial Organization (which did not, of course, focus necessarily upon Palestine).<sup>157</sup>

Similar sentiments can be found among pro-Jewish demonstrators in Australia. For instance, senior Presbyterian Rev Dr Robert Steel told Sydney's 1881 rally that he hoped some of the funds collected for Russian Jewry would be used to establish refugees in agricultural settlements in Palestine.<sup>158</sup> Protesting the pogroms of 1905, Sydney's Anglican Archdeacon J. D. Langley advocated 'a combination of the European Powers, with the view of restoring Palestine to the Jewish people, which would for ever put an end to such horrible atrocities'.<sup>159</sup>

To most (but not all) champions of the Jewish refugees of the 1930s, the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine presented an obvious long-term solution to the problem of Jewish persecution. Probably the best-known 'Gentile Zionist' in Britain in the 1930s was Josiah Wedgwood (created first Baron Wedgwood in 1942), a long-serving MP who wished to see a

## PHILOSEMITISM

Jewish Palestine become an independent Dominion within the Commonwealth. Wedgwood was also among the most vocal and untiring champions of the Jewish refugees in Britain.<sup>160</sup> Other vocal British champions of Jewish refugees from Nazism, such as the Rev James Parkes (1896–1981) were also outspoken Zionists, as were anti-Nazi, anti-Appeasement politicians like Winston Churchill and Leo Amery.

### *Elitist/Conservative Philosemitism*

While most ideologically identifiable philosemites were on the political left, a not insignificant number were political conservatives or admired Jews as a time-honoured 'elite' people. Political conservatives throughout post-1789 European history down to 1945 are often viewed as likely to have been the primary advocates of antisemitism, on either religious or 'racial'/nationality grounds. But a certain number admired Jews for the very qualities most despised by conservative antisemites, and especially for the fact that the Jews were unquestionably among the oldest continuously-existing peoples in the world. The religious and moral codes of the Jews were also often admired by conservatives, for instance by encouraging 'positive' eugenically oriented values, hygiene and cleanliness. Above all, Jews were admired by many conservatives for their reputed intelligence and their uncanny ability to succeed as individuals and as a group, virtually wherever they found themselves and despite all their oppression and adversity. And while the ability of Jews to succeed as capitalists and businessmen was one of the primary causes of antisemitism on the Continent, throughout the English-speaking world, where capitalism was ubiquitous, and especially in the United States (the homeland of the 'rags to riches' story), Jewish entrepreneurial ability was often admired by well-established Protestants, even as they often objected to the overly visible and overly rapid upward social mobility of Eastern European Jewish immigrants.

At the Damascus rally the banker John Masterman, who was to be elected the following year Conservative MP for the City, identified Jews as a 'most influential and respectable class of persons' whose wealth benefited the nation. He had special praise for Sir Moses Montefiore. His fellow Conservative and banker, Matthias Wolverley Attwood, declared that it was an 'honour' and a 'privilege' as well as a 'duty' to defend the Jewish religion from obloquy.<sup>161</sup>

The Conservative MP R. N. Fowler told the 1872 rally of his 'sorrow and shame' at centuries of persecution towards a people to whom so much was owed, and at the 1890 rally he paid tribute to the economic benefits which successive generations of Jewish financiers and merchants had brought to London.<sup>162</sup> The Conservative MP J. G. Hubbard reminded Russia at the 1882 rally of the advantages of toleration: 'the foundations of English commerce and industry were laid partly by Jews'.<sup>163</sup>

At the 1906 rally the imperialist Viscount Milner, making a similar point, cited the economic contribution of Jews to the Cape Colony and the Transvaal; he had served in both as governor. Milner was known to be well disposed towards Jewry: he had acknowledged Yiddish as a European tongue when elements within South Africa were attempting to discriminate against potential Eastern European Jewish immigrants by the use of a language test, and he described Claude Montefiore as a 'dear and lifelong friend'.<sup>164</sup>

At Adelaide's 1905 protest rally, conservatively inclined wealthy Congregationalist businessman Sir Herbert Phillips had observed that Jews had a special claim upon their 'reverence and sympathy' because they were in the forefront of human achievement, producing 'leaders of intellect', industry and statecraft.<sup>165</sup> While such an observation was not confined to political and social conservatives, it does suggest a major motivating force propelling such people towards philosemitic activity.

Some Conservatives and imperialists might well have championed the Jewish cause because they admired Disraeli. The Australian politician Sir George Reid, who attended Sydney's 1881 rally, wrote of the favourable impact that Disraeli's handling of the Eastern Question had made on him, confessing that before 1878 he had never considered Disraeli 'quite an Englishman' but that thereafter 'few could be more ardent admirers than I was . . . I could not think of any man who was a truer Englishman'.<sup>166</sup> Australian political conservatives, including supporters of the Jewish cause, participated at public meetings praising Disraeli's handling of the Eastern Question. One local governor, Sir Francis Newdegate, a pro-Zionist who made a point of attending Jewish functions in Hobart and Perth, cited Disraeli as an exemplar of Jewish loyalty to Britain and the Empire.<sup>167</sup>

One of the most potent forces for Gentile philosemitism during (and after) the inter-war period was the unique status enjoyed by Albert Einstein as the 'world's cleverest man' and greatest scientist of the century. The plight of Einstein and of other Jewish intellectual refugees from Hitler unquestionably drew deep sympathy from many quarters, especially in the United States, which respected science and university-based learning. The reputation of Einstein, Freud, and others also helped to form and solidify the image of Jews as uniquely gifted at many intellectual pursuits such as theoretical science and music, and has led to many attempts to explain the unquestionably very great Jewish over-representation among Nobel Prize winners and among leading modern intellectuals.<sup>168</sup>

### *Conclusion*

This paper has suggested something of both the range and depth of philosemitism in the modern English-speaking world. In no sense do we



## PHILOSEMITISM

deny either the reality or the force of antisemitism (although its virulence in the English-speaking world can easily be exaggerated and misconstrued). We wish, however, to place on record that another side of the coin does indeed exist, perhaps fully as large and as important as hostility towards the Jews, however much less well-known it unquestionably is.

### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Solomon Rappaport, *Jew and Gentile: the Philo-Semitic Aspect*, New York, 1980, and Alan Edelstein, *An Unacknowledged Harmony: Philo-Semitism and the Survival of European Jewry*, Westport, Conn., 1982.

<sup>2</sup> However, see Albert S. Lindemann, *The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs (Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank, 1894-1915)*, Cambridge, 1991: an excellent, much-needed account of philosemantic responses during those celebrated affairs.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, M. C. N. Salbstein, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: the Question of the Admission of the Jews to Parliament, 1828-1860*, Rutherford, N. J., 1982; *Jewish Chronicle*, 7, 14, 28 January 1848 carries accounts of typical rallies and petitions.

<sup>4</sup> *The Times*, 4 July 1840. There was also a protest rally at Manchester. *Ibid.*, 21 July 1840.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in Cyrus S. Adler and Aaron M. Margalith, *With Firmness in the Right: American Diplomatic Action Affecting Jews, 1840-1945*, New York, 1946, p. 4; see also Jonathan Frankel, *The Damascus Affair: 'Ritual Murder', Politics and the Jews in 1840*, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 212-13, 224.

<sup>6</sup> *Voice of Jacob*, 18 August 1843.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 1 September 1843; *Ipswich Express*, 22 August 1843, quoted *ibid.*, was representative of popular indignation; *Chambers Journal*, July 1840; *Christian Observer*, November 1840, pp. 701-2; *Protestant Magazine*, 1 December 1843; and *Christian Lady's Magazine*, January 1844, pp. 66-76.

<sup>8</sup> *Voice of Jacob*, 9 June, 8 August, 1, 15, 29 September, 13 October, 24 November 1843, 31 July 1846; and Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna, *Personal Recollections*, 3rd edn., London, 1847, p. 310. There also seems to have been a fear on the part of Jewish leaders that the participation of Gentiles would jeopardize Montefiore's negotiations with foreign rulers. See *Christian Lady's Magazine*, December 1846, p. 570 and Hyam Guedalla, *The Roumanian Government and the Jews*, London, 1872.

<sup>9</sup> The *Jewish Chronicle* carried many editorials and articles urging caution at any Jewish co-operation with Christians over Mortara which might be used by Evangelical conversionists for their own ends: for instance, 'The Evangelical Alliance and the Mortara Case', 12 November 1858, and 'Capital Made Out of the Mortara Affair by the Conversionists', 28 January 1859. But the Evangelical Alliance (founded 1846) was not militantly conversionist: see note 15 below.

<sup>10</sup> The full text of the petition and many of its signatories appeared in *The Times*, 19 October 1859.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> The Archbishop of Dublin was Anglican, not Roman Catholic. So far as is known, no Roman Catholics signed this petition. See also Josef L. Altholz,

'A Note on the English Catholic Reaction to the Mortara Case', in *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 23, no. 2, 1961, pp. 111-18. Among the signatories was Robert Cooper Lee Bevan, a millionaire City banker who, ironically, was the father of Nesta Webster, the leading antisemitic conspiracy theorist of the First World War period.

<sup>13</sup> 'The Mortara Protest', *Jewish Chronicle*, 11 November 1859.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 5 October 1877. By the time this retrospective report appeared, the *Jewish Chronicle* was warmly recommending Jewish communal co-operation with the Evangelical Alliance, formerly headed by Eardley, since it was not a conversionist body and offered its support for oppressed Jews strictly owing to humanitarian motives.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 12, 19, 26 November, 3, 10, 24 December 1858 and 11 February 1859; *The Times*, 28 December 1858.

<sup>17</sup> 'San Francisco California: the Great Mortara Meeting', *Jewish Chronicle*, 11 February 1859, summarizing report in *San Francisco Gleaner*, 21 January 1859; see also Bertram Wallace Korn, *The American Reaction to the Mortara Case, 1858-1859*, Cincinnati, 1957.

<sup>18</sup> 'New York: the American Protestant Association', *Jewish Chronicle*, 4 February 1859.

<sup>19</sup> 'Mortara Meetings', *ibid.*, 14 January 1859.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 17, 24, 31 May 1872. Granville was sympathetic, and the British consul in Bucharest was helpful, but the key role in attempts to alleviate Roumanian Jewry's plight was played by the American consul, Benjamin Peixotto, who was himself Jewish. See Lloyd P. Gartner, 'Rumania, America, and World Jewry: Consul Peixotto in Bucharest, 1870-1876', *American Jewish Historical Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 1, 1968, pp. 25-117.

<sup>21</sup> *The Times*, 23 January 1882.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 2, 7, 13 February and 22 June 1882; *Outrages Upon the Jews in Russia. Report of the Public Meeting at the Mansion House, on Wednesday, February 1st, 1882. With an Appendix*, London, 1882.

<sup>23</sup> *The Times*, 3, 18 February 1882 and *Jewish Herald* (Melbourne), 5 May 1882.

<sup>24</sup> *The Times*, 18, 27 February 1882; *Jewish Chronicle*, 25 October 1895. For public meetings in New York and Philadelphia, conducted by non-Jewish notables, see *New York Times*, 2, 16, 19 February 1882.

<sup>25</sup> *Argus* (Melbourne), 2, 12 August 1881.

<sup>26</sup> *South Australian Register* (Adelaide), 20 August 1881.

<sup>27</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 May 1881.

<sup>28</sup> *Jewish Herald* (Melbourne), 2 June 1882.

<sup>29</sup> *The Times*, 11 December 1890.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, see also *Jewish Herald* (Melbourne), 30 January 1891.

<sup>31</sup> *The Times*, 3 November 1890. The Russians were Nihilist writer S. Stepniak, Felix Volkhovzky, and Prince Kropotkin.

<sup>32</sup> David D. Brodeur, 'Christians in the Zionist Camp: Blackstone and Hechler', in *Faith and Thought*, vol. 100, no. 3, 1972, pp. 290-91. In 1916 a comparable 'Blackstone Memorial' was sent to President Wilson: Yaakov Ariel, 'A Neglected Chapter in the History of Christian Zionism in America: William E. Blackstone and the Petition of 1916', in Jonathan Frankel, ed.,

## PHILOSEMITISM

*Jews and Messianism in the Modern Era: Metaphor and Meaning*, Oxford, 1991, pp. 68–85.

<sup>33</sup> A useful recent history of the Dreyfus Affair in the context of wider French society is Eric Cahan, *The Dreyfus Affair in French Society and Politics*, London, 1994.

<sup>34</sup> See reports in *The Times*, 11–22 September 1899.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 11, 15, 22 September and 3 November 1899.

<sup>36</sup> Robert Spcaight, *The Life of Hilaire Belloc*, London, 1957, p. 97.

<sup>37</sup> See, for example, F. C. Conybeare, 'French Military Justice', *National Review*, vol. 32, Nov. 1898, pp. 337–56; L. J. Maxse, 'Some International Aspects of the Dreyfus Scandal', *ibid.*, vol. 32, January 1899, pp. 731–41; Godfrey Lushington, 'The Conspiracy Against Dreyfus', *ibid.*, vol. 33, June 1899, pp. 1–64.

<sup>38</sup> Editorials, *The Times*, 11 and 13 September 1899.

<sup>39</sup> Petition reported in *Age* (Melbourne), 22 September 1899; *The Times*, 16, 18, 22 September 1899.

<sup>40</sup> For an article making this last point see Ronald K. Huch, 'British Reaction to the Dreyfus Affair', in *Social Science*, vol. 5, no. 1, 1975, pp. 22–28.

<sup>41</sup> See Hilary L. Rubinstein, "'A Disgrace to Christendom': Australian Reactions to the Dreyfus Affair', in *Australian Jewish Historical Society Journal*, vol. 12, part 3, 1994, pp. 467–83.

<sup>42</sup> *Argus*, 16 September 1899. Several petitions were cabled to the French government from Australian towns and cities.

<sup>43</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 September 1899.

<sup>44</sup> *Jewish Herald*, 2 September 1898, *Age*, 18 September 1899, *West Australian* (Perth), 18 and 19 September 1899. There were reportedly 2,000 people at the Perth rally.

<sup>45</sup> Both the reasons for the Aliens Act and the extent to which it may reasonably be termed antisemitic are debatable. Before 1905 Britain had no restrictions of any kind on immigrant settlement. Such restrictions were obviously inevitable, especially after the beginnings of the 'Welfare State' a few years later. It is generally believed that the Aliens Act decreased Russian Jewish migration to Britain by about one-third down to 1914, although other factors (such as greatly increased 'chain migration' to the United States) were significant. The most balanced accounts of the Aliens Act include John A. Garrard, *The English and Immigration, 1880–1910*, Oxford, 1971 and Eugene C. Black, *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1920*, London, 1988. See also W. D. Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World: Great Britain*, London, 1996, pp. 153–59.

<sup>46</sup> *The Times*, 9 January 1906; *Massacre of Jews in Russia. Report on the Protest Meeting at Queen's Hall, January 8th, 1906*, London, 1906.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> *Jewish Herald*, 17 November, 1 and 15 December 1905.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 15 December 1905.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 November 1905. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Perth was unable to attend.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> See Lindemann, *op. cit.* in Note 2 above, pp. 174–93 for an especially illuminating account of the Beilis Affair, and Maurice Samuel, *Blood Accusation*, New York, 1966. Lindemann points out that Beilis had unusually widespread support from both liberals and conservatives in Russia, and even from antisemites, who were disturbed by the more extreme advocates of antisemitic violence.

<sup>56</sup> The protest, and the lengthy list of signatories, were published in *The Times*, 6 May 1912. Rev Charles Voysey, Sir Gilbert Murray, John Galsworthy, and Dr W. H. Gaskell signed the protest after publication: *Jewish Chronicle*, 17 May 1912.

<sup>57</sup> *The Times*, 6 May 1912; *Jewish Chronicle*, 10 May 1912, carried the texts of protests regarding Beilis from leading figures in Germany, France, and Russia, together with the full list of signatories. The German list would certainly repay careful analysis. It included *inter alia* Werner Sombart, author of *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, who is often seen as an extreme antisemite.

<sup>58</sup> 'Beilis: Great Protest Meeting in London', *Jewish Chronicle*, 31 October 1913 with *Supplement*.

<sup>59</sup> 'Provincial Meetings', *ibid.*

<sup>60</sup> For the text and signatories, see *American Jewish Year Book 5675 . . . 1915*, Philadelphia, 1914, pp. 79–82.

<sup>61</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 31 October 1913.

<sup>62</sup> On British antisemitism at this time see, for example, Sharman Kadish, *Bolsheviks and British Jews: The Anglo-Jewish Community, Britain, and the Russian Revolution*, London 1992, and Gisela C. Lebzelter, *Political Anti-Semitism in England, 1918–1939*, London, 1978.

<sup>63</sup> Another new element to appear at that time was the existence of the Palestine Mandate. The question of the relationship between post-1917 Zionism and philosemitism is discussed below.

<sup>64</sup> *America and the Jews*, London, 1921, p. 7. (This was a pamphlet published by the Board of Deputies of British Jews about the protest described here.)

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 8–12.

<sup>68</sup> *The Times*, 23 November 1925; Jacob Epstein, *Epstein: an Autobiography*, London, 1964, p. 110.

<sup>69</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 30 June 1933. For a list of the eminent persons supporting the German Refugee Assistance Fund see *Time and Tide*, 10 February 1934. It names several speakers at public meetings and Sir Michael Sadler, who signed the pro-Epstein letter. See also petition signed by 20 senior academics, *The Times*, 26 April 1933, and the initial statement to the press of the Academic Assistance Council (later the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning), in Norman Bentwich, *The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars*, The Hague, 1953, pp. x-xii; and *Jewish Chronicle*, 2 June, 18 October 1933.

<sup>70</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 12 May 1933.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*; W. D. Rubinstein, 'The Anti-Jewish Riots of 1911 in South Wales: A Re-Examination', *Welsh History Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, December 1997, pp. 667–99.

## PHILOSEMITISM

<sup>72</sup> *Australian Jewish Herald* (Melbourne), 11 May 1933.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid. See also W. D. Rubinstein, 'The Attitude of the Australian Jewish Community and of Non-Jewish Opinion Leaders to the Rise of Nazi Germany and Nazi Anti-Semitism in 1933', *Australian Jewish Historical Society Journal*, vol. 12, part 1, 1993, pp. 101-14.

<sup>74</sup> *Australian Jewish Herald*, 25 May 1933; *Hebrew Standard* (Sydney), 16 May 1933.

<sup>75</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 16 June 1933.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 8 January, 5 November, 23 December 1938; *The Times*, 14 and 19 November, 19 December 1938; the Bishop of Durham wrote the introduction to *The Yellow Spot: the Outlawing of Half a Million Human Beings*, London, 1936, an indictment of Nazi persecution.

<sup>77</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 10 June 1938.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 22 July 1938.

<sup>79</sup> *The Times*, 12 November 1938 and *Jewish Chronicle*, 9 December 1938.

<sup>80</sup> *The Times*, 18 November 1938.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 17 November 1938. Oxford's protest was sent to the Chancellor, Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax and Cambridge's to the German ambassador.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 19 November 1938.

<sup>83</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 25 November 1938.

<sup>84</sup> *The Times*, 19 December 1938; Sidney Dark, *The Jew To-Day*, London, 1933; Sidney Dark and Herbert Sidebotham, *The Folly of Anti-Semitism*, London, 1939.

<sup>85</sup> Marcus Braybrooke, *Children of One God: a History of the Council of Christians and Jews*, London, 1991 and Israel Porush, 'The New South Wales Council of Christians and Jews 1943-1948', *Australian Jewish Historical Society Journal*, vol. 6, part 4, 1968, pp. 181-95.

<sup>86</sup> *The Times*, 22 November 1938.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 17 November 1938.

<sup>88</sup> On the pervasively widespread nature of antisemitism in interwar Quebec see Esther Delisle, *The Traitor and the Jew: Anti-Semitism and the Delirium of Right-wing Nationalism in French Canada From 1929-1939*, Montreal, 1993 and Irving Abella, 'Anti-Semitism in Canada in the Interwar Years', in Moses Rischin, ed., *The Jews of North America*, Detroit, 1987.

<sup>89</sup> *The Times*, 17 and 22 November 1938.

<sup>90</sup> Another listing of 'Forms of Philo-Semitism' was suggested by Edelstein, op. cit. in note 1 above, pp. 176-90: economic, religious, nationalistic, intellectual, democratic/liberal and humanistic and social philosemitism. We believe that our categories are more appropriate in order to encompass the types of philosemitism encountered in the English-speaking world from 1840 to 1939.

<sup>91</sup> Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background* (New York, 1967); and idem., *American Nationalism: An Interpretive Essay* (New York, 1957).

<sup>92</sup> Until the 1830s the City was illiberal towards Jews: *Jewish Chronicle*, 8 January 1847; see David Kynaston, *The City of London, Volume 1: A World of its Own, 1815-1890*, London, 1994, pp. 20-21, 23, 53-54, 62, 92, 252-53,

270. The change was partly ascribed to the influence on the urban middle class of the philosemitic Duke of Sussex: see *Voice of Jacob*, 26 May 1843.

<sup>93</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 13 May 1842; see also *ibid.*, 5 March 1847 and 14 December 1860.

<sup>94</sup> *The Times*, 4 July 1840.

<sup>95</sup> See *ibid.*, 19 October 1859 and *Jewish Chronicle*, 28 October 1859.

<sup>96</sup> *Outrages Upon the Jews in Russia*, *op. cit.* in note 22 above, p. 11. The obligation and desire of Englishmen to help the oppressed was a recurrent theme at the rallies.

<sup>97</sup> See *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 May 1881.

<sup>98</sup> *The Times*, 11 December 1890.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.* Argyll was active in the anti-slavery movement. See Christine Bolt, *The Anti-Slavery Movement and Reconstruction: A Study in Anglo-American Co-operation 1833-77*, London, 1969, p. 11 *et seq.*

<sup>100</sup> Cyrus Adler, ed., *The Voice of America on Kishineff*, Philadelphia, 1904, p. 136.

<sup>101</sup> *Jewish Herald*, 1 December 1905 and 12 January 1906.

<sup>102</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 30 June 1933.

<sup>103</sup> See, for example, Judith Berlin-Lieberman, *Robert Browning and Hebraism: A Study of the Poems of Robert Browning Which Are Based on the Rabbinical Writings and Other Sources in Jewish Literature*, Jerusalem, 1934.

<sup>104</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 31 January 1896.

<sup>105</sup> *The Times*, 2 February 1882 and 11 December 1890; *Jewish Chronicle*, 8 October 1897.

<sup>106</sup> Matthew Arnold, *Letters*, London 1895; *Jewish Chronicle*, 29 November 1895; Myer Domnitz, 'Matthew Arnold on Hebraism and Hellenism', *ibid.*, 30 September 1938 (*Supplement*).

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 19 June 1903.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 5 and 12 June 1895.

<sup>109</sup> Walter Besant, *The Rebel Queen*, London, 1893, quoted in Madison C. Peters, *Justice to the Jew: The Story of What He Has Done for the World*, London, 1900, p. 148.

<sup>110</sup> See Hilary L. Rubinstein, 'A Noble Sight to See'. Philo-Semitic Responses in Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Australia to Jewish Crises Overseas', *Australian Jewish Historical Society Journal*, vol. 13, part 3, 1996, pp. 424-62.

<sup>111</sup> 'The American Protest Against the Jewish Massacres', *Evening Post* (Louisville, Ky.), quoted in Adler, ed., *op. cit.* in note 100 above, p. 320.

<sup>112</sup> *The Times*, 4 July 1840.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 May 1912.

<sup>114</sup> *Outrages Upon the Jews in Russia* (*op. cit.* in note 22 above), p. 22.

<sup>115</sup> *Massacre of Jews in Russia*, *op. cit.* in note 46 above p. 37.

<sup>116</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 5 May 1933.

<sup>117</sup> Gladstone to Dr Samuel Montagu, 13 May 1896, described himself as 'strongly anti-anti-Semitism', *Jewish Chronicle*, 29 May 1896.

<sup>118</sup> See Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World*, *op. cit.* in note 45 above, pp. 296-304; for Shaw see *Jewish Chronicle*, 1 January, 12 February 1926, and *Supplement*, 29 January 1926.

## PHILOSEMITISM

<sup>119</sup> See Tony Kushner, 'Beyond the Pale? British Reactions to Nazi Anti-Semitism, 1933-39', in *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 8, nos 1 and 2, 1989, pp. 143-60; Rumbold, letter, *The Times*, 9 June 1903; blood accusations were raised in Bohemia (and elsewhere) in 1899.

<sup>120</sup> See Altholz, op. cit. in Note 12 above.

<sup>121</sup> See especially Todd Endelman's chapter 'Philo-Semitism in Anglo-Christianity' in his *The Jews of Georgian England 1714-1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society*, Philadelphia, 1979, pp. 50-85 and David Katz, 'The Phenomenon of Philo-Semitism', in *Studies in Church History*, vol. 29, 1992, pp. 327-61.

<sup>122</sup> *Outrages Upon the Jews in Russia*, op. cit. in Note 22 above, p. 20. See also Farrar's article 'Persecution of the Jews in Germany and Russia', *South Wales Daily News*, 16 January 1882.

<sup>123</sup> Anne Bon, letter, *Argus*, 23 May 1903.

<sup>124</sup> Quoted in Barbara W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: How the British Came to Palestine*, London, 1956, p. 81.

<sup>125</sup> J. C. Wedgwood, *The Seventh Dominion*, London, 1928, pp. 119-21.

<sup>126</sup> *Outrages Upon the Jews in Russia*, op. cit. in Note 22 above, p. 17; *Jewish Chronicle*, 4 February 1938, invoked that speech.

<sup>127</sup> Harriet Martineau, *Eastern Life Past and Present*, vol. 1, London, 1848, p. iii, quoted in *Jewish Chronicle*, 8 February 1850; idem., *The History of England during the Thirty Years Peace 1816-1846*, London, 1850, quoted *ibid.*, 1 March 1850.

<sup>128</sup> *Jewish Herald*, 19 June 1903.

<sup>129</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 24 January 1913.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 5 March 1933; address before British and Foreign Bible Society; cf. his speech at Jewish Religious Education Board, *ibid.*, 7 July 1933.

<sup>131</sup> Eulogy by Rev. Morris Joseph, *ibid.*, 13 September 1912; see also *ibid.*, 26 July 1912.

<sup>132</sup> *South Australian Register*, 20 August 1881; *Observer* (Adelaide), 23 February 1907.

<sup>133</sup> *Ballarat Star*, 8 and 9 June 1903.

<sup>134</sup> Peters wrote several books in defence of Jews: see *Dictionary of American Biography*, New York, 1934, vol. 14, pp. 507-8.

<sup>135</sup> *Massacre of Jews in Russia*, p. 34. Green was not named but it is obvious that he was the Jewish minister to whom Horton referred.

<sup>136</sup> *The Times*, 2 and 4 July 1840; Salbstein, op. cit. in Note 3 above, pp. 38-39; Bolt, op. cit. in Note 99 above, pp. 10, 16, 20, 55, 102; *Jewish Chronicle*, 31 May 1872.

<sup>137</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 26 April, 31 May 1872; Henry Richard, *Memoir of Joseph Sturge*, London, 1864.

<sup>138</sup> *The Times*, 11 December 1890.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 July 1840.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, 11 December 1890.

<sup>141</sup> *The New Judaea*, April 1933, p. 99.

<sup>142</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 28 January 1859.

<sup>143</sup> Alexander McCaul, *Reasons for Believing the Charge Lately Revived Against the Jewish People is a Baseless Falsehood*, London 1840; *Jewish Chronicle*, 28 January 1859; cf. *ibid.*, 27 December 1850.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 22 February 1850.

<sup>145</sup> So, for that matter, had Gladstone. See *Protestant Magazine*, 1 June 1840.

<sup>146</sup> W. T. Gidney, *The History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, From 1809 to 1908*, London, 1908; the Bishop of Stepney's fund became known as the East London Fund for the Jews.

<sup>147</sup> *Christian Lady's Magazine*, May 1843, p. 439 and June 1843, p. 540; cf. letter from Rev Baptist Noel, *Jewish Chronicle*, 31 October 1851.

<sup>148</sup> *Voice of Jacob*, 31 July 1846.

<sup>149</sup> *Massacre of Jews in Russia*, op. cit. in Note 46 above, pp. 34-35.

<sup>150</sup> For example, Tuchman, op. cit. in Note 12 above; Franz Kobler, *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, London, 1956; N. A. Rose, *The Gentile Zionists: a Study in Anglo-Zionist Diplomacy, 1929-1939*, London, 1973.

<sup>151</sup> Tuchman, op. cit. in Note 12 above, pp. 175-207.

<sup>152</sup> *Voice of Jacob*, 31 July 1846; Tonna, op. cit. in Note 8 above, pp. 398-416.

<sup>153</sup> See, for example, Serge Liberman, 'Gentile Champions of Jews in Australia', in W. D. Rubinstein, ed., *Jews in the Sixth Continent*, Sydney, 1987, p. 89.

<sup>154</sup> Laurence Oliphant, *The Land of Gilead*, London, 1880; idem., 'Jewish Tales and Jewish Reform', *Blackwood's Magazine*, vol. 132, November 1882 pp. 639-53; *The Times*, 15 February, 7 April 1882.

<sup>155</sup> See Cyrus Hamlin, 'International Aid for the Jews', *Our Day*, (Lexington, Mass.) vol. 8, no. 53, July 1891, pp. 1-8.

<sup>156</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 21 February, 17 April, 29 May, and 10 July 1896.

<sup>157</sup> Sir Alfred E. Turner, *Sixty Years of a Soldier's Life*, London, 1912, pp. 323-24; others endorsing ITO included writers Anthony Hope, a Beilis protest signatory, and Mrs. Humphry Ward. *Jewish Herald*, 29 December 1905.

<sup>158</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 May 1881.

<sup>159</sup> *Jewish Herald*, 15 December 1905.

<sup>160</sup> See C. V. Wedgwood, *The Last of the Radicals: The Life of Josiah Clement Wedgwood M.P.*, London, 1951.

<sup>161</sup> *The Times*, 4 July 1840.

<sup>162</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 31 May 1872 and *The Times*, 11 December 1890.

<sup>163</sup> *Outrages Upon the Jews in Russia*, op. cit. in Note 22 above, p. 25.

<sup>164</sup> *Massacre of Jews in Russia*, op. cit. in Note 46 above, pp. 28-29; *Jewish Chronicle*, 28 August 1903, 9 May 1912.

<sup>165</sup> *Jewish Herald*, 1 December 1905.

<sup>166</sup> Sir George Houston Reid, *My Reminiscences*, London, 1917, pp. 154-55.

<sup>167</sup> *Argus*, 30 July 1878; A. Patchett Martin, *Australia and the Empire*, Edinburgh, 1889; *Jewish Observer* (Perth), 9 July 1920.

<sup>168</sup> For instance, the very old notion, popularised in recent times by Ernest van den Haag and others, that the disproportionate number of Jewish intellectuals derives from the many centuries when the rabbinate married and produced many offspring, but the Christian clergy was celibate. On this matter see Ernest van den Haag, *The Jewish Mystique* (New York, 1969) and Sander L. Gilman, *Smart Jews: The Construction of the Image of Jewish Superior*



## PHILOSEMITISM

*Intelligence* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1996). This latter book consistently ridicules the concept of Jewish 'superior intelligence' without actually examining the question of whether it is true.

# THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

Robert A. Rockaway

ON 29 November 1993, Khalid Abdul Muhammad, the 'Representative' and 'National Assistant' of Louis Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam, delivered a speech to black students at Kean College in Union, New Jersey, in which he attacked Catholics, whites, blacks, and Jews. His statements about Jews appeared particularly outrageous. He accused 'the hooked-nosed, bagel-eating, lox-eating Jews' from the 'synagogue of Satan' of undermining the fabric of American society. He stated that Jews controlled the Federal Reserve and the White House; they persecuted the blacks; they had dominated the slave trade and participated in the civil rights movement only in order to exploit the blacks; they used Hollywood films against the blacks; they 'raped black women', supported apartheid, and were sucking the blood of the black community.<sup>1</sup>

The black audience cheered him and only one black student, when given the chance of asking a question, likened the speech to a Hitlerite tirade.<sup>2</sup> News of that speech created an uproar and outraged Jewish communal leaders across America; they asserted that American Jews had always been sympathetic to black aspirations for equality and that they had led the struggle for civil rights. In the twentieth century, African Americans had received more assistance and co-operation from Jews than from any other American ethnic group.<sup>3</sup> In 1909, Jews had been among the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the oldest African American civil rights organization in the United States: seven Jews served on its first general committee; four Jews sat on the executive committee; and three Jews had served terms as presidents of the NAACP. Throughout the 1930s, Jews constituted almost half of the organization's legal committee, while Jewish philanthropists — such as Jacob Schiff and Julius Rosenwald — contributed millions of dollars to black colleges and black state schools in the South.<sup>4</sup>

The renowned black civil rights leader, Martin Luther King, had declared in 1967: 'It would be impossible to record the contribution that

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

Jewish people have made toward the Negro's struggle for freedom, it has been so great'.<sup>5</sup> Why, then, did Khalid Abdul Muhammad so brazenly attack Jews? Was it simply antisemitism or was there another purpose? This paper attempts to give some answers to these questions. During the course of the research for this paper, I interviewed several persons. Each of them gave permission for the interview to be taped and to be quoted later in any article or book I might publish on the Nation of Islam and the Jews.

### *African-American Antagonism Towards Jews: A Perspective*

Although many Jews believe that tension between Jews and blacks in the United States is a recent phenomenon, in fact relations between the two groups have been marked with strain and ambivalence for several generations.<sup>6</sup> In 1942, the African-American Nobel Prize winner Ralph Bunche, who was then a political scientist at Howard University, stated: 'It is common knowledge that many members of the Negro and Jewish communities of the country share mutual dislike, scorn, and mistrust'.<sup>7</sup> The black scholar, Harold Cruise, said 25 years later, in 1967, that solidarity between blacks and Jews was never a real fact and that their relationship had always been 'rather ambiguous'.<sup>8</sup> Jonathan Kaufman was of the same opinion: he stated in 1988 that the 'alliance between blacks and Jews was never as strong as it appeared. It was rooted as much in the hard currency of politics and self-interest as in love and idealism' and that even when the alliance seemed strongest, the co-operation between blacks and Jews 'covered a cauldron of ambivalent feelings and emotions'.<sup>9</sup>

Antagonism towards Jews within black culture began in the nineteenth century among slaves in the South and long before these people had ever seen a Jew. Generations of blacks in the American South absorbed the fundamentalist beliefs of the white Protestants who saw Jews as the people who killed their Saviour, who had never accepted the validity of Christianity, and who were ruthless, exploitative and cunning.<sup>10</sup> Slaves chanted songs such as 'Were you there when the Jews Crucified my Lord?' and 'De Jews done killed poor Jesus'.<sup>11</sup> In handbooks for teaching religion to black children, there were questions and answers such as: Q. 'Who Killed Jesus?' A. 'The wicked Jews'.<sup>12</sup> By the First World War, black culture had become permeated with the Christian Gospel with the result that the word 'Jew' became associated with the 'enemy', the killer of Jesus. Richard Wright recalled that when he was growing up in Mississippi and in Tennessee, in the second decade of the twentieth century, 'All of us black people who lived in the neighborhood hated Jews, not because they exploited us but because we had been taught at home and in Sunday school that Jews were Christ killers' and added that this antagonism 'was bred in us from childhood; it was not merely racial

prejudice, it was part of our culture'.<sup>13</sup> Another black novelist, James Baldwin, stated that among African Americans, 'the traditional Christian accusation that the Jews killed Christ is neither questioned or doubted'.<sup>14</sup>

Moreover, the accusation of being Christ killers was not the only stereotype of Jews to be adopted. Many American Protestants have long depicted the Jews as money-grubbing materialists, as dishonest and unscrupulous businessmen, and as unproductive parasites living off the hard work of others.<sup>15</sup> Such an accusation found ready acceptance among the blacks, who resentfully viewed Jews throughout much of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as overly zealous and unprincipled in their drive for wealth.<sup>16</sup> Many hotels and resorts excluded wealthy Jews while at the other extreme poor immigrant Jews from Eastern Europe were viewed as incarnations of filth, disease, and political radicalism. American patricians, such as Henry Adams and the historian Frederick Jackson Turner, openly and unabashedly expressed antisemitic sentiments about these immigrants. The pervasive anti-Jewish atmosphere of that era most probably also affected black Americans.<sup>17</sup> That was the case with two famous black leaders at the turn of the century: Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois.<sup>18</sup> Washington said in his early speeches that Jews were exploiting shopkeepers and usurious creditors<sup>19</sup> while in his initial writings Du Bois claimed that Jews were sly, shrewd, unscrupulous, and lacking in 'straight-forward openheartedness'.<sup>20</sup> (On the other hand, Du Bois later came to praise Jews and hold them up as an example to the blacks — as related in an article in this journal, 'W. E. B. DuBois on Black Nationalism and Zionism', vol. XXVIII, no. 2, December 1986.)

Throughout the decades of the latter half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, Protestant Americans regarded both Jews and blacks as outsiders. The blacks came to believe that by adopting the white majority's attitude towards Jews, they might rank themselves among the white mainstream by establishing that affinity with them. In *The Souls of Black Folk*, published in 1903, Du Bois wrote about the Black Belt of Georgia and claimed: 'The Jew is heir to the slave Baron' — although he must have known that few Jews had owned plantations either before or after the American Civil War — and added that in the harsh economic conditions, 'only a Yankee or a Jew could squeeze more blood from debt-cursed tenants'.<sup>21</sup>

During and after the First World War, black Americans began moving from the South to northern cities and came into more direct contact with Jews.<sup>22</sup> That contact in New York, Detroit, and Chicago often reinforced black prejudices. During the 1920s, as American Jews were beginning to achieve middle-class status and aspirations, they moved from their old areas of settlement and the newly-arrived blacks moved into those districts, where housing was available and the remaining Jews did not fight to reject them — as other immigrant groups (the Irish and the

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

Italians, for example) had done.<sup>23</sup> Thus, former Jewish enclaves became predominantly black: for instance, in 1920 Harlem was Jewish, but by 1930 it had a black majority.<sup>24</sup>

Although most upwardly-mobile Jews moved away from their old neighbourhoods, some remained behind as landlords, shopkeepers, and businessmen. In such cases, the relations between blacks and Jews were primarily those characterizing landlords and tenant, and shopkeepers and customers, and some Jewish proprietors and businessmen took advantage of their black clients and engaged in unethical economic practices.<sup>25</sup> James Baldwin recollected with great bitterness his frustrations and anger at being thus victimized: 'When we were growing up in Harlem our demoralizing series of landlords were Jewish, and we hated them. We hated them because they were terrible landlords and did not take care of the building'. There were broken windows, blocked sinks and lavatories, defective heaters, cockroaches and rats. These conditions were dangerous particularly for those who had children. He commented: 'We knew that the landlord treated us this way only because we were colored, and he knew that we could not move out'. He also resented deeply the local Jewish shopkeepers: 'The grocer was a Jew, and being in debt to him was very much like being in debt to the company store. The butcher was a Jew, and yes, we certainly paid more for bad cuts of meat than other New York citizens, and we very often carried insults home, along with the meat'.<sup>26</sup>

Eli Golan, a former Chicago attorney, politician, and member of the city's Board of Tax Appeals, remembered black residents complaining about some Jewish landlords who owned dilapidated apartment buildings in the black district and he admitted that in a number of cases the complaints were justified: the apartments had no heat or hot water, improper garbage disposal, and were rat-infested. These Jews were known as slumlords and the tenants had much cause to dislike them.<sup>27</sup> James Baldwin noted in 1948: 'I remember meeting no Negro in the years of my growing up, in my family or out of it, who would really ever trust a Jew, and few who did not, indeed, exhibit for them the blackest contempt'.<sup>28</sup>

During the economic depression of the 1930s, the living conditions of blacks worsened, and the contrast with the situation of white Americans became even greater: in 1933, 25 per cent of the white labour force were unemployed, but the rate for blacks reached almost 40 per cent.<sup>29</sup> It was believed that about half the inhabitants of Harlem were on relief in the 1930s and anti-Jewish feelings were fuelled by the real grievances of the blacks.<sup>30</sup> There is evidence that this situation was exacerbated in Detroit, Chicago, Baltimore, New York, and Philadelphia, when poor blacks in these cities increasingly targeted Jews as the source of their troubles.<sup>31</sup> I. B. Price noted that in Harlem 'it had become a way of life to blame the Jew for discrimination and abuse'.<sup>32</sup> Black newspapers in Harlem,

Chicago, and Philadelphia, commented on the increasing antisemitism which was evident: that was one of the major themes in those publications in the 1930s.<sup>33</sup>

In 1935, there was a riot in Harlem, when the inhabitants were incensed by their dilapidated and overcrowded accommodation and by the pervasive discrimination they suffered. There were antisemitic tirades at street corners, and resentment against Jews exploded with much destruction of Jewish property: the Jewish shops were especially targeted and a reporter at the black-owned *Amsterdam News* described the riot as 'Moses' coming-out party'.<sup>34</sup> The sociologist Arnold Rose, who examined the evidence, stated: 'A definite feeling of anti-Semitism was manifested during this riot and has been generally present during riots among Negroes at least ever since'.<sup>35</sup>

Anti-Jewish attitudes persisted and indeed became even more prevalent during the Second World War. By the early 1940s, black authors — who had differing opinions about Jews — generally agreed that black antisemitism was on the increase.<sup>36</sup> Numerous observers, both black and white, also noted the sharp rise in antisemitic feeling and behaviour among blacks in Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia.<sup>37</sup> According to a New York City poll, 70 per cent of that city's blacks held negative attitudes towards Jews.<sup>38</sup> All the while, black newspapers continued publishing libellous articles about Jews.<sup>39</sup> Writing in 1941, Ralph Bunche regretted the expression of such antisemitism: 'In the home, the school, the church, and in Negro society at large, the Negro child is exposed to disparaging images of the Jew. Negro parents, teachers, professors, preachers, and businessmen . . . generalize loosely about "the Jew", his disagreeable "racial traits", his "sharp business practices", his "aggressiveness", "clannishness" and his prejudice against Negroes'. Bunche added that the Jew is not disliked by Negroes because he was white 'but because he is a "Jew" as the Negro conceives the Jew'.<sup>40</sup>

In May 1945, Tennessee's *National Baptist Voice* noted: 'The truth of the matter is: Negroes are filled with anti-Semitism. In any group of Negroes, if the white people are not around, the mention of the Jew calls forth bitter tirades'.<sup>41</sup> Arthur Huff Fauset, a columnist for the black newspaper, *The Philadelphia Tribune*, also deplored the fact that a large number of black Americans blamed Jews for all the evils which white America perpetrated against them; he noted that the most vicious kinds of exploitation and racial prejudice would pass unnoticed if the culprits were Gentiles. 'But let it be said that a Jew has taken the slightest advantage of a Negro and he becomes "the dirty Jew", "kike", "sheeny", "exploiter"'.<sup>42</sup>

Black America's unfavourable opinion of Jews continued after the Second World War. Surveys from the 1960s until the 1990s have shown black Americans to be more antisemitic than American whites.<sup>43</sup> In

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

1992, the head of Afro-American studies at Harvard University said that African Americans, especially the younger and better educated adults, were twice as likely as their white counterparts to be antisemitic.<sup>44</sup> The leaders of the Nation of Islam have relied upon the disparaging perceptions of Jews which have existed and continue to exist in the African-American community.

### *Origin of the Nation of Islam*

The Nation of Islam (also called the Black Muslims) is an African-American nationalist movement.<sup>45</sup> Traditionally, black nationalism in the United States has followed two predominant patterns. The first is external emigration, primarily to Africa or Haiti; the most famous of these programmes was Marcus Garvey's 'Back-to-Africa' movement, which sought to settle American blacks in Africa, as the title makes clear.<sup>46</sup> The second variety seeks to establish some form of separate status for African Americans within the United States and it is to this category that the Nation of Islam wants to adhere.<sup>47</sup> The members of the Nation of Islam oppose integration and they have dissociated themselves from Christianity — the religion of the white men who oppressed and enslaved blacks. In its stead, they have adopted Islam, which they view as a non-white Afro-Asian faith. The Nation of Islam appeals to American blacks because it gives them a sense of purpose and destiny. Its programme offers them four things: an explanation of their plight (caused by the Caucasian race, 'the white devils'); a sense of pride and self-esteem (blacks are superior to whites); a vision of a glorious future (black ascendancy); and a practical immediate programme of uplift (working hard and uniting to create black enterprises and prosperity).<sup>48</sup>

The beginnings of the movement are shrouded in myth.<sup>49</sup> According to historians, a mysterious peddler came in the summer of 1930 to the black ghetto of Detroit. The inhabitants thought that he was an Arab. His name is usually given as Wallace D. or W. D. Fard, because he is said to have told an early convert: 'My name is W. D. Fard, and I come from the holy city of Mecca'.<sup>50</sup> When he first came, he sold raincoats and silk clothing. As he went into the homes of his customers, he started to market a new faith. He told blacks that they were 'Asiatic peoples of noble heritage whose degraded condition in America could only be rectified by knowing and practicing their true and natural religion — Islam'.<sup>51</sup> He said that he had come to awake the members of the Black Nation to the range of possibilities available to them in a world temporarily dominated by the deceitful white race. He would help them to relive, at least in fantasy, the glorious history of black Afro-Asians.<sup>52</sup>

Fard arrived in Detroit when the city and the country were in the throes of the Great Depression. The unemployed, desperate blacks who lived in city slums grew increasingly bitter towards the whites who

seemed to control their lives. Fard offered them hope and pride and a small number joined his movement. These followers came to regard him as a prophet who had been sent to bring them freedom, justice, and equality. Encouraged by that response, Fard established the first temple of the Nation of Islam in Detroit in 1931, the year following his reported arrival.<sup>53</sup>

The cult developed rapidly. By 1933 Fard had established a 'University of Islam' (in fact, a combined elementary and secondary school) to teach Muslim (rather than white Christian) civilization; a Muslim Girls Training Class; and a self-defence unit known as the 'Fruit of Islam'.<sup>54</sup> But in 1934 Fard disappeared as suddenly and mysteriously as he had come and one of his chief lieutenants, Elijah Muhammad, took his place. His original name was Elijah Poole, and he was born in Georgia. In 1923, when he was 25 years old, he moved to Detroit with his family; there he met Fard in 1931 and joined the Nation of Islam.<sup>55</sup> He devoted himself wholeheartedly to Fard and to the movement and within a short time he became Fard's most trusted lieutenant. When a chief minister of Islam had to be appointed to preside over the organization, Fard chose Elijah Muhammad — who, after Fard's disappearance, moved to Chicago and began to reshape the movement. He claimed that Fard had been none other than Allah himself come to earth and that he, Elijah Muhammad, was Allah's Prophet or the 'Messenger of Allah'.<sup>56</sup> Under his leadership, the Nation of Islam sought to become self-sufficient and separate from white society. He continually advocated self-help and the ideal of complete economic withdrawal from the white society and to this end, he sought to establish black businesses and industries which would reduce inter-racial contact to a minimum and would provide jobs and capital for black workers and entrepreneurs. With financial contributions from their followers and by pooling their resources, the Black Muslims established temples, schools, apartment complexes, grocery shops, a bank, a publishing concern, restaurants, small businesses, and farms. By the mid-1970s, the movement claimed more than 150,000 adherents and assets of more than 50 million dollars — constituting the most potent economic force in the black community.<sup>57</sup>

Nation of Islam followers are distinguished from Orthodox Muslims (who do not view them as true Muslims) by their belief that Elijah Muhammad is the messenger of Allah. They believe that Allah (in the person of W. D. Fard) commissioned Elijah Muhammad to arouse America's sleeping Black Nation and rid its members of domination by whites. Black Muslims also espouse a racist ideology: Elijah Muhammad denounced the entire white race, without exceptions, preaching that the white or Caucasian race embodied all that was evil. Whites were 'the human beast — the serpent, the dragon, the devil. . . . Since by nature they were created liars and murderers, they are the enemies of truth and righteousness, and the enemies of those who seek the truth'.<sup>58</sup>



## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

### *The Nation of Islam's Early View of the Jews*

Black Muslims have denied that they have a special dislike of Jews. Malcolm X — once Elijah Muhammad's main minister and the movement's leading light — was reported to have stated in an interview: 'We make no distinction between Jews and non-Jews so long as they are all white. To do so would be to imply that we like some whites better than others. This would be discrimination, and we do not believe in discrimination'.<sup>59</sup> Malcolm X was born Malcolm Little in Omaha, Nebraska, in about 1925, and converted to the Nation of Islam while he was serving a ten-year sentence for robbery. Upon his release from prison, he joined the Black Muslim temple in Detroit; he then went on to become the Muslim minister of the New York Temple in 1954. He was quick-witted, sharp-tongued and charismatic and attracted a great deal of attention from white publications and television programmes. By 1960, he was rivalling Elijah Muhammad in influence and fame. Jealousy within the latter's entourage led to a dispute between the two men. In March 1964, Malcolm X broke with Elijah Muhammad and set up a rival group (Muslim Mosque, Inc.), but he was murdered by gunmen in February 1965; his killers were former members of the Nation of Islam. They were later tried and found guilty of his murder in a court of law.<sup>60</sup>

It is true, as Malcolm X asserted, that the Nation of Islam classifies Jews as white persons. Under Elijah Muhammad, attacks on Jews did not form a distinct element in the Nation's theology. Jews are not even mentioned in the index of his basic text, *Message to the Blackman in America*, published in Chicago in 1965.<sup>61</sup> On the other hand, Black Muslim ideology does view Jews as white men of a special category. Black Muslims believe that some individual behaviour is determined, at least in part, by national or racial traits. Thus, the Anglo-Saxons are diplomats or statesmen; the Italians are criminals and racketeers; the Irishmen serve in the police; the Germans are good scientists; and the Jews are the brains of the white race. Jews are writers and thinkers and they are shrewd and cunning enough to manipulate the other whites. 'All Jews are born psychologists' and they use that special talent to accomplish their own ends; they reach the top by 'psyching' their way up. One Black Muslim saying states: 'One Jew is smarter than a roomful of white men' and adds: 'He can spend a quarter and make a million dollars; or he can rob you blind while he's telling you a funny joke'.<sup>62</sup>

Since most of the followers of the Nation of Islam lived in the black ghettos, they came into contact with Jewish landlords and Jewish shopkeepers and, as noted earlier in this paper, they were influenced by the prevailing anti-Jewish attitudes in the wider society, as well as having some cause to feel resentful against their local landlords and shopkeepers. Before his break with Elijah Muhammad, Malcolm X regularly depicted Jewish businessmen as the leading exploiters of blacks in the ghetto. A

1959 FBI report quoted Malcolm X as saying that the Jew 'owns businesses in the black belts of the major cities, pays low wages, and charges high prices'.<sup>63</sup> Black Muslims further alleged that Jews not only dominated blacks economically (by owning all the stores and businesses in the black ghetto) but they also infiltrated and manipulated African-American organizations, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; they point to the three Jewish presidents of the NAACP and the Jewish lawyers who headed the organization's Legal Defense and Educational Fund as evidence for their contention.<sup>64</sup> The Nation of Islam claims that Jews took up these positions because it was in their own interest to keep the whites and blacks continually at each other's throats, and they succeeded in their aim by using the special 'psychology' with which they are inherently endowed.<sup>65</sup> In his autobiography, Malcolm X claimed that Jews were the worst of the hypocritical white liberals who funded, and worked with, civil rights organizations: they were acting for their own self-interest and for very practical reasons: 'All of the bigotry and hatred focused on the black man keeps off the Jew a lot of heat that would be on him otherwise'.<sup>66</sup>

Black Muslims also claimed that the Jews kept a stranglehold on public opinion through their alleged control of the mass media, since they owned radio and television stations, as well as many magazines and newspapers. They hired Gentiles to 'front' for them so as not to antagonize the general public, 'but on crucial issues, they control the thinking of the people' and 'they use this power to forward the Zionist cause'.<sup>67</sup> Leaders of the Nation of Islam identify themselves with Muslims and Africans and they have expressed sympathy for the Arabs and hostility towards Zionism and Israel. In a 1960 interview with C. Eric Lincoln, Malcolm X declared that 'the Jews with the help of Christians in America and Europe, drove our Muslim brothers [that is, the Arabs] out of their homeland, where they had been settled for centuries, and took over the land for themselves' and he added that in America, the Jews were sapping the very life-blood of the African Americans 'to maintain the state of Israel, its armies and its continued aggression against our brothers in the East'.<sup>68</sup>

In 1960, Elijah Muhammad began to write a column for the weekly black newspaper, the *Los Angeles Herald-Dispatch*, which for a time served as the official organ of the Nation of Islam and was sold at all Nation of Islam venues across the United States. He used that column to attack Christianity and Judaism:<sup>69</sup> for instance, the issue of that paper dated 9 January 1960 condemned Judaism for its 'brutal treatment of the Palestine Arabs' and claimed that the crimes committed by the 'educated and highly cultured' Jews 'were conducted with the aid and sanction of the Christian countries'.<sup>70</sup> The *Los Angeles Herald-Dispatch* was later displaced by *Muhammad Speaks*, which was launched in May 1960. Within a few years, the Nation of Islam claimed, the circulation of that paper,

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

which became a weekly, had reached 600,000.<sup>71</sup> *Muhammad Speaks* regularly published items attacking Israel and Zionism, repeatedly using loaded phrases such as 'Israeli persecutors' and 'Israeli occupation of Palestine'.<sup>72</sup> The American Jewish Committee stated that an analysis carried out in 1972 revealed that the publication displayed a 'pathological hatred of Israel'.<sup>73</sup> It published a column entitled 'Middle East Report' written by a former president of the Organization of Arab Students in the United States; not surprisingly, the column was strongly pro-Arab, and levelled many accusations against Israel. The 4 February 1972 issue of *Muhammad Speaks* condemned Israel for its 'aggression, occupation of land, exiling of Arab inhabitants, annexation of Arab territories' and preparing 'for new aggression'.<sup>74</sup>

The Nation of Islam also denigrated Jewish claims about the Holocaust. At a rally in 1964, Malcolm X said in answer to a question about the Holocaust: 'Everybody talks about the six million Jews. But I was reading a book the other day that showed that one hundred million of us were kidnapped and brought to this country — *one hundred million*. Now everybody's wet-eyed over a handful of Jews who brought it on themselves'.<sup>75</sup>

Elijah Muhammad died in 1975 and the Nation of Islam then split into two competing segments; his son and designated successor, Wallace Deen Muhammad, led one faction, while the other fell under the leadership of Louis Farrakhan.

### *The Rise to Prominence of Louis Farrakhan*

Louis Haleem Abdul Farrakhan was born Louis Eugene Walcott on 11 May 1933 in the Bronx, New York. He grew up in Boston as an Episcopalian and graduated from Boston Latin School with honours, then spent two years at Winston-Salem Teachers' College in North Carolina. However, his first love was music and he sang and played the guitar after leaving college, performing in nightclubs as Calypso Gene or the Charmer, apparently hoping for a career in show business.<sup>76</sup> But he was recruited into the Nation of Islam by Malcolm X in the early 1950s — although he did not then entirely abandon the entertainment industry. He wrote and recorded '*A White Man's Heaven Is A Black Man's Hell*', which became a favourite Black Muslim hymn.<sup>77</sup>

Farrakhan joined the Fruit of Islam, the Nation's security force, and showed himself to be an able soldier in that force so that Elijah Muhammad appointed him minister of the Nation of Islam's temple in Boston. When Malcolm X broke with Elijah Muhammad in 1964, Farrakhan took up his position as minister of the Harlem temple; and after Malcolm X's assassination, Farrakhan's star rose rapidly: within a few years, he became prominent in the urban black community and a 'national spokesman' for the Nation of Islam.<sup>78</sup> His Harlem rallies drew

thousands and his Sunday sermons were carried live on radio. By 1975, Farrakhan was a leading figure in the Black Muslim movement and he was described as 'a better orator than the late Dr Martin Luther King. He sings better than Marvin Gaye. He is a better writer than Norman Mailer. . . . He is more of a diplomat than Henry Kissinger, and he is prettier than Muhammad Ali [the boxer]'.<sup>79</sup>

For two years after the death of Elijah Muhammad, Farrakhan remained with his heir, Wallace Muhammad, who immediately set about instituting reforms in the Nation of Islam. He decentralized authority, sold off or leased many of the organization's property holdings, and disbanded the Fruit of Islam security force. He also declared that Fard was not Allah but a mortal man and that the memory of his father Elijah Muhammad needed to be reconsidered in the perspective of his times and his limitations. Instead of continuing the policy of total separation from whites, Wallace advocated co-operating with them. He also changed the name of the Nation to the 'American Muslim Mission'.<sup>80</sup>

Not every Black Muslim approved of these changes and the movement began to lose members. In 1977, Farrakhan left Wallace Muhammad and formed his own branch of the Nation of Islam in Chicago. He reaffirmed the doctrines of Elijah Muhammad and his vision of what the Nation of Islam should be. These tenets included the belief that whites are 'devils', and that blacks are racially superior to whites and are God's chosen people. Farrakhan also reaffirmed the policies of economic self-help and the absolute racial separation of blacks from whites. He expected Muslim men to lead lives of strict self-discipline: they were to be sober, work hard, devote themselves to their families' welfare, and deal honestly with others. He revived the paramilitary unit (the Fruit of Islam) and reinstated a strict code of dress — dark suits, white shirts and ties for men; and no provocative or revealing dresses for women.<sup>81</sup>

Farrakhan proved to be a talented, charismatic, and inspirational leader. He published a bi-weekly newspaper, *The Final Call*, which reached many thousands of readers. He began to be featured on black talk shows and he travelled around the country, lecturing to black college audiences. By 1984, Farrakhan was well-known in the black community, but little recognized outside it. However, his dispute with the Jews was to make him into a public figure.

#### *Louis Farrakhan's Perception of Jews*

It has been claimed by Farrakhan (and by his spokesmen) that his specific antagonism towards Jews began during Jesse Jackson's race for the 1984 Democratic presidential nomination.<sup>82</sup> A 1994 article in *Newsweek* magazine stated that until that campaign Farrakhan 'had not singled out Jews for special vilification'.<sup>83</sup> In a February 1995 interview, the 'national spokesman for the Nation of Islam' who is also 'the official spokesman for

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

Minister Farrakhan' asserted that the Jews (the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith) attacked Jesse Jackson first and the Nation of Islam was only retaliating. He declared: 'We do not turn the other cheek. Just as the Bible says, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth"''.<sup>84</sup>

In fact, Farrakhan had made statements alleging Jewish control of the media as early as 1972. On 22 April 1972, in an interview on WABC-TV in New York, Farrakhan complained about an American Jewish Committee report on antisemitism in the Black Muslim movement written by Milton Ellerin, a trends analysis director for the Committee. Farrakhan said: 'A Jew by the name of Milton Ellerin said that the Black Muslims . . . are a source of anti-Semitism that is infecting the black community. So, I knew from reading that report that this Jew was in control of the media. This man was telling the Jewish community and the white American community that we got to do something about these Black Muslims'.<sup>85</sup> The next day, on the WNBC-TV programme 'Positively Black', Farrakhan repeated the charges that Jews were 'in control of the media'.<sup>86</sup> A few weeks later, in an article in May 1972 in *Muhammad Speaks*, he stated: 'Since the Jews are in control of the mass media, newspaper, television, radio, we knew then that we could begin to look for a concerted attack on the Nation of Islam through the mass media'.<sup>87</sup>

During Farrakhan's tenure as minister of the Nation of Islam's mosque in Harlem, in 1972 and 1973, the mosque's bookshop displayed and sold copies of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, the nineteenth-century tsarist antisemitic forgery, and *A History of Jewish Crime*, a virulently antisemitic book published in Pakistan.<sup>88</sup> Until the Jackson campaign in 1984, American Jews had paid scant attention to Farrakhan. On 13 February 1984, the *Washington Post* carried an article on Jesse Jackson and the American Jewish community, stating at one point: 'In private conversations with reporters, Jackson has referred to Jews as "Hymie" and to New York as "Hymietown"''.<sup>89</sup> These words were condemned by Jewish communal leaders as well as in editorials in the general press. At first, Jackson denied having made these statements and then he claimed that he could not recall making them. Finally, he admitted having said them and apologized.<sup>90</sup>

At the beginning of his campaign, Jackson had been provided with Nation of Islam bodyguards from the Fruit of Islam until the US Secret Service took over his protection, since he was a contender for the Democratic nomination for president. After Jackson admitted making those derogatory statements about Jews, he began to be shadowed by the Jewish Defense League, he received some death threats, and his family began to be harassed.<sup>91</sup> When he learned about this, Farrakhan was outraged. He declared at a Nation of Islam meeting in Chicago on 25 February 1984, when introducing Jesse Jackson: 'I say to the Jewish people who may not like our brother, when you attack him you attack

the millions who are lining up with him. You are attacking all of us. If you harm this brother, I warn you in the name of Allah, this will be the last one you do harm'.<sup>92</sup>

Many saw that speech as a threat. It was quoted in the leading newspapers and generated widespread criticism of Farrakhan. But it also gave him national exposure and from then on his pronouncements received careful analysis from the Anti-Defamation League and other Jewish defence organizations.<sup>93</sup> Farrakhan reacted to the charges of antisemitism by uttering anti-Jewish invectives and making unsubstantiated accusations which only confirmed his antisemitism in the opinion of most American Jews. On 9 March 1984, he alleged in Philadelphia that according to 'reports' he had received ('reports' which he did not identify), 'Israeli hit squads' had been sent to the United States to assassinate Jackson. The Israeli consul-general in Philadelphia quickly and vigorously denied that charge, which he described as 'outrageous'.<sup>94</sup> Two days later, in a radio broadcast, Farrakhan stated: 'The Jews don't like Farrakhan, so they call me Hitler. Well, that's a good name. Hitler was a very great man. He wasn't great for me as a Black man, but he was a great German. He rose [sic] Germany up from nothing'.<sup>95</sup>

There was a storm of protest, to which Farrakhan responded: 'What is it about Hitler that you love to call every black man who rises up with strength a Hitler? What have I done? Who have I killed? I warn you, be careful. You're putting yourself in dangerous, dangerous shoes. You have been the killers of all the prophets. Now, if you seek my life, you only show that you are no better than your fathers'.<sup>96</sup> On 11 April 1984, Farrakhan held a press conference in Washington and when reporters questioned him about his references to Hitler, he declared: 'I don't think you would be talking about Adolf Hitler 40 years after the fact if he was some minuscule crackpot that jumped up on the European continent. He was indeed a great man, but also a wicked — wickedly great person'.<sup>97</sup>

A few weeks later, in the 14 May 1984 issue of *New York Magazine*, Michael Kramer reported that Farrakhan 'told Jews celebrating Passover that unless they believed in Jesus "then maybe the death angel will stop at your door and kill the firstborn out of your house"'.<sup>98</sup> It is worth noting that in their diatribes against Jews, Farrakhan and his spokesmen — who identify as Muslims — continually refer to the Jews' alleged killing of Jesus. Most Black Muslims were brought up as Christians and their religious perceptions of Jews were therefore based on Christian, rather than Muslim, beliefs. By accusing Jews of being Christ-killers, Farrakhan and his spokesmen may be appealing to Christians as well as to Muslims. In a June 1984 address at the National Press Club, Farrakhan declared that the State of Israel had not had peace in 40 years and would never have peace 'because there can be no peace structured on injustice, lying, thievery, and deceit using God's name to shield your dirty religion or practices under His Holy and Righteous name'.<sup>99</sup>

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

Farrakhan's persistent attacks on Jews led to angry editorials throughout the United States. Jesse Jackson's rivals for the 1984 Democratic presidential nomination — former Vice-President Walter Mondale and Senator Gary Hart — condemned his statements while Vice-President George Bush censured them as 'intrusions of anti-Semitism into the American political process'. Mainstream black journalists and others in the black community — including representatives of the American Muslim Mission and the president of the National Association of Black Journalists — criticized Farrakhan's statements.<sup>100</sup> But that controversy only increased the media attention he received: his pronouncements and appearances were reported in major newspapers and magazines. He began appearing on network television programmes and spoke at the United Nations Correspondents Club in New York and the National Press Club in Washington.<sup>101</sup>

By the end of 1984, Farrakhan had become a media star and his stature among African Americans rose: college and university campuses throughout the country invited him to speak and his message now reached the eyes and ears of millions of Americans — from college youths to more mature audiences.<sup>102</sup> At some of the forums, Farrakhan invited others to sit on the stage with him, including Arthur Butz, a professor of electrical engineering at Northwestern University who had written a book claiming that the Holocaust never happened,<sup>103</sup> and a former Ku Klux Klan leader, Tom Metzger.<sup>104</sup> Metzger is an advocate of segregation of blacks and whites — which is also what the Nation of Islam advocates.<sup>105</sup>

In 1985, Farrakhan invited Kwame Toure, formerly known as Stokely Carmichael, to speak at the Nation of Islam's Savior's Day celebration. Carmichael in 1966–67 had led the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), an organization of college-educated young black men and women, which was founded in 1960 to achieve racial justice by non-violent means. After the Six-Day War of 1967, the SNCC became increasingly radical, anti-Jewish, and anti-Zionist.<sup>106</sup> In 1967, the renamed Kwame Toure declared: '... the worldwide criminal Zionists must be uncovered. . . . We must smash Israel and Zionism'. The Libyan leader, Muammar Qaddafi, appeared via satellite television at the 1985 rally and exhorted the followers of Farrakhan to 'destroy white America' and it was reported that he had given the Nation of Islam a \$5 million interest-free loan.<sup>107</sup>

Perhaps the Farrakhan speech which received the greatest attention at that time was the one he delivered at New York City's Madison Square Garden on 7 October 1985, before a crowd of 25,000. The core of his address was antisemitism and his words seemed to mesmerize his audience. His statement that 'the Jewish lobby has a stranglehold on the government of the United States' drew responses of 'Yes!' and 'Tell 'em Brother'.<sup>108</sup> When Farrakhan asked, 'Who were the enemies of Jesus?', the audience replied, 'Jews! Jews! Jews!'.<sup>109</sup> Julius Lester, who was then

director of the African American Studies programme at the University of Massachusetts,<sup>110</sup> was present and he later commented: 'The audience greeted each anti-Semitic thrust by rising to its feet, cheering, arms outstretched at 45 degree angles, fists clenched. As this scene repeated itself throughout the evening, I wondered, is this what it was like to be at the Nuremberg rallies in Nazi Germany?'.<sup>111</sup>

*Farrakhan's Anti-Jewish Campaign After 1985*

After 1985, Farrakhan's denunciations of the Jews continued unabated in high schools, on college campuses, on radio and television talk-shows, in speeches to black audiences, and through his newspaper *The Final Call*. His themes remained the same: there is a Jewish conspiracy to run the world; Jews exert undue influence and control over black leaders and black politicians; Jews exploit the black community economically; Jews control the media; Israel is an outlaw state; Jews were prominent in the slave trade; and Jews aim to destroy Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam.<sup>112</sup> Sometimes, Farrakhan laced his comments with taunts and threats. Speaking at the State University of New York at Old Westbury, in April 1987, he accused Jews of threatening Jesse Jackson's life and killing Jesus Christ and declared that they would be 'punished and die' for those acts.<sup>113</sup> A year later, in May 1988, Farrakhan spoke at a dinner in Flushing, New York, and according to a columnist of the *New York Post*, he referred to the 'narrow-minded common Jew' and stated: 'The Jews cannot defeat me. I will grind them and crush them into little bits'.<sup>114</sup>

A comparison between the Holocaust and the black experience in the United States became a recurring theme for Farrakhan and his spokesmen in the 1980s. They acknowledged the losses of Jewish life but insisted that the 'Black Holocaust' was infinitely worse. In a speech in September 1985 in Los Angeles, he warned Jews that they must not push their six million down the throats of blacks, who had 'lost 100 million to slavery'.<sup>115</sup> And in April 1988, when speaking to students at Rutgers University, he stated: 'You Jews lost six million and we cry for you. Yet, by conservative estimates, we lost 100 million in the Middle Passage [the sea journey from Africa to America]. Who will cry for us?'.<sup>116</sup>

By the 1990s, the Nation of Islam presented a harsher perspective on the Holocaust. Khalid Abdul Muhammad complained in a talk at Kean College that 'everybody always talk about Hitler exterminating six million Jews' and added: 'But don't nobody ever ask what did they do to Hitler? What did they do to them folks? They went in there, in Germany, the way they do everywhere they go, and they supplanted, they usurped, they turned around and a German, in his own country, would almost have to go to a Jew to get money. They had undermined the very fabric of the society'.<sup>117</sup>



## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

In 1994, the Nation of Islam began sponsoring a travelling road show of speakers, who went to black communities, high schools, and college campuses to spread their message. One of their publicity leaflets, announcing a conference in Washington, D.C., stated: 'Saturday, Sept. 24th and Sunday, Sept. 25th 1994, at McKinley Tech High School, **THE BLACK HOLOCAUST CREW RETURNS!!**'. One of the features of the programme was to be Dr Khalid Muhammad who would speak about the 'Conspiracy to Destroy Black Men' and another was Steve Cokley (who had achieved notoriety by accusing Jewish doctors in South Africa of injecting black babies with the AIDS virus) whose talk was entitled 'Naming the Names of the Enemy'.<sup>118</sup>

Farrakhan is sought after as a college speaker — especially at black institutions — because of his forceful, magnetic, and colourful personality. Student councils are independent entities and can invite whom they will: American colleges have a strong tradition of freedom of speech.<sup>119</sup> Despite the fiery oratory, there is no evidence that the Nation has ever physically attacked Jews. Although Farrakhan's appearances and pronouncements on college campuses have led to demonstrations and some shouting matches, they have not created any serious clashes between students. But there is great concern that the hostile preachings of Farrakhan and his spokesmen, combined with their ability to whip crowds into a frenzy, might create an atmosphere which could easily explode into violence.<sup>120</sup> The Washington D.C. Regional Director of the American Jewish Committee attended one of the Nation of Islam rallies in that city. In an interview in 1995, he stated that he had 'never been in a room in which the feeling of hate was so tangible. It was an electric feeling and I was surprised that violence was not done that night'.<sup>121</sup>

During the 1990s, the publications of the Nation of Islam continued in almost every issue of *The Final Call* and in their local press — such as the Brooklyn and Philadelphia editions of *Blacks and Jews News* — to print defamatory statements about Jews.<sup>122</sup> At most Farrakhan appearances, speeches, or rallies, his followers display for sale copies of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and Henry Ford's *The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem*, as well as other antisemitic publications which are also on sale at Nation of Islam bookshops in Atlanta, Chicago, Detroit, New York, and Washington.

In 1991, the most seriously damaging publication of the Nation of Islam appeared; its title was *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews: Volume I*. It was compiled by the Nation's 'Historical Research Department' and presented as a scholarly text containing 1,275 footnotes in the course of 334 pages. The authors claimed that the data in the book had been 'compiled primarily from Jewish historical literature' and 'from the most respected of the Jewish authorities' with the aim of excluding every source 'considered anti-Semitic and/or anti-Jewish'.<sup>123</sup> Nevertheless, there are chapters entitled 'Jews and the Rape of Black

Women', and 'Jews of the Black Holocaust'.<sup>124</sup> The book has been described by Henry Louis Gates as 'one of the most sophisticated instances of hate literature yet compiled' and has become enormously influential in the black community.<sup>125</sup> Through a clever use of selective quotations, quotations taken out of context, generalizations unsupported by evidence, and distortions of original sources, the book purports to document the Jews' alleged domination of the American slave trade.<sup>126</sup> It has been denounced as filled with bias, shoddy scholarship, distortions, inaccuracies, and half-truths, by eminent American historians and scholars of American slavery — such as Eugene Genovese, C. Van Woodward, Winthrop Jordan, and David Brian Davis.<sup>127</sup> Davis, a professor of history at Yale University, has stated that the volume was 'insidiously clever' because 'while filled with the grossest distortion, it looks like bona fide research'.<sup>128</sup> In a highly unusual move, the American Historical Association (AHA) condemned 'as false any statement alleging that Jews played a disproportionate role in the exploitation of slave labor or in the Atlantic slave trade'.<sup>129</sup> The AHA had decided to make that condemnation, according to one of the resolution's framers, because the media had given the charges 'wide currency while failing to dismiss them as spurious'.<sup>130</sup> That was only the second time in its history that the AHA had taken a position on a specific historical event; the earlier case was to condemn those who denied that the Holocaust had ever taken place.<sup>131</sup> Nevertheless, professors of African-American studies in the City College of New York and at Wellesley College are said to persist in assigning the *Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews* to their classes.<sup>132</sup> The scholarly format of the book may have an unfortunate impact on a generation of impressionable college youth. It has also become something of a bible for Louis Farrakhan and his spokesmen, who carry it wherever they go for speaking engagements and claim that it verifies their accusations about the duplicity and wickedness of Jews.

### *Why the Jews?*

In trying to understand why Mr Farrakhan and his spokesmen have chosen to assail the Jews, it would be easy to simply label them irrational and paranoid antisemites and racists, and leave it at that. The answer, however, is more complex. The situation of the majority of black Americans is desperate. Their communities are rife with crime, drug addiction, and AIDS. They are progressively falling further behind whites in wages and employment rates. And unemployed black professionals are far less likely than their white counterparts to find paid work. The greatest causes of death among young black men are murder and suicide: nearly half the black males in the United States in the age group 15 to 19 years who died in 1988 were killed by guns. One fourth of black Americans between the ages of 18 to 25 are in some phase of the criminal

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

justice system: either on probation or in prison. Infant mortality rates in black ghettos approach those of most third world countries; in Harlem, the rate is said to rival that of Bangladesh.<sup>133</sup>

Black Americans cannot find a satisfactory explanation for this situation. Their high expectations of the Civil Rights movement have not been fulfilled: indeed, racism in the United States seems to have become more acceptable during the last few years. More and more blacks have come to believe that America does not care about them, does not care how black people live, indeed does not care *if* black people live.<sup>134</sup> As a result, African Americans see themselves as a people under siege and, in the words of black Congressman Major Owens, they 'do not see any light at the end of the tunnel'.<sup>135</sup> This despair makes them ripe for the easy answers of demagogues. Farrakhan's oratory feeds on an undeniable history of denigration of blacks at the hands of Americans of every ethnic and religious group. He convinces many that he has undeniable knowledge of who is to blame for the black condition: 'the white devils' — especially the Jews.

African-American culture is already permeated with jaundiced views of the Jews. As noted earlier, for many years anti-Jewish sentiment has consistently been higher among African Americans than among white Americans,<sup>136</sup> so that when Farrakhan accuses the Jews, he is resurrecting a familiar scapegoat, one that black Americans can readily accept.<sup>137</sup> The goal of the leaders of the Nation of Islam is to uplift the black community. One of their programmes involves fighting against substance abuse in the black ghetto; to this end, they have gone there to establish clinics which help drug addicts as well as those infected with AIDS. This assistance is well known and it helps to arouse respect and gratitude for the Nation of Islam — so that when Farrakhan attacks Jews, his standing makes his audience listen attentively to what he says.<sup>138</sup> Moreover, the organization has an excellent propaganda network: newspapers, radio and cable television broadcasts, and video and audio cassettes promote its activities and spread the message of Jewish sins against blacks.<sup>139</sup>

The leaders of the Nation of Islam know that Jews are especially sensitive to accusations of racism. Indeed, it seems sometimes that Jews are the only group who loudly react to Black Muslim charges of racism against whites — with resulting publicity which keeps Black Muslims in the news and in the public eye.<sup>140</sup> As a result of his antisemitic pronouncements, Farrakhan has been invited to appear on numerous prime-television talk-shows and has been the subject of articles in national newspapers and magazines.<sup>141</sup>

In the wider black society in the United States, there is presently a leadership vacuum and some confusion. No single African-American individual or organization commands the allegiance and respect enjoyed by the late Dr Martin Luther King or the NAACP in earlier years and there is a struggle for power. Farrakhan is a separatist hardliner, who

wants the blacks to segregate themselves from white America. One of his spokesmen stated: 'We want our own flag, our own nation, our own government, and our own law'.<sup>142</sup> Opposing Farrakhan are the pluralists, who advocate black integration and co-operation with whites. Taylor Branch has commented that any black leader who stands up to the white establishment or makes 'white America leap on a chair in fright or revulsion will win the generous admiration of suffering black America'.<sup>143</sup> Farrakhan appears to be well aware of that, and by being more rhetorically militant than the established national black leaders he attracts a large following among discontented and alienated blacks — because he is willing to condemn the Jews, whom blacks (as well as some whites) perceive as the most successful sector in the white community. Moreover, it is more politic to attack Jews rather than the entire white majority; Jews constitute only about 2.5 per cent of all whites in the country and there is latent antisemitism among Gentile whites.<sup>144</sup>

Farrakhan's public speeches regularly draw very large crowds.<sup>145</sup> In 1992, some 53,000 fans came for the opening game of the baseball World Series in Atlanta's Fulton County Stadium; but just about a mile away, at the Georgia Dome in downtown Atlanta, 60,000 people paid 15 dollars each to hear Farrakhan speak.<sup>146</sup> In October 1993, he filled a 16,500-seat sports arena in Los Angeles. Two months later, 25,000 came to hear him speak in New York.<sup>147</sup> Such audiences and their admiration for him contribute to his image as the pre-eminent black leader.<sup>148</sup> It is notable that when a number of black politicians in Chicago needed a celebrity speaker to raise funds for one of their causes, they turned to Farrakhan as the one black man they believed could fill any hall in town.<sup>149</sup>

Farrakhan claims that American white society wants to keep blacks in a position of servitude: 'If Black people are going to be free, we have to control our own organizations, control our own artists, control the wealth that's in our community', he stated. He accuses 'the Jewish lobby' of participating in the scheme to exploit and control blacks and has repeatedly claimed that Jews hold 'control over black professionals, black intellectuals, black entertainers and black sports figures'.<sup>150</sup> He has stated: 'my ultimate aim is the liberation of our people' — the people whom Jewish hands hold back. Therefore, he argues, 'we need to sever those hands from holding us. . . . The black man will never be free until we address the problem between blacks and Jews'.<sup>151</sup> Jews are particularly dangerous because 'Jews are the most organized, rich and powerful people, not only in America, but in the world. They're plotting against us even as we speak'.<sup>152</sup> Farrakhan sees Zionism and Israel as part of this conspiracy and Jewish support for Israel figures prominently in his rhetoric. Black Muslims claim that Jewish success is partly the result of Jewish power and sway over the darker peoples of the earth and that Israel is a white, European imperialist nation which oppresses the black American's dark-skinned Muslim brothers, the Palestinian Arabs.<sup>153</sup>

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

When the Nation of Islam's leaders claim that there is an international Jewish conspiracy and that Jews are racists, they point to Israel's treatment of the Palestinians as evidence for that contention.<sup>154</sup> After all, did not a United Nations Resolution declare that Zionism was racism? Since that Resolution had indeed been passed by the United Nations in November 1975, the audiences are impressed — especially since Black Muslims omit to state that the Resolution was later rescinded, in December 1991. It has been said that such strong condemnations of Israel also served to gain some economic rewards: as stated above, Libya is reputed to have given some financial support to the Nation of Islam specifically because of its anti-Israel and anti-Zionist position.<sup>155</sup>

Farrakhan and his spokesmen direct much of their hostility against the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, which has long maintained that the Nation of Islam is a racist organization, whose hatred for whites and whose religious bigotry permeate its organization. The ADL has therefore lobbied against government recognition and against the allocation of federal funds to Black Muslims.<sup>156</sup> Consequently, the ADL is seen as the chief enemy<sup>157</sup> and the leaders of the Nation of Islam accuse it of spying on them and of co-operating with the federal government to 'destroy, discredit and disqualify black leaders and black organizations',<sup>158</sup> with the ultimate aim of the conspiracy being 'to destroy Louis Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam'.<sup>159</sup> Jews, led by the ADL, prevented the Black Muslims from getting support, private or governmental, for their inner city programmes, so that they could continue their domination of blacks. In *The Final Call*, a correspondent stated: 'Jews are trying to dictate to blacks how they should live and who they should listen to'. The Jewish lobby had been working overtime to intimidate politicians and 'to disqualify the Nation of Islam' from getting aid.<sup>160</sup>

Many responsible black leaders either do not condemn Farrakhan for these statements or they may hesitate to repudiate him; they cite his 'positive side' — such as the Nation of Islam's counselling programmes for prisoners, drug addicts, alcoholics, and members of street gangs — as a reason why they do not dissociate themselves from him or his movement. That attitude has led Farrakhan to acquire increasing acceptance and respectability. The chairman of the Chicago Housing Authority was reported as stating in 1994: 'I've seen what black Muslims have done with hardened criminals. They go into the penal system and work with these young men, so when they come out they are no longer on drugs and respect women and their neighbors'.<sup>161</sup> A minister of the Union Temple Baptist Church in Washington, D.C., has stated that his church developed a working relationship with the Nation of Islam because of Farrakhan's emphasis on economic development within the black community, its substance-abuse programme, and its self-help programme.<sup>162</sup>

The executive director of the San Diego Urban League has stated: 'to the extent that Minister Farrakhan brings a message of hope to the most vulnerable, downtrodden people of the world, he is a positive force'. On 24 July 1991, there was a fund-raising affair in Farrakhan's honour at the famous Schomburg Center in Harlem, which is a leading black library institution; the 'honorary chairpersons' listed on the invitation included a New York City councilwoman, a New York State Assemblywoman, and the publisher of the *Amsterdam News*.<sup>163</sup> Farrakhan has also been honoured in cities across the United States for his anti-drug activities. In 1989, the District of Columbia passed a resolution applauding him and the Nation of Islam for succeeding in closing down a drug market in an apartment complex; and in 1989-90 for the work carried out in Philadelphia; Tacoma, Washington; Compton, California; and Prairie View, Texas.<sup>164</sup>

On the other hand, some African-American leaders have spoken out publicly against Farrakhan. In February 1994, Congressman Owens issued a forceful statement condemning Louis Farrakhan and his attacks on Jews. He urged black leaders to dissociate themselves from him and from his hate group and 'let them march off to their own destruction'; the answer to the Nation of Islam was for coalitions of white and black citizens 'to mount more aggressive campaigns for jobs, justice and community rebuilding'. Only positive programmes would show American blacks that they have not been deserted and that it was in their interest to fight Farrakhan's racism.<sup>165</sup>

### *Conclusion*

Some Jewish leaders in the United States believe that Farrakhan's brand of anti-Jewish sentiment is not a major trend in the black community, since despite the man's undeniable charisma and notoriety, his adherents constitute only a small proportion of the country's Black Muslims, who numbered more than two million.<sup>166</sup> They admit, however, that his anti-Jewish vehement pronouncements generate distrust against Jews, since few mainstream black leaders speak out in defence of American Jews. But other Jewish leaders maintain that Farrakhan poses a real danger because of the appalling situation of the majority of black Americans. Hatred feeds on despair and they believe that the Nation of Islam is an organization that is steeped in hate, a hate which pervades its entire operations and which could have dire consequences.

A member of the American Jewish Committee told me in an interview in February 1995: 'The Nation of Islam is an organization which, in its own way, is influential. When you disseminate hate-filled ideas about Jews and other groups, there is going to be a certain sticking effect on the minds of young people . . . and that is dangerous'.<sup>167</sup> Another Jewish leader, who has been a long-term civil rights activist and who has held

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

important positions in the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee, noted that Farrakhan appeals to a wide spectrum of American blacks and that his rallies attract not only well-to-do black professionals, business people, and college students, but also the poor and the unemployed. He comments that one of Jesse Jackson's aides has drawn attention to the fact that many young and middle-aged black professionals felt resentful about failing to achieve recognition in America and they tended to regard Farrakhan as their spokesman.<sup>168</sup>

It is relevant here to state that from 1996 to 1998, I carried out a survey of American college students studying in Israel. I asked 200 of them whether they believed that Farrakhan posed a danger to American Jews; 58 per cent (116 students) said that he did and the reason most frequently given was that, as one of the students told me, 'History has shown that unchecked antisemitic rhetoric can lead to physical violence against Jews'.

Some Jewish leaders in America believe that Farrakhan has achieved success partly because he has been able to raise funds for his organization, although his achievements cannot be denied. At a meeting between Jewish activists and black politicians, one black congressman is reported to have said to the Washington representative of the American Jewish Congress: 'My Community is dying. Young men in my community are dying at an amazing rate. I have to do something about this. I can't stand on the sidelines and do nothing. . . . The Nation of Islam is getting results. How dare you tell me I can't work with them. I'll work with anyone who has a solution to this problem'.<sup>169</sup>

In his book, *A Torchlight for America*, published in 1993, Farrakhan stated: 'Am I really an anti-Semite? Am I really a hater? When people disagree, the intelligent and rational thing to do is to have a dialogue. Perhaps through dialogue differences can be reconciled. If anything that I have said or written is proven to be a lie, then I will retract my words and apologize to the world'.<sup>170</sup> Mainstream American Jewish defence organizations refuse to engage in such a dialogue until Farrakhan *first* apologizes for what he has said about Jews.<sup>171</sup> There is little evidence that he is ready to do so; consequently, the antagonism between him and American Jewry is likely to persist. Until substantial progress is made to alleviate the terrible plight of African Americans, Mr Farrakhan's anti-Jewish allegations will continue to find a receptive audience among black Americans and to cause great concern to American Jews — as well as to Jews in other countries.

### *Acknowledgements*

I wish to thank Dina Porat and the Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Anti-Semitism and Racism at Tel-Aviv University for sponsoring the research for this study.

ROBERT A. ROCKAWAY

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Paul Berman, *Blacks and Jews: Alliances and Arguments*, New York, 1994, pp. 1–2. The ADL printed excerpts from the speech in the *New York Times*, in an advertizement entitled, 'You decide', *New York Times*, 16 January 1994.

<sup>2</sup> Berman, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Interview with Congressman Major R. Owens, 21 February 1995.

<sup>4</sup> Murray Friedman, *What Went Wrong: The Creation and Collapse of the Black-Jewish Alliance*, New York, 1995, p. 48.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in Leonard Dinnerstein, *Antisemitism in America*, New York, 1994, p. 208.

<sup>6</sup> An excellent study of this relationship is Robert G. Weisbord and Arthur Stein, *Bittersweet Encounter: The Afro-American and the American Jew*, New York, 1970.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59. Ralph Bunche became a diplomat and prominent official of the United Nations. He won the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1950 for negotiating an armistice between Israelis and Arabs.

<sup>8</sup> Harold Cruse, *The Crises of the Negro Intellectual*, New York, 1967, pp. 169–70.

<sup>9</sup> Jonathan Kaufman, *The Broken Alliance: The Turbulent Times Between Blacks and Jews in America*, New York, 1988, p. 267.

<sup>10</sup> Dinnerstein, *op. cit.* in Note 5 above, p. 197; B. Z. Sobel and May L. Sobel, 'Negroes and Jews: American Minority Groups in Conflict', *Judaism*, vol. 15, 1966, p. 5.

<sup>11</sup> Dinnerstein, *op. cit.* in Note 5 above, p. 198.

<sup>12</sup> Quoted in Dinnerstein, *op. cit.* in Note 5 above, p. 198. At the same time, African Americans identified with the Biblical Hebrews, as a nation that had endured slavery. Slave songs are filled with references to Pharaoh, Moses, Egypt, and the free states as 'the Promised Land'.

<sup>13</sup> Richard Wright, *Black Boy*, New York, 1966, pp. 70–71. See also Dinnerstein, *op. cit.* in Note 5 above, pp. 197–99, for an explication of this attitude.

<sup>14</sup> James Baldwin, 'The Harlem Ghetto: Winter 1948', *Commentary*, vol. 5, 1948, p. 168.

<sup>15</sup> For a discussion of these, see John Higham, *Send These to Me: Jews and Other Immigrants in Urban America*, New York, 1975, pp. 116–37 ('Ideological Anti-Semitism in the Gilded Age'); and pp. 174–95 ('Anti-Semitism and American Culture').

<sup>16</sup> Dinnerstein, *op. cit.* in Note 5 above, p. 202. Black jokes and stories usually depict the Jew as a dishonest, unscrupulous, but successful businessman.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* and Higham, *op. cit.* in Note 15 above, for examples of these trends.

<sup>18</sup> Born into slavery, Booker T. Washington (1856–1915) became a leading African-American educator. He headed the Tuskegee Institute, a college for black people in Alabama. Harvard-educated W. E. B. Du Bois (1869–1963) was a radical African-American writer and reformer. In 1909, he helped to found the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).



## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

<sup>19</sup> Dinnerstein, op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 200.

<sup>20</sup> Dinnerstein, *ibid.*, pp. 200–1. Both men modified their utterances about Jews after they began receiving help from wealthy Jews for their projects. See Leonard Dinnerstein's comments in the *American Jewish Archives*, vol. 39, 1987, pp. 200–1.

<sup>21</sup> Andrew Hacker, 'Jewish Racism, Black Anti-Semitism', in Berman, op. cit. in Note 1 above, p. 155; W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*, New York, 1989, pp. 138, 139.

<sup>22</sup> From 1914 to 1933, more than 1.3 million blacks left the south to move north. The black population of Detroit increased by 611 per cent, Cleveland by 307 per cent, Chicago by 148 per cent, and New York by 66 per cent. See 'Afro-Americans', in *The Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, Cambridge, Mass., 1980, p. 15. See also Patrick Renshaw, 'The Black Ghetto 1890–1940', *Journal of American Studies*, vol. 8, 1974, pp. 41–42; Hasia R. Diner, 'Between Words and Deeds: Jews and Blacks in America, 1880–1935' in *Struggles in the Promised Land: Toward a History of Black-Jewish Relations in the United States*, edited by Jack Salzman and Cornel West, New York, 1997, pp. 94–97.

<sup>23</sup> Diner, op. cit. in Note 22 above, p. 97. The pattern of black movement into previous Jewish areas became so widespread and common that it gave rise to the cynicism that selling one's property to a Jew would eventually lead to the neighbourhood becoming black.

<sup>24</sup> Gilbert Osofsky, *Harlem: The Making of a Ghetto*, New York, 1968 and Jeffrey S. Gurock, *When Harlem Was Jewish, 1870–1930*, New York, 1979.

<sup>25</sup> Weisbord and Stein, op. cit. in Note 6 above, p. 40; Diner, op. cit. in Note 22 above, pp. 100–1. This problem is not peculiar to Jews. In the 1990s, African Americans have complained about the unethical business practices of Chaldian grocers in Detroit and Korean grocers in Los Angeles and New York.

<sup>26</sup> James Baldwin, 'Negroes Are Anti-Semitic Because They're Anti-White', *The New York Times Magazine*, 9 April 1967.

<sup>27</sup> Interview with Eli Golan, 9 April 1995. Golan was born in Chicago in 1910 and was the first Jewish Republican to be elected to Chicago's Board of Tax Appeals.

<sup>28</sup> James Baldwin, op. cit., in Note 14 above, p. 169.

<sup>29</sup> *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970*, Washington, D.C., 1975, p. 135.

<sup>30</sup> Dinnerstein, op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 203.

<sup>31</sup> Renshaw, op. cit. in Note 22 above, pp. 54–55.

<sup>32</sup> Isabel Boiko Price, 'Black Responses to Anti-Semitism: Negroes and Jews in New York, 1880 to World War II', Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1973, p. 339.

<sup>33</sup> Weisbord and Stein, op. cit. in Note 6 above, pp. 57–60. One black newspaper, Chicago's *Dynamite*, made scurrilous attacks on Jews and urged their expulsion from black districts (Renshaw, op. cit. in Note 22 above).

<sup>34</sup> Quoted in Friedman, op. cit. in Note 4 above, p. 94.

<sup>35</sup> Weisbord and Stein, op. cit. in Note 6 above, p. 80.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59.

<sup>37</sup> Dinnerstein, op. cit. in Note 5 above, pp. 206–7; Weisbord and Stein, op. cit. in Note 6 above, pp. 42–43; and Sidney Bolkosky, *Harmony and Dissonance: Voices of Jewish Identity in Detroit, 1914–1967*, Detroit, 1991, pp. 265–69.

<sup>38</sup> Dinnerstein, op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 207.

<sup>39</sup> Weisbord and Stein, op. cit. in Note 6 above, p. 60.

<sup>40</sup> Ralph Bunche, 'Forward' to Lunabelle Wedlock, *The Reaction of Negro Publications and Organizations to German Anti-Semitism*, Washington, D.C., 1942, p. 8. Quoted in Dinnerstein, *American Jewish Archives*, vol. 39, 1987, pp. 201–2.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 201.

<sup>42</sup> Quoted in Dinnerstein, op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 207.

<sup>43</sup> Gertrude J. Selznick and Stephen Steinberg, *The Tenacity of Prejudice: Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America*, New York, 1969, pp. 118–31 and Jennifer Golub, *What Do We Know About Black Anti-Semitism?* American Jewish Committee, 1990.

<sup>44</sup> Henry Louis Gates, Jr., 'Black Demagogues and Pseudo-Scholars', *New York Times*, 20 July 1992.

<sup>45</sup> The Nation of Islam is a sect of the larger Black Muslim religious group. All Nation of Islam people are Black Muslims. However, not all Black Muslims are members of Farrakhan's Nation of Islam.

<sup>46</sup> Garvey came to New York from Jamaica in 1916. In the 1920s, his movement attracted thousands of impoverished black Americans. In 1925 Garvey was convicted and imprisoned for using the mail to defraud; President Calvin Coolidge commuted his sentence in 1927 and he was deported to Jamaica. Garvey died in 1940.

<sup>47</sup> Excellent discussions of the various forms which black nationalism has taken are found in Theodore Draper, *The Rediscovery of Black Nationalism* New York, 1969; and E. U. Essien-Udom, *Black Nationalism: A Search for an Identity in America*, Chicago, 1962.

<sup>48</sup> C. Eric Lincoln, *The Black Muslims in America*, 3rd edn, Grand Rapids, 1994, pp. 63–93. See also, Martha F. Lee, *The Nation of Islam: An American Millenarian Movement*, Syracuse, 1996, pp. 19–36; and Mattias Gardell, *In the Name of Elijah Muhammad: Louis Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam*, Durham, 1996, pp. 11–68.

<sup>49</sup> The first 'Back-to-Islam' movement was founded by Timothy Drew, a native of North Carolina, who changed his name to Noble Drew Ali. He propagated the idea that American blacks could achieve salvation by making themselves into 'Asiatics' or more specifically, into Moors or Moorish-Americans, whose ancestors had come from Morocco. He composed a 64-page *Holy Koran* for his followers and set up a 'Moorish-American Science Temple' in Newark, New Jersey. Drew Ali died in 1929. For information about Drew, see Draper, op. cit. in Note 47 above, pp. 69–73; Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 48–52; and Essien-Udom, op. cit. in Note 47 above, pp. 33–36.

<sup>50</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, p. 11.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 258.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 12–14; see also Gilles Kepel, *Allah in the West: Islamic Movements in America and Europe*, Cambridge, England, 1997, p. 15.

<sup>53</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 11–12.

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>55</sup> Draper, op. cit. in Note 47 above, p. 76.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.; Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, p. 16; *Muhammad Speaks*, vol. 10, no. 3, p. 24; Lee, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 23–28.

<sup>57</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 85–90, 103, 264; *Washington Post*, 18 September 1988. The actual number of Nation of Islam members is a closely guarded secret. In 1995, estimates of the Nation's membership ranged from 2,000 to 200,000. See the *New York Times*, 28 August 1995, p. 9.

<sup>58</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 20, 73, 207–8; *Muhammad Speaks*, 18 July 1959. See also Elijah Muhammad, *Message to the Blackman in America*, Newport News, 1992 [Chicago, 1965].

<sup>59</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, p. 161. In recent years, Malcolm X has emerged as one of the most significant figures in African-American culture. His autobiography (*The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, 1965) has become a classic, and his ideas and philosophy have captivated a generation of young people — black and white. Malcolm's name and face have become icons and can be found on clothing, buttons, and records, and his life has been the subject of plays, operas, and seminars. In 1992, Spike Lee produced a film about Malcolm's life and death.

<sup>60</sup> Draper, op. cit. in Note 47 above, pp. 86–88; Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, p. 263; Lee, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 39–44.

<sup>61</sup> Elijah Muhammad, op. cit., pp. 342–48; *Washington Post*, 21 March 1994.

<sup>62</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, p. 160.

<sup>63</sup> Clayborn Carson, *Malcolm X: The FBI File*, New York, 1991, p. 137.

<sup>64</sup> Jews, on the other hand, point to these same facts to show how much Jews were involved in helping blacks attain civil rights.

<sup>65</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, p. 162.

<sup>66</sup> Malcolm X, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, op. cit. in Note 59 above, p. 283. Following a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1964, Malcolm X denounced the racist doctrines of Elijah Muhammad and modified his antisemitism.

<sup>67</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 160–61.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., p. 161.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., p. 125.

<sup>70</sup> Quoted in Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 126–27.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 128.

<sup>72</sup> Weisbord and Stein, op. cit. in Note 6 above, p. 99.

<sup>73</sup> Robert G. Weisbord and Richard Kazarian, Jr., *Israel in the Black American Perspective*, New York, 1985, p. 46.

<sup>74</sup> *Muhammad Speaks*, 4 February 1972; Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 164–65.

<sup>75</sup> Quoted in *Malcolm X*, ADL Report, pp. 25–26. It should be noted that after his pilgrimage to Mecca, Malcolm's statements regarding Jews and the Jewish community became more moderate and conciliatory. See the *New York Times*, 24 May 1964; the *Village Voice*, 25 February 1965; *Malcolm X*, ADL Report, 1992, pp. 26–29; and *Malcolm X: On The Record*, ADL Special Report, November 1992, pp. 4–5.

<sup>76</sup> *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994. For biographies of Farrakhan see also, Arthur J. Magida, *Prophet of Rage: A Life of Louis Farrakhan and His Nation*, New

York, 1996; Mattias Gardell, op. cit. in Note 48 above; and Florence Hamlish Levinsohn, *Looking for Farrakhan*, Chicago, 1997.

<sup>77</sup> *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994.

<sup>78</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, p. 268; *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994.

<sup>79</sup> Quoted in Kenneth S. Stern, *Farrakhan and Jews in the 1990s* American Jewish Committee, December, 1992, p. 3.

<sup>80</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 263–65, 275; Lee, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 57–75; Gardell, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 99–118.

<sup>81</sup> Lincoln, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 64–93, 267–70; *Louis Farrakhan: The Campaign to Manipulate Public Opinion*, ADL Research Report, 1990, p. 21. The 'Muslim Program' appears on the last page of every issue of the Nation of Islam's official organ, *The Final Call*. The Program is divided into two parts: 'What the Muslims Want'; and 'What the Muslims Believe'.

<sup>82</sup> C. Eric Lincoln quotes Farrakhan as telling him this (*Lincoln*, op. cit. in Note 48 above, p. 269). Dr Abdul Alim Muhammad, who functions as the 'Minister of Health' and 'National Spokesman of the Nation of Islam', as well as the 'Official Spokesman for Minister Louis Farrakhan', makes the same claim (interview with Dr Abdul Alim Muhammad, 17 February 1995). This same story is repeated when Farrakhan is written about in the press (*Washington Post*, 21 March 1994).

<sup>83</sup> *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994.

<sup>84</sup> Interview with Dr Abdul Alim Muhammad, 17 February 1995.

<sup>85</sup> Quoted in Stern, op. cit. in Note 79 above, p. 3. The report Farrakhan referred to appeared in the AJC's newsletter *Currents*, February 1972. The article noted the 'strain of anti-Semitism' and 'pathological hatred for Israel' displayed in the Black Muslim publication, *Muhammad Speaks*. The author worried that the 'inflammatory anti-Israel material is easily translated by the reader into hatred of American Jews'.

<sup>86</sup> Quoted in *Louis Farrakhan: The Campaign to Manipulate Public Opinion*, op. cit. in Note 81 above, p. 27.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*; *Muhammad Speaks*, 12 May 1972.

<sup>88</sup> ADL Report, op. cit. in Note 81 above, pp. 27–28.

<sup>89</sup> *Washington Post*, 13 February 1984.

<sup>90</sup> *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 86, 1986, p. 66; Dinnerstein, op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 219.

<sup>91</sup> *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994; Gardell, op. cit. in Note 48 above, p. 250.

<sup>92</sup> Ellen Hume, 'Falling Out: Blacks and Jews Find Confrontation Rising Over Jesse Jackson', *The Wall Street Journal*, 29 May 1984, p. 1.

<sup>93</sup> The ADL carefully monitored the utterances of Farrakhan and his associates and issued a series of 'Research Reports', which scrupulously recorded all their verbal attacks against Jews.

<sup>94</sup> Quoted in ADL Report, op. cit. in Note 81 above, p. 25.

<sup>95</sup> Quoted in Fred Barnes, 'Farrakhan Frenzy', *The New Republic*, no. 193 October 28, 1985.

<sup>96</sup> Quoted in ADL Report, op. cit. in Note 81 above, p. 25. The accusation that Jews are the 'killers of the Prophets', is an expression used often in Muslim and Arab anti-Jewish literature. See Esther Webman, *Anti-Semitic Motifs in the Ideology of Hizbullah and Hamas*, Tel-Aviv University, 1994, p. 18.

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

<sup>97</sup> *Washington Post*, 12 April 1984. Quoted in ADL Report, op. cit. in Note 81 above, p. 26.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24 and *New York Magazine*, 14 May 1984.

<sup>99</sup> Quoted in Wolf Blitzer, *Between Washington and Jerusalem: A Reporter's Notebook*, New York, 1985, p. 186. See also, *Newsday*, 26 June 1984.

<sup>100</sup> ADL Report, op. cit. in Note 81 above, p. 24.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>102</sup> Kenneth Bandler, 'Farrakhan on the Campus: Challenges Facing Jewish Students', *Israel Horizons* no. 34, 1986, p. 15. Dinnerstein, op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 220; *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 86, 1986, p. 68; *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 87, 1987, pp. 120, 121.

<sup>103</sup> Dinnerstein, op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 220. Butz is part of a group of pseudo-historical revisionists who maintain that the Jews of Europe were not exterminated. They founded an 'Institute for Historical Review' and publish the *Journal of Historical Review*. The 'Institute' and *Journal* are funded by neo-Nazi and other antisemitic organizations in America and England. On Butz, see Deborah E. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*, New York, 1993, pp. 123-36.

<sup>104</sup> ADL Report, op. cit. in Note 81 above, p. 29; Stern, op. cit. in Note 79 above, p. 8. After the rally, Metzger announced that not only had he contributed money to Farrakhan, but that the two had held a number of meetings together (*New York Times*, 3 October 1985, p. 19.).

<sup>105</sup> Farrakhan admitted to an interviewer that he had 'some common ground' with Metzger, because they both favour separation of the white and black races: Steven Barboza, *American Jihad: Islam After Malcolm X*, New York, 1994, p. 147.

<sup>106</sup> Weisbord and Stein, op. cit. in Note 6 above, pp. 102-5; Friedman, op. cit. in Note 4 above, pp. 204-11, 227-33.

<sup>107</sup> *Washington Post*, 18 September 1988; *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 87, 1987, p. 120; Stern, op. cit. in Note 79 above, p. 8.

<sup>108</sup> Roger Rosenblatt, 'The Demagogue in the Crowd', *Time*, 21 October 1985, p. 102; quoted in Dinnerstein, op. cit. in Note 5 above, p. 220.

<sup>109</sup> Quoted in Julius Lester, 'The Time Has Come', *The New Republic*, 28 October 1985, p. 14.

<sup>110</sup> Julius Lester is a black American who converted to Judaism. He subsequently left the African-American studies programme over a conflict about Jewish-related issues. He then began teaching in the university's Jewish studies programme.

<sup>111</sup> Lester, op. cit. in Note 109 above, p. 11. New York's Mayor Koch and Governor Mario Cuomo both denounced Farrakhan (*New York Times*, 9 October 1985, 11, p. 6; *The Final Call*, December 1985, p. 4.).

<sup>112</sup> *The Final Call* (27 January 1992, 24 August 1992 and 17 August 1994) and *New York Times*, 21 February 1994. Farrakhan and his spokesmen maintain that the leading instrument for his destruction is the ADL and its surrogate, the Jewish Defense League (JDL). Interview with Dr Abdul Alim Muhammad, 17 February 1995.

<sup>113</sup> Quoted in ADL Report, op. cit. in Note 81 above, p. 33.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37; *New York Post*, 21 May 1988.

<sup>115</sup> *Los Angeles Times*, 17 September 1985.

<sup>116</sup> *Home News* (New Jersey), 7 April 1988. Quoted in ADL Report, op. cit. in Note 81 above, p. 45. Farrakhan's attitude toward the Holocaust strikes a responsive chord among some black leaders and intellectuals who think that Americans expend a disproportionate amount of time and money memorializing what was essentially a European and European Jewish catastrophe. They note that while the United States has a Holocaust museum in its capital city, it has no comparable edifice commemorating the central tragedy of American history — slavery.

<sup>117</sup> *Baltimore Jewish Times*, 21 January 1994; In other speeches, Khalid Muhammad minimized the Holocaust, saying that it only lasted for a decade, while the holocaust against black people lasted for 500 years (*Washington Post*, 19 April 1994; *Jerusalem Post*, 21 April 1994).

<sup>118</sup> Handbill (undated) published by 'Graphix Division of the Pyramid Complex', in Washington, D.C. The title on the handbill reads: 'Man: Know Thyself: Black Education Conference 1'.

<sup>119</sup> Donna E. Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services in the Clinton Administration, when Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, defended black students who brought Farrakhan to the University. Although she personally found his ideas offensive, she viewed the issue as one of free speech (Harris E. Chaiklin, 'Current Anti-Semitism and the Role of the Jewish Communal Service Professional'. Paper delivered at the World Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Jerusalem, 4-7 July 1994, p. 11). The freedom of speech rationale was used also at other universities (*Yale Daily News*, 15 February 1990; *New Haven Register*, 15 February 1990; *Washington Jewish Week*, 24 September 1992).

<sup>120</sup> Interview with Mark Pelavin, director, Washington Office of the American Jewish Congress, and David Friedman, director of the Washington office of the ADL, 21 February 1995.

<sup>121</sup> Interview with David Friedman, 21 February 1995.

<sup>122</sup> Articles accused Jews of controlling the Federal Reserve Bank; Jewish journalists of printing articles besmirching the black image; and Jewish producers in Hollywood of producing films and TV shows which degrade blacks. See, *The Final Call*, 17 August 1994; *Philadelphia Blacks and Jews News*, Spring 1994; and the *Brooklyn Blacks and Jews News* Winter 1991, for examples of these articles.

<sup>123</sup> *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*, 1991, p. iv.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, p. v.

<sup>125</sup> Henry Louis Gates, Jr., 'The Uses of Anti-Semitism', in Berman, op. cit. in Note 1 above, p. 219.

<sup>126</sup> Harold Blackman, *Farrakhan's Reign of Historical Error: The Truth Behind 'The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews'*, Los Angeles, 1992, illustrates how the Nation of Islam misquoted scholars.

<sup>127</sup> *Jew Hatred As History: An Analysis of the Nation of Islam's 'The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews'*, ADL, 1993, pp. i-iv; *Detroit Jewish News*, 11 February 1994; and *The Atlantic Monthly*, September 1995, pp. 109-14.

<sup>128</sup> *Washington Post*, 15 February 1995.

<sup>129</sup> *Washington Post*, 15 February 1995. The American Historical Association is the nation's leading organization of professional historians. It has 18,000 members.

## THE NATION OF ISLAM AND THE JEWS

<sup>130</sup> *Washington Post*, 15 February 1995.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>132</sup> Professor Tony Martin used the book in his survey course on African American History at Wellesley College. This created a campus-wide controversy. Martin then wrote a book, *The Jewish Onslaught*, 1993, defending his position and describing how he — as well as other African Americans — have been the target of ‘a hysterical campaign of Jewish lies, distortions and half-truths’.

<sup>133</sup> Julius Lester, ‘The Lives People Live’, in Paul Berman, *op. cit.* in Note 1 above, pp. 172–73; *Washington Post*, 30 April 1995; interview with Congressman Major Owens (N.Y.), 21 February 1995.

<sup>134</sup> Julius Lester, *op. cit.*, in Note 133 above, p. 175; Interview with Congressman, Major Owens, 21 February 1995.

<sup>135</sup> Interview with Congressman Major Owens, 21 February 1995.

<sup>136</sup> Gertrude J. Selznick and Stephen Steinberg, *op. cit.* in Note 43 above, pp. 117, 129; Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, *Jews and the New American Scene*, Cambridge, Mass., 1995, pp. 100–7; Dinnerstein, *op. cit.* in Note 5 above, pp. 223–27; and Friedman, *op. cit.* in Note 4 above, p. 347.

<sup>137</sup> Interview with Major Owens, 21 February 1995; interview with Mark Pelavin and David Friedman, 21 February 1995. The Jew as a scapegoat for black troubles is one theory that psychologists propose. Psychiatrist Alvin Poussaint attributes Farrakhan’s popularity to his skill at tapping into the frustrations and anger which African Americans feel about the unfulfilled promises of the Civil Rights movement. See Dinnerstein, *op. cit.* in Note 5 above, pp. 220, 223–24, for a summary of these theories.

<sup>138</sup> Interview with Congressman Major Owens; interview with Mark Pelavin and David Friedman; interview with Dr. Jeffrey Hoffman, 16 February 1995. Until 1996, Dr. Hoffman worked with heroin and cocaine addicts in the black inner city of Washington, D.C. His activities brought him into a close working relationship with Nation of Islam members, who were engaged in similar activities.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*; every issue of *The Final Call* advertises the full range of propaganda materials for sale.

<sup>140</sup> On 6 May 1995, the BBC series ‘Focus on Faith’ broadcast a programme entitled ‘Louis Farrakhan: The Man and the Mission’.

<sup>141</sup> Farrakhan has appeared on CNN’s ‘Larry King Show’, ABC’s ‘Nightline’, and CBS’ ‘60 Minutes’, and has been written about in *Newsweek*, *Time* and the *Washington Post*.

<sup>142</sup> Speech given by Khalid Abdul Muhammad at Howard University, 19 April 1994. The programme, entitled ‘Documenting the Black Holocaust’, was broadcast over C-SPAN television.

<sup>143</sup> Quoted in Dinnerstein, *op. cit.* in Note 5 above, p. 222. One BBC radio commentator noted that ‘the more the media deploras him [Farrakhan], it seems, the more of a hero he becomes’ (BBC broadcast of 6 May 1995: see Note 140 above).

<sup>144</sup> Interview with Mark Pelavin and David Friedman, 21 February 1995.

<sup>145</sup> *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 87, 1987, p. 120; *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994.

<sup>146</sup> Lincoln, *op. cit.* in Note 48 above, p. 270.

<sup>147</sup> *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994.

<sup>148</sup> Clayborn Carson, 'The Politics of Relations between African-Americans and Jews', in Berman, op. cit. in Note 1 above, pp. 133, 141.

<sup>149</sup> *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994. In 1994, a *Time* magazine and CNN poll of 504 African Americans found that 73 per cent of those surveyed were familiar with Farrakhan — more than any other black political figure except Jesse Jackson and Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas.

<sup>150</sup> *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.* For another interpretation of Farrakhan's attitude towards the Jews, see Gardell, op. cit. in Note 48 above, pp. 245–84.

<sup>152</sup> *New York Daily News*, 25 January 1994.

<sup>153</sup> *The Final Call*, 17 August 1994. For a discussion of these attitudes, see Weisbord and Kazarian, op. cit. in Note 73 above, pp. 44–48.

<sup>154</sup> *The Final Call*, 17 August 1994; *Philadelphia Blacks and Jews News* Spring 1994.

<sup>155</sup> Interview with Congressman Major Owens, 21 February 1995; he stated that he had no knowledge of Farrakhan receiving money from any other Arab government but Libya.

<sup>156</sup> The ADL's views and efforts are summarized in its January 1994 Civil Rights Division Policy Background Report, 'Mainstreaming Anti-Semitism: The Legitimization of Louis Farrakhan'.

<sup>157</sup> The attitude of Minister Farrakhan towards the ADL can be found in his numerous speeches and interviews. See, for example, the *Chicago Sun-Times*, 4 February 1994; the *New York Times*, 21 February 1994; the *New York Daily News*, 25 January 1994, 4 February 1994; and *The Final Call*, 27 January 1992; 8 February 1995. Gardell, op. cit. in Note 48 above, has an extended discussion about Farrakhan's conflict with the ADL.

<sup>158</sup> *Chicago Sun-Times*, 4 February 1994.

<sup>159</sup> *New York Times*, 21 February 1994; *New York Daily News*, 4 February 1994.

<sup>160</sup> *The Final Call*, 7 January 1992.

<sup>161</sup> *Newsweek*, 28 February 1994.

<sup>162</sup> Interview with Eric Kareem, 17 February 1995.

<sup>163</sup> *The Anti-Semitism of Black Demagogues and Extremists*, ADL Report, 1992, pp. 9–10.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>165</sup> Statement of Congressman Major R. Owens in the U.S. House of Representatives, 3 February 1994; interview with Congressman Owens, 21 February 1995.

<sup>166</sup> In August 1995, an American Muslim leader estimated that there were more than two million African American Muslims in the United States and that only 10,000 of them were members of the Nation of Islam (*New York Times*, 28 August 1995, p. 9).

<sup>167</sup> Interview with David Friedman, 16 February 1995.

<sup>168</sup> Friedman, op. cit. in Note 4 above, p. 335.

<sup>169</sup> Interview with Mark Pelavin, 16 February 1995.

<sup>170</sup> Louis Farrakhan, *A Torchlight for America*, Chicago, 1993, p. 157.

<sup>171</sup> The ADL has been the most adamant in this stand.



# HASSIDISM REAPPRAISED

Jacques Gutwirth

(*Review Article*)

ADA RAPOPORT-ALBERT, ed., *Hasidism Reappraised*, The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, xxiv + 514 pp., London and Portland, Or., 1996, £65.00.

This large volume — with 29 contributions, a detailed bibliography (from p. 465 to p. 491), and an index — is based on the Proceedings of an International Conference, convened by the Institute of Jewish Studies of University College London, which took place in June 1988. It was held in memory of Joseph G. Weiss (1918–1969), a great scholar of hassidism who had been a professor at University College London.

The Conference was entitled 'The Social Function of Mystical Ideals in Judaism: Hasidism Reappraised'. In the Preface to the present volume, the Editor tells us (p.v): 'The turning-point was occasioned by the convergence primarily of two factors. On the one hand the libraries and archives of eastern Europe were becoming increasingly accessible. . . . On the other hand, the passing away in 1982 of Gershom Scholem, who had pioneered the academic study of Jewish mysticism and whose approach had dominated the field for at least a half a century, was followed, perhaps inevitably, by a revision of his entire scholarly enterprise'.

The Editor follows her Preface with an Introduction in which it is made clear that the volume is not concerned only with a revision of Scholem's oeuvre, but deals also with an appraisal of several other scholars of Hassidism: Simon Dubnow, Martin Buber, and Raphael Mahler. That is quite appropriate. On the other hand, I think that in this volume the data from the archives and libraries of Eastern Europe on hassidism are slender, while in Israel there has been a great deal of research on that subject, as some of the contributions show.

The first two essays in Part I are dedicated to Joseph Weiss, who was a disciple of Scholem, and the authors (Jacob Katz and Sara Ora Heller Wilensky) are full of praise for his scholarship. Wilensky states that she is publishing for the first time in English translation 20 letters which Weiss sent her from 1949 to 1968, when she was in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

## JACQUES GUTWIRTH

These letters are especially revealing on the difficult relations which Weiss had with his 'patron', Scholem, and on the anguish which he felt 'at the schism that divided them in the early 1950s' (p. 11) as well as on various happenings in Israeli universities — but they tell us very little about hassidism.

Part Two consists of seven contributions and is entitled 'Towards a New Social History of Hasidism'. Gershon David Hundert deals with 'The Conditions in Jewish Society in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Middle Decades of the Eighteenth Century'. He compares the rise of hassidism there to the Great Awakening in the United States from 1740 onwards. He notes that at the time, there was a population explosion among the Jews of Poland and contends that this was not as a result of a very high birth rate (as had been assumed by many) but as a result of a lower death rate: infant mortality of Jewish inhabitants was lower than obtained in the general population. Scholars of hassidism have stressed that the movement in its early phase had appealed particularly to young Jews; but they generally failed to note that during that period, 'the proportion of young people in the Jewish population would constantly expand; the society as a whole would be younger rather than older' (p. 47).

Social, economic, and political conditions were unstable and in such situations, the usual tensions between the generations can become exacerbated. Hundert maintains that earlier historiographers have exaggerated the sense of insecurity of the Jews during the middle decades of the eighteenth century and that this is 'a classical instance of the lachrymose presentation of the Jewish experience' (p. 48).

The next essay in the volume is by Moshe J. Rosman and is entitled 'Social Conflicts in Miedzyboz in the Generation of the Besht'. He begins by referring to Hundert's opinion about social conditions in Jewish society. His own approach was to seek to discover what the situation was in the area where hassidism began. The Baal Shem Tov (the Besht), who was the founder of hassidism, lived in Miedzyboz from about 1740 until his death in 1760. The town was then owned by the Czartoryski family and their archives can be found in the library bearing their name, in Cracow. Rosman examined the archives and sets out the position of Jews in the town, as revealed by these sources. There were Jewish *arendators* who had arrangements with the Czartoryski owners to farm taxes as well as tolls and customs duties and controlled mills and liquor-manufacturing appliances. Contrary to the myth that the Besht was an anti-Establishment figure, 'he was supported by the establishment to the end of his days in Miedzyboz, and such support apparently was extended to his son after his death' (p. 59). Admittedly, Polish archives may not be entirely reliable about the facts of the case, but Hundert notes that in a responsum cited by another historian of hassidism (Benzion Dinur), there is confirmation

## HASSIDISM REAPPRAISED

of 'the Besht's respected status within the official, normative Jewish community' of the town (p. 59).

The next contribution is a stimulating essay by Shmuel Ettinger (who died three months after the 1988 conference), 'Hasidism and the *Kahal* in Eastern Europe'. His sources on the institutions of Jewish communities in that region include the minute books of the community councils (the *kahalim*) as well as the smaller societies, the *hevrot*, which preserved their records for centuries. Unfortunately, only a small number of original documents have survived and some have been misquoted or tampered with by amateur historians. Ettinger notes that some modern historians of hassidism and European Jewry have followed the school of thought which claimed that the emergence of hassidism was primarily a response to the disintegration of traditional institutions among the Jews of Eastern Europe and that the movement suffered from the hostility it was shown by the Jewish establishment. In fact, that establishment was rebuked by no less an authority than the Gaon of Vilna for being too lenient towards the hassidim, while in the important community of Pinsk, a hassidic leader was appointed as the communal rabbi, 'after the start of the Vilna-led campaign against the hasidim' (p. 69). Moreover, hassidic leaders had acquired a reputation as specialist intermediaries in obtaining the liberation of Jews who had been held prisoners and Ettinger cites the case of a rabbi of a Volhynian community who signed an agreement in 1778 with a hassidic rabbi for payment of an annual fee for the next four years for the redemption of captives. That was 'at the very time at which the calls for the excommunication of the hasidim were being issued' (p. 69).

However, Ettinger does not deny that there were very serious struggles between the scholarly-wealthy elite and the hassidim who enjoyed the support of the poorer Jews in villages or that of 'common' townspeople. Ettinger's valuable contribution does stress the variegated picture which in fact existed in the relations between the *kahal* and the hassidim in the eighteenth century, but it does not invalidate the fundamental views of Dubnow or of Jacob Katz about the disintegration of Jewish communal institutions during that period, which resulted in the emergence 'of new forms of communal leadership in place of the old moribund ones' (p. 65).

Ettinger's essay is followed by a very lengthy contribution (pp. 76-140) from the editor of the volume, Ada Rapoport-Albert, entitled 'Hasidism after 1772: Structural Continuity and Change'. Hassidism was led firmly (and in a manner which was unhesitatingly accepted by its members) first, by its founder the Baal Shem Tov and on his death in 1760, by his revered disciple and successor Rabbi Dov Ber (known as the Maggid of Mezchirech) who died in 1772. The editor analyses the first writings concerning the Baal Shem Tov and concludes that he and his disciple 'both operated within the framework of a non-centralist leadership which found its natural continuation in the fragmented structure of the hasidic leadership after 1772' (p. 101). On the other hand, in the case

of the various sects of hassidic groups, authority rests unquestionably only in the charismatic leader of each group, its *rebbe*. Admittedly, there was an instance of such a *rebbe* who aspired to be recognized as the supreme leader of all hassidim: he was Rabbi Nahman of Bratslav and the Editor comments that 'his claim needs to be examined in its peculiar ideological context' and that it was 'undoubtedly connected with his messianic view of himself' (p. 113). Unlike some other hassidic leaders, Rabbi Nahman of Bratslav left no dynastic successors; but he has 'followers'. As for the disciples of any particular hassidic rabbi, the attachment is based on the kabbalistic doctrine of 'root affinity' (p. 128). The author then deals with the hereditary principle under which 'the leadership of hasidism began to be transmitted within dynasties from one generation to the next' and adds that this principle 'was also applied at the level of the ordinary hasidim to their affiliation with a particular court and leader' (p. 137).

The next contribution is by Zeev Gries; his is an original subject: 'The Hasidic Managing Editor as an Agent of Culture'. Such a managing editor will have built the collective memory of hassidism by publishing books and tracts which have been based on the transcriptions by faithful disciples of the sayings of their leaders. However, Gries concludes that 'hasidic literature . . . never became an indispensable part of the hasidic experience, either as an object of personal study at home or through any programme of instruction or study within the hasidic *beit midrash*' (p. 155).

Part Three of the volume is entitled 'The Social Function of Mystical Ideas in Hasidism'. The first contribution in that part is by Immanuel Etkes, who examines the position of the Zaddik, or rather, 'the relationship between the theory and practice of zaddikism' (p. 159). The cult of a saintly hassidic leader was given legitimacy by Rabbi Elimelekh of Lyzhansk at the end of the 1780s. The loyalty and devotion to a spiritual leader, and even to a dynasty of successive leaders, had to be defended in face of the opposition of the Gaon of Vilna and the communal establishment.

That essay is followed by another entitled 'The Paradigms of *Yesh* and *Ayin* in Hasidic Thought'. The author is Rachel Elijor and she strives to explain hassidic doctrine regarding the Being (*Yesh*) and the Non-Being (*Ayin*). She states (pp. 174-75): 'The hasidic masters were fully aware of the disparity between their perception of the universe as God-filled and the human experience of God's transcendence and inaccessibility. They explained this disparity as arising from the fact that the human senses can perceive only the material reality of *yesh* but cannot respond to the challenge of detecting its hidden divinity in *ayin*'.

A brief contribution to that Part of the volume is entitled 'Hasidism and the Dogma of the Decline of the Generations'; the author, Louis Jacobs, comments that many rabbinic texts had implied, well before the emergence of hassidism, 'that each successive generation after the

## HASSIDISM REAPPRAISED

revelation at Sinai exhibits further decline' (p. 208). The hassidim were well aware of that, but they maintained that their own great charismatic leaders, the zaddikim, were endowed with sanctity and could perform miracles. The fact that these extraordinary men were very remote in time from the Temple period meant that they were very close to the beginning of the Messianic age. Louis Jacobs concludes his concise scholarly essay with the wry observation that since the hassidic zaddikim were believed to be able to reach the world which is beyond time, they could accept the doctrine of the decline of the generations in principle but also assert that that doctrine could be circumvented in the case of their own zaddikim, so that they could have their cake and eat it.

Part Four of the volume is entitled 'Distinctive Outlooks and Schools of Thought Within Hasidism'. The first contribution in that section is by Bracha Sack, who considers the influence of the work of the Safed kabbalist, Elijah de Vidas, on the teachings of the revered successor of the Besht, the Maggid of Mezhibezh. This is followed by Roland Goetschel's essay on the study of the Torah *lishmah*, for its own sake, in the work of Moses Hayyim Efrayim of Sudylkow, who was the grandson of the Baal Shem Tov. The author considers in some detail the importance which the sage of Sudylkow attached to the power of meditating on the 22 letters of the alphabet and on the zaddik's special ability to manipulate the letters, as well as the redemptive power of the letters, which represent the divine origin of reality.

The next contribution is by Moshe Hallamish, on the teachings of Rabbi Menahem Mendel of Vitebsk. That rabbi was specifically named in the *herem* of 1772 by the Gaon of Vilna, but Hallamish lays stress on the manifestations of faith of Menahem Mendel and on the ways he attained communion with God. Naftali Loewenthal then writes on 'Habad Approaches to Contemplative Prayer, 1790-1920'. That style of prayer was reserved for the elite among hassidim. Indeed, Rabbi Dov Ber, the son of the founder of this school, which is still flourishing nowadays, was so alarmed when he saw that his guidance on the contemplative process was being misinterpreted, that he later had to restrain his followers from becoming too intense in their contemplation.

The next essay is by Yehoshua Mondshine, on the fluidity of categories in hassidism, as seen in the teachings of Rabbi Zevi Elimelekh of Dynow, whose *Benei Yisakhar* is a hassidic classic. That rabbi has, for instance, a flexible attitude about obeying the Torah, as a reaction to the rigidity of the mitnaggedim in that respect. There was much debate on this issue by various rabbis; Rabbi Asher of Karlin 'wrote to one of his followers who wanted to dedicate himself to his studies rather than work, telling him that to work for his livelihood, and so to be in a position to give charity and support to others, was better for him than weeks and years of studying Torah' (p. 308). Mondshine lays great stress on the fluidity of categories in hassidism — which is of course the subject of his essay, as

seen in its title — and illustrates that aspect of hassidic teaching in illuminating examples of the statements of various hassidic leaders instructing their students and followers. These are summarized in a brief but enlightening Appendix to his article (pp. 316–20).

The next essay is by Yoseph Salmon on Rabbi Naphtali Zevi of Ropczyce, known as ‘the Ropshitzer’ (1760–1827). There are many legends about that rabbi’s conversion to hassidism; he was related by kinship to two of the most famous Jewish theologians of his time, who actively opposed the hassidic movement. Salmon goes into some detail about the various tales of the conversion of the Ropshitzer to hassidism, and considers which is the most probable version. What is indisputable is that the opponents of the hassidic movement, the mitnaggedim, were very harsh in their opposition and that the Ropshitzer’s own brother, Rabbi Jacob Yukel, to the end of his life was among those who showed such hostility. Salmon tells us that the Ropshitzer was ambivalent towards the mitnaggedim: he sometimes refused to condemn them for their active rejection of hassidism, while at other times he spoke harshly about them, asserting that the zaddikim were ‘the true leaders of the generation and it is on their account that the world exists’ and is reported as saying that the belief that the mitnaggedim would return to the world in the shape of dogs was true (p. 326). Indeed, the Ropshitzer was said to be endowed with the magical and para-psychological talents of the Besht: he was said to have the power to destroy the enemies of the Jews, to exorcize evil spirits, ‘and to gain access to secret knowledge’ (p. 334).

Part Five of the volume is entitled ‘The Hasidic Tale’. The first essay in that section is by Gedaliah Nigal, who stresses that the most salient feature of hassidic tales centres on the powers of miracle workers, and that since at least the gaonic period these men were known as *ba’alei Shem* — masters of the divine name — a title which has been conferred to the Besht. In the next essay, Karl Erich Grozinger considers two versions of tales relating to the Besht, one in Yiddish and the other in Hebrew, in 1814 and 1815. The Hebrew version tends to refrain from stressing the magical feats of the Besht while in another tale, the Yiddish text states that the time was not right for the coming of the Messiah, and the Hebrew version steers clear of the subject. Grozinger then notes that an American version, propagated by the Lubavitch hassidim, states that the Besht was ‘the charismatic teacher of a new approach to Jewish faith’, without reference to his being a miracle-worker.

Part Six is concerned with Hassidic historiography. Israël Bartal, in the first of the essays in this section, strongly condemns those who sought to belittle the role of the maskilim (the members of the Jewish Enlightenment, the Haskalah); he blames the neo-romantics and the nationalist historiographers for not giving due praise to maskilim who were scholars and who — although hostile to hassidism — have provided us with most valuable data on the hassidim and on the development of

## HASSIDISM REAPPRAISED

the hassidic movement. The next essay is by Jacob Barnai who analyses the historiography of hassidic immigration to the Holy Land, especially to Safed and to Tiberias, in the eighteenth century. Various motives have been advanced for that immigration: a mystic desire to settle in the Promised Land, as was the case of the earlier Sabbataean movement; or a belief in the messianic coming; or a search for personal redemption; or to flee from the persecutions which hassidim endured in Poland at the hands of the mitnaggedim; or to escape from the poverty which prevailed among Polish Jews. The author does not believe that any of these theories has been conclusively proved, but he does reject the claim by religious Zionists that the hassidim were their spiritual ancestors.

The next contribution is by Moshe Idel: it is a critical appraisal of Martin Buber's and Gershom Scholem's views of hassidism. According to him, Buber was interested mainly in the religious characteristics of a certain type of mysticism and only then in the genesis of hassidism — while Scholem's interest is mainly historical. However, both men were in agreement that hassidism was a response to a great spiritual crisis, after the decline of Sabbateanism and of Frankism (p. 391). After analysing in some detail the attitudes of the two famous scholars to hassidism, Idel sets out his own theory: 'I should now like to propose a panoramic approach. Its thrust is that hasidism cannot be understood as a reaction to any physical or spiritual crisis but rather as the result primarily of the interaction between a long series of paradigmatic spiritual concepts and a variety of social factors' (p. 397). Idel does then write about the spiritual concepts and refers to the writings of the Maharal of Prague but says little about the social factors. He also does not give much space to the magico-religious factors in hassidism.

However, that is remedied by the contribution by Chone Shmeruk, entitled 'Yitzhak Schiper's Study of Hasidism in Poland'. Schiper was an authority on the history of Polish Jewry and was imprisoned in the Warsaw ghetto, where he continued his writings on hassidism. In 1943, he was in the Majdanek camp, where he died. Some of his notebooks were later discovered and Shmeruk was able to read the text and the introduction to the book, published by Z. Targielski, a student of Hebrew at Warsaw University, who had found the notebooks. Schiper argued that it was the practical rather than the philosophical aspects of hassidism which attracted Polish Jewry and according to Shmeruk, by practical aspects, Schiper meant 'such elements as healing, atonement for sins, ecstatic prayer, joy in worship, and a negative attitude to scholasticism' (p. 406).

Part Seven of the volume, entitled 'Contemporary Hasidism' consists of two essays. The first is a stimulating contribution by Joseph Dan: 'Hasidism: The Third Century'. The third century of hassidism began in about the middle of the twentieth century. Joseph Dan asserts that hassidism has moved with the times and made a total adjustment to

modern technology and to the mass media as well as to the politics of democracy, while maintaining its traditional identity. The strict code of dress has been preserved so that it 'provides subtle differentiation of particular hasidic affiliation' and is 'something of a military uniform' (p. 422). The other essay in that section is by Daniel Meijers, who writes about a community of mitnaggedim in Jerusalem which was founded after the Second World War by the 'Brisker rav', Rabbi Soloveichik (1886-1959). For that sect, the most essential requirement is the study of Torah 'and there is practically no one in the community who is not intellectually able to devote himself exclusively to the study of Torah' (p. 431), while for the hassidim, the Almighty may be found in all activities, even the most mundane. The present reviewer, who has carried out fieldwork among hassidim for several decades, wonders whether the comparison between a small group of mitnaggedim and the hassidic communities is apt: the former are a limited and elitist segment whereas the hassidim have been going from strength to strength.

The final part of the volume is a brief overview of the present state of research on hassidism. There are two essays; the first is by Arthur Green who is concerned with early hassidism and who claims that 'contemporary scholarship has negated almost all the once clearly established answers' to the questions of the origins of hassidism and of its success (p. 441). This is a sweeping comment but it is admittedly true that recent studies have provided some new outlooks on the past story of hassidism. The other contribution in that final section is by Immanuel Etkes, whose subject is the past trends and the new directions of hassidism. He asserts that Scholem, Tishby, and Joseph Weiss himself have overestimated the affinities between Sabbateanism and hassidism.

The present volume is undoubtedly of great value for our knowledge of hassidism. But it is regrettable that the role of hassidic leaders as *ba'alei Shem* (miracle-workers) since the days of the founder himself, the Besht, is not given more discussion by the contributors. That function of a charismatic *rebbe* is very much still alive nowadays among hassidic communities. In particular, the present state of hassidism is generally not given much prominence, and even the economic conditions of the time when hassidism emerged and gained adherents are given some space only in a few of the essays.

Both the large and the small courts of hassidic leaders, whether in Israel, in Montreal, or in New York would be very worthy of study. It is to be hoped that new 'reappraisals' will be sponsored in the near future, based on proper ethnographic fieldwork, carried out in depth — and not based on superficial and facile newspaper journalism. Hassidism is a remarkable movement: after the Shoah, it was believed that it was also doomed to disappear but in the event, hassidism attracted growing numbers of adherents and it has expanded beyond all expectations.



# ESSENTIAL OUTSIDERS: CHINESE AND JEWS

Harold Pollins

(*Review Article*)

DANIEL CHIROT and ANTHONY REID, eds., *Essential Outsiders: Chinese and Jews in the Modern Transformation of Southeast Asia and Central Europe*, vii + 333 pp., University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997, n.p. (paperback).

WHETHER or not it is sensible to select two very different minorities, chosen on the basis that they have been 'remarkably successful as . . . entrepreneurial and professional minorit[ies]', as the blurb pronounces, must remain a matter of opinion. There is, however, a more important problem about the book and its objectives. The blurb again: 'The essays in this book explore the reasons why the Jews in Central Europe and the Chinese in Southeast Asia have been both successful and stigmatized, essential but not fully accepted'. That approach is confirmed in the sub-title of the book. I took that to mean that the eleven essays would deal with the economic importance of these two minorities. The emphasis would be *economic* because the phrase 'entrepreneurial minorities' appears frequently, and Part Four is entirely devoted to Chinese business. One might expect some statistics to demonstrate 'importance' and perhaps even a counterfactual approach — aiming to test some such proposition as that economic development in the countries examined would have been different, possibly at a lower rate, if there had been no Jews in Central Europe or Chinese in Southeast Asia. Thus could be measured, or at least indicated, how important the two minorities were.

Generally, though, there are few statistics; the significance of the two groups is taken for granted. In chapter 5, 'Jewish Entrepreneurship and Identity under Capitalism and Communism in Central Europe: the Unresolved Dilemmas of Hungarian Jewry', Victor Karady states baldly: 'Jews formed either the main entrepreneurial class or a major component of it during the period when capitalist market economies were established in the region extending from Germany and Switzerland in the west to historic Russia in the east' (p. 125). He supports this by reference to a

number of studies: by Hillel Levine on Poland; the volume of essays on Hungary edited by Michael Silber; and the works by, or edited by Yehuda Don and Karady himself.<sup>1</sup> Yet Karady's definition of entrepreneurial groups is very wide: 'including traders, industrialists, professionals, and other "independent" members of learned classes'. Admittedly this definition is not unusual, but it can lead to difficulties. It includes, *inter alia*, certain artisans and trades people. Does that mean that the Jewish entrepreneurs who are said to have played such an important role in those economies range from major industrialists and Jews in the *arendas* system (whereby they would lease or manage an estate) to a self-employed peddling glazier? One would have thought a basic feature of entrepreneurship must be some minimum (largish) quantity of capital or the ability to control economic activities.

We can leave those points to one side, for in at least two of the essays there is some discussion of the reasons for minority economic success — Karady (pp. 128ff) on Jews and Gary G. Hamilton and Tony Waters in their chapter, 'Ethnicity and Capitalist Development: The Changing Role of the Chinese in Thailand'. The latter refer to the five reasons that sociologists usually give for minority success, 'advantages conferred by the conditions of ethnicity and minority status'. First, being 'strangers' and socially marginal they can work the market more easily than can those who are embedded in the social order. Second, they are temporary migrants, even if their transience may last for several generations, and so do not integrate into society. Instead, they invest in hard work and defer their gratification rather than invest in social status within the host society. Third, they create close-knit networks which result in reduced risk and thus greater economic success.

Those three advantages arise from their minority status. Two others are products of the minority group's interaction with the majority. First, the occupational structure of the host society allows the minority to occupy certain economic roles which are essential but difficult to fill and the minority monopolizes them. There is created a middleman minority. Second, a dominant political group may bestow economic privileges on minorities while denying them access to political power (pp. 258–60).

Hamilton and Towers think such explanations too broad and over-generalized since they do not explain why only some minorities appear to be successful while others are not. They might perhaps have added that generalizations about the role of some minorities, such as Jews and Chinese, may need modifying. It is not irrelevant to observe that in Britain, the first country to industrialize and to become a major capitalist country, the 'outsiders' who played a major role were Christian Nonconformists. It is they who appear in the historical literature of the Industrial Revolution, at a time when the Jewish population of Britain was small and the majority were poor, or at most were sufficiently upwardly mobile only to become small shopkeepers. Generalizations on

## CHINESE AND JEWS

the economic role of Jews in the process of modernization would need to bear British experience in mind.

Hamilton and Towers extend their criticisms to those explanations which centre on the particular qualities of the minority. They include, for the Chinese, 'a high regard for education, hard work, and obedience, a precocious ability to handle money, and a Confucian emphasis on self-discipline and family welfare' (p. 260). But they insist that all these explanations, while significant, do not take into account the institutional and organizational variations that the Chinese have encountered. One can readily apply the same argument to the Jews in Central Europe. Incidentally, K. S. Jomo, in his chapter on Malaysia, dismisses the supposed significance of Confucianism, *inter alia* noting that it used to be blamed for the economic backwardness of the Chinese. 'Nevertheless, because of the hegemonic influence of Western academia, a generation of culturalists has been rediscovering Confucianist influences throughout East Asia, often to the amusement of East Asians themselves' (p. 237).

These topics touch one of the two approaches in the book, a duality described by Daniel Chirot, one of the editors, in the first chapter: 'Conflicting Identities and the Dangers of Communalism'. As well as raising 'venerable but still relevant controversies about why certain ethnic groups seem able to adapt more successfully to modern capitalist societies than others' (p. 3) there are 'insights about the very formation of ethnic and nationalist identities, and clues about when such a process is more or less likely to lead to either violent social separation and conflict or peaceful accommodation'. That is to say, these discussions are within the mainstream of ethnic relations and they may or may not have anything to do with economic matters.

Presumably it was mainly the latter that the editors had in mind when they write that during the conference at which the papers in this volume were given, 'we were all awakened early in the morning by the January 1994 earthquake that jolted southern California and caused so much damage in Los Angeles. This may have been a sign of how dangerous the ground on which we were treading really is' (p. vii). Several contributors to this book, in discussing the relationship between the economy and ethnic relations, ponder what would happen if the Asian economic miracle faltered. Daniel Chirot points to the dangers that can arise when there is competition between 'different culturally defined groups if those groups become fixed hereditary categories . . . [in that case] distrust of communities other than one's own becomes more or less inevitable . . . An expanding economy may accommodate the resulting tensions for a while, but communal thinking and bargaining will so dominate political thinking that in times of retrenchment or exacerbated competition, communal hatreds, jealousies, and fears must come to the fore' (p. 29). More specifically he wrote of Southeast Asia: 'The Chinese minorities are playing such a large role in the economic transformation there that

they could easily become targets of those frustrated by some of the changes taking place . . . There may one day be serious economic or political reverses to the recent progress' (p. 27). In 1998, four years after the conference where the papers were delivered, it happened; the 'tiger' economies were in trouble. One consequence was that in some countries, notably Indonesia, Chinese businesses were attacked by the mob and many Chinese were killed and injured.

*I*

The eleven chapters are arranged in four Parts. Part One, entitled 'Similarities and Disparities: An Introduction to the Comparison of Entrepreneurial Minorities', contains two general chapters by each of the two editors. Daniel Chirot bases his discussion to some extent on the nine chapters which are case-studies and aims to produce some generalizations. But he is keen to show that some traditional explanations of antisemitism and anti-Sinicism (or should that really be antisinicism?) do not necessarily apply to the studies reported in the book. Six of the eleven chapters centre on the Chinese minorities: two refer to Thailand; one each to the Philippines, Java, and Malaysia; and the sixth is a more general concluding essay covering the various countries. Two chapters are on Jews in Vienna and Hungary and a third covers several countries. We can look first at the studies of Southeast Asia.

Although it is the last chapter in the book, that by Linda Y. C. Lim and L. A. Peter Gosling, 'Strengths and Weaknesses of Minority Status for Southeast Asian Chinese at a Time of Economic Growth and Liberalization' is a useful starting-point. First, it notes that the area exhibits a combination of ethnic and religious diversity combined with inter-ethnic peace and rapid economic growth. Another general statement is that in traditional Southeast Asian culture, profit-seeking trade was best undertaken by outsiders. Since they were not part of the social fabric, they could absorb the social tension that haggling might produce. It is another example of the 'middleman minority' thesis. Europeans encouraged the Chinese: they were useful to the colonial economies and because of their small numbers they did not pose a threat to the colonial powers. More recently, though, the Chinese have changed by rediscovering their Chinese roots and by not being afraid to flaunt their wealth.

They briefly look at the situation in the various countries which are spelled out in greater detail in the individual case-studies. There are two complementary chapters on Thailand. That by Hamilton and Waters, mentioned above, gives a run-through of Thai economic history in which the Chinese have been significant players for a long period, for many years indeed as 'privileged insiders'. However, in the early part of the century the monarchy adopted western political practices and this was accompanied by hostility towards the Chinese minority.

## CHINESE AND JEWS

They indicate the changing relationships between Thais and Chinese, showing how the latter have adapted to the changes. The story is brought up to date; the constant factor has been the persistent economic success of the Chinese. Surprisingly, in view of the authors' earlier insistence on the need to study institutional and structural matters in order fully to understand minority economic roles, they end by arguing that since the Chinese are successful everywhere, 'Local histories, even a succession of local histories, cannot explain what is, after all, a general occurrence' (p. 277).

The second Thai essay is by Kasian Tejapira: 'Imagined Uncommunity: The *Lookjin* Middle Class and Thai Official Nationalism'. He deals in a little more detail with the twentieth-century growth of Thai nationalism and its consequences for the Chinese minority. He is a university lecturer and 'also a noted journalist and was formerly a radical activist and guerrilla fighter in the jungle of northeastern Thailand' (p. 319). So his vocabulary is not surprising in his description of Field Marshal Plaek Phibunsongkhram, who was Prime Minister for most of the 1940s and 1950s, as 'the führer and pioneer of Thai militaristic statism'. Nevertheless, his chapter is otherwise quite 'academic' in tone. Thai nationalism, conceived by King Vajiravudh (1910-25), is 'narrowly based on the Thai race and is politically centered on and arbitrarily defined by the state' (p. 76). In the process the Chinese, now the arch enemy, were compared by the king to the Jews, reminiscent of antisemitic language in Europe.

The Thai word *Lookjin*, which literally means 'Chinese descendants', is used in this essay, the author tells us, to refer to people of Chinese blood who were born in Thailand. They seldom have any knowledge of the Chinese language, often have Thai names, and many have Thai marriage partners. But since the 1960s, in a period of economic growth, the *Lookjin* have become more self-conscious of their Chinese background and have taken a leading role in economic development. Yet they still have little place in the political system.

While in Thailand there was essentially a bipolar relationship, in the other countries studied here — Java, the Philippines, and Malaysia — the relationships were complicated by the presence of a European colonial power; or, in the case of the Philippines, two: Spain at first and then the United States. Edgar Wickberg, in 'Anti-Sinicism and Chinese Identity Options in the Philippines', explores the country's colonial history showing, for example, that whereas Spain's cultural mission was 'to Catholicize and hispanicize, the Americans [aimed] to create a modern Philippine nation with popular education in English and with American democratic ideals and institutions' (p. 163). But the Chinese in the Philippines were also affected by events in China, notably the Japanese invasion in 1931, resulting in an upsurge of support for the mainland. This occurred despite the fact that at the same time Filipino

policy was to redefine citizenship when the USA was withdrawing in the 1930s. Whereas the Americans had imposed the notion of citizenship based on place of birth, it now became based on racial origin. Ethnic Chinese were thus excluded. There are Chinese in the Philippines who are 'part of the global Chinese . . . They happen to be in the Philippines, but they may move elsewhere' (p. 176). Others are of mixed race and are mainly committed to the Philippines, as shown by their use of English. Yet whoever they are, they are not fully integrated into society even though technically they are citizens (granted in 1975 by Ferdinand Marcos, in association with his opening of relations with mainland China).

Takashi Shiraishi, in 'Anti-Sinicism in Java's New Order', begins brusquely and precisely: 'Violent, popular anti-Sinicism came to Dutch Java in the early 1910s' (p. 187). He quotes a somewhat complacent report of 1908 that there was no nationalist Javanese threat to Dutch rule nor was anti-Sinicism worrying, although there were some signs of Chinese nationalism as well as of Javanese self-awareness. He pinpoints the onset of hostility towards the Chinese by reference to the creation late in 1911 of the Sarekat Islam, a native national movement. There were riots between Muslims and Chinese in 1912. At the same time as the movement was spreading rapidly, the Chinese were influenced by the Chinese revolution of 1911.

Strangely, before these events there had appeared to be improvements in race relations. (Indeed, most of the essay deals with events before this period.) On the one hand the position of the Chinese had been eased by the extension to them of Dutch civil law. And a number of restrictions on their activities had been removed. Why then the great upsurge of popular anti-Chinese feelings in Java? One view of Dutch officials was that the Chinese had become 'arrogant' after the Chinese revolution of 1911. But the author points out that there was no such popular echo in Siam nor in British Malaya, even though in the latter country Chinese nationalist politics was more active than in Southeast Asia. He says that a second explanation which was proffered by Dutch officials, and accepted by historians, is more plausible but flawed. It was that the Sarekat Islam was primarily established in order that the native bourgeoisie could meet the commercial competition of the Chinese. Thus being anti-Chinese formed a natural consequence. The author looks for more profound explanations. He finds some comparisons with the history of the Jews in Poland and Romania partly relevant. The Dutch were aiming to modernize and the Chinese were in practice in the way of the growth of a native middle class. He summarizes: 'They were no longer needed as the state's financiers, they became vulnerable to violent popular hatred, and they were politically powerless even as they became an economically prosperous "middleman" minority in a society neatly structured along racial lines and dominated by a modern bureaucratic state and modern corporate capitalism' (p. 190).

K. S. Jomo's chapter, 'A Specific Idiom of Chinese capitalism in Southeast Asia: Sino-Malaysian Capital Accumulation in the Face of State Hostility', deals with a former British colony which became independent in the mid-1950s. It shows that generally policy has been geared in favour of the Malays to redress the imbalance of earlier years. The inclusion of other territories into Malaysia extended the policy to embrace their indigenous populations, all becoming known as Bumiputeras. While they have undoubtedly prospered the Chinese have nevertheless participated in economic development. The author notes, as do other authors, a growth of Chinese self-awareness, and concludes with a brief statement about the reality of what he calls a 'Chinese business idiom'. It exists, he suggests, generally in Southeast Asia, 'based on a kind of resistance to state control and the sense that ethnic discrimination is either an existing or at least a potential threat' (p. 253).

That chimes with the view expressed by Lim and Gosling about the underlying and potential sources of inter-ethnic hostility (pp. 292-293). They refer to the disproportionate benefits of economic growth going to an alien ethnic minority; to the perception of lessened Chinese loyalty to their country of residence compared with their growing cultural and economic ties with other Chinese communities; and the uncertainty in the post-cold-war era of mainland China, notably its economic policies towards Southeast Asia. Such pessimistic tones would not doubt be more greatly emphasized in the light of the more recent economic turmoil in that area.

## II

Three chapters centre on the Jews of Central Europe. Unlike those on the Chinese, they refer mainly to the past. Hillel J. Kieval's 'Middleman Minorities and Blood: Is There a Natural Economy of the Ritual Murder Accusation in Europe?' ends with the First World War. The dates in Steven Beller's, "'Pride and Prejudice" or "Sense and Sensibility"? How Reasonable Was Anti-Semitism in Vienna, 1880-1939?', indicate its scope. The one substantial surviving Jewish community in Central Europe, that of Hungary, allows Victor Karady to touch upon the post-Second World War period.

The two topics in Hillel J. Kieval's essay — middleman minorities and ritual murder accusations — might appear at first sight to be strange bedfellows. (He considers the strange upsurge in modern documented accusations against Jews of ritual murder, mostly in the 1890s but lasting from the early 1880s, at Tiszaeslar, Hungary, to the perhaps best-known case of Beilis in Kiev in 1911-13.) Kieval begins with a discussion of theories of middleman minorities, notably that, in its various forms, produced by Edna Bonacich. He posits a number of objections to such theories and, before examining the ritual murder cases, briefly looks at

Hillel Levine's *Economic Origins of Antisemitism: Poland and Its Jews in the Early Modern Period* (1991). Levine provides a link between middleman-minority theories and the blood libel mainly through the fact of Jews as innkeepers in Poland. The institutional factor was the *propinacja* system whereby the lord had a monopoly of the manufacture and sale of vodka, Jews acting as leaseholders.

Kieval makes seven objections to interpretations which 'assign a natural economy to ethnic conflict, and to accusations of Jewish ritual murder specifically' (pp. 218-19). He mentions, among others, the lack of attention paid to teachings in churches, the need to have more detailed local studies in addition to general descriptions of socio-economic crisis, and not least the tendency of students of the phenomena to accept published and probably tendentious accounts. His own conclusion about the late nineteenth century ritual murder accusations is that they were a move away from myth and premodern stereotypes and were less religious in tone. Instead, the attacks on Jews were more 'scientific', involving such detractors as physicians and criminologists. In an allusion to Levine's work he ends his chapter with the statement that in the decades immediately preceding the First World War, the blood libel's 'connection to premodern economic exchange seems almost to have been trivial' (p. 226).

The second of the essays on Jews is Steven Heller's on Vienna. Despite the length of the period in the title (1880-1939) it is mainly about the latter part of the nineteenth century. His theme is his objections to the view that sees antisemitism as a disease, a virus. He does not agree with the notion that it is thus irrational, the disease coming to the fore in times of tensions in society. He prefers the idea that 'what often decided whether anti-Semitism made sense or not depended on the presence of Jews in society and the role they played within it' (p. 101). He does this by using the themes of Jane Austen's novels. *Pride and Prejudice* is about the experiences of strangers, and *Sense and Sensibility* is a story about the social consequences of the conflict between rationalism and romanticism' (p. 101). He goes into many details but in essence this is just another exposition of interactionism. His arguments are interesting and subtle but there is a curiosity, with echoes of other views in the book, about the notion of 'strangers' or 'outsiders'. He notes that around 1900 there were very few 'natives' in Vienna. Many Viennese came from non-German-speaking ancestry — perhaps one third were Czech. 'Everyone', he says, 'was assimilating into the city's culture, not just the Jews. In reality, the Jews were no more "foreigners" than everyone else' (p. 116). But in practice they were defined as the foreigners and non-Jews could define themselves by establishing what they were not. Consequently, since Jews were proportionately over-represented in the economy, the professions, and the arts, this was seen as an unfair advantage. The economic crisis of 1873 in particular brought things to a head. The author is arguing that



## CHINESE AND JEWS

antisemitism can be seen as a rational exercise, as against its description as a disease. In an important if brief aside he compares the adverse consequences of economic problems in Vienna with what (at the date of his paper) might happen if the economy faltered in Southeast Asia — the Chinese in the various territories being seen as having an unfair advantage over the indigenous population.

Victor Karady, on Hungarian Jewry, concentrates mainly on the post-1945 period, although he prefaces his remarks with some general statements about the Jews' historic economic role in Eastern Europe generally. But he also looks at aspects of the relations between Jews and Hungarians in the nineteenth century. His essay moreover indicates the necessity of locating the study of minority groups within the individual circumstances of each society. Most of those who survived the Shoah in Eastern European countries emigrated. This was mainly because of popular antisemitism, often exploited by communist leaders. There was less of it in Hungary and under Janos Kadar (1956–88) it was suppressed.

The author also makes the point that the Shoah affected different parts of Hungarian Jewry. The rural areas were hardest hit and a high proportion of those in Budapest sought conversion to avoid deportation. The consequences were that the remnant consisted of a high proportion of independent entrepreneurs and professionals — higher than in the general population. Admittedly part of the explanation was the antisemitic legislation of 1938–44 which led to many becoming self-employed because of restrictions on the employment of Jews. Thus after 1945 Hungarian Jewry was both bourgeois and assimilated. Yet the new communist regime's policies went counter to the entrepreneurial/professional classes. This was disastrous for many but for others there were new opportunities if they fell in with the communist system.

However, Karady brings the story to the present, briefly indicating the changes in attitudes towards Judaism and Zionism from the end of the war in 1945 to the end of communism in 1989, and subsequently. One consequence has been a recrudescence of Zionism and Judaism, but also of Hungarian nationalism among Jews. He concludes: 'Assimilation into the Hungarian nation and the promotion of a distinct Jewish identity again appear as viable options, as they did a hundred years ago' (p. 146).

This volume of essays needs to be seen as a series of disparate studies in the field of ethnic relations concentrating on two distinctive minority groups. The notion of the possibility of producing generalizations from them (for example, that the Chinese are successful in whatever country they reside) is countered by the very clear conclusion that one can make better sense of the material by pursuing local/country studies. Perhaps in the long run an adequate number of such studies might enable useful general statements and theories to be put forward. At the moment, it seems, we must locate our information within specific national contexts.

HAROLD POLLINS

NOTE

<sup>1</sup> Hillel Levine, *Economic Origins of Antisemitism: Poland and its Jews in the Early Modern Period*, 1991; Michael Silber (ed.), *Jews in the Hungarian Economy, 1760–1945*, 1992; Yehuda Don and Victor Karady (eds.), *Social and Economic History of Central European Jewry*, 1990.

## BOOK REVIEWS

C. C. ARONSFELD, *Wanderer From My Birth*, xi+324 pp., Janus Publishing Company, London, 1997, £9.90 (paperback).

Caesar Casper Aronsfeld begins the Preface to his autobiography by stating: 'This will be judged the story of a nobody . . . a scrap of flotsam that was whirled around bits of Europe' (p. ix). On the other hand he has by no means been unknown, especially to the Jewish community in Britain as well as elsewhere. He was associated with the Wiener Library for nearly 30 years and then with the Institute of Jewish Affairs. He edited *Patterns of Prejudice*. He has been active in other ways.

These are the memoirs of a man born in 1910 in Exin, near Bromberg, in the province of Posen which was then Prussian and is now Polish. The population of 4,000 consisted of some 3,000 Roman Catholics who were Poles, 800 Protestants (mainly Germans), and 200 Jews. The Germans and Jews always joined together in elections to vote against the Polish candidate. The family spoke German, not Yiddish, and after the First World War all the Germans in the area were offered the choice of either adopting Polish nationality or to remain Germans and leave. His father was a patriotic German so the family, like most of the Germans, left. They settled in Berlin.

In the Preface he states that he first thought of a title for his book along the lines of 'Against the Current' until he found it had been used by Sir Isaiah Berlin. He explains this early choice because, he says: "'Against the Current'" has always been my instinctive impulse when considering the opinions held by the majority' (p. x). Whatever the reason for the origin of his attitude it was undoubtedly why, having observed and studied the rise of Nazism — he read *Mein Kampf* — he left Germany, for good, within weeks of Hitler's coming to power in 1933. He might well have come to England anyway but by chance he had earlier met an Englishman in Germany who invited Aronsfeld to Britain.

He has some interesting descriptions of his immediate experiences in London and with the Jewish refugee organizations, including their clear objective of encouraging emigration to a third country; Brazil was one such possibility, as was Kenya. At any rate they were supposed to train in order to obtain proficiency in a craft, partly to reduce the number of Jews entering the professions (and so avoid the antisemitic accusation of Jews overloading them) and partly in some cases as preparation for emigration to Palestine. He chose to become a sewing-machine mechanic.

## BOOK REVIEWS

In Leeds, the clothing centre where he trained, he spent time, inter alia, writing letters to the *Yorkshire Post*, a newspaper of repute which was anti-Nazi. But he soon took up the post which was to occupy him for nearly three decades at what is now the Wiener Library. During the Second World War, when it was transferred from Amsterdam to England, the Library's function of collecting and disseminating information about the Nazis was officially considered work of national importance and its documentation was used for the purposes of psychological warfare.

Although Aronsfeld ended up as Wiener's second-in-command, he did not take over after Wiener died. He explains that he was an assistant, not a person who directs. He worked instead for the Institute of Jewish Affairs. He has much to say on the individuals he met and some of the behind-the-scenes manoeuvres — for instance over the relations between the Wiener Library and the Parkes Library, formed by Rev. James Parkes. There was talk of merging the two institutions but nothing came of it in Aronsfeld's time.

This is not a straightforward autobiography for he interrupts his narrative with his thoughts on a variety of subjects. They are mainly in keeping with the sentiments he expresses in his Preface: 'Dissidence happens to be part of a Jewish tradition and I would find it disturbing were my views ever seen in harmony with an (even Jewish) majority at any one time'. (p. x) So we find a criticism of the writings of Rashi, an article entitled 'Nonsense Commentaries', one of several pieces he wrote on the subject of Bible commentators which, he says, 'were firmly kept out of the Jewish press' (p. 128). He refers to his published views after the Second World War when he thinks he was probably among the first Jews in England to make the point that not all Germans were guilty. As one would expect from the stance he adopts, he finds much to criticize in religious orthodoxy as well as in certain aspects of Israeli life and politics.

Aronsfeld is a fluent writer. The book is an easy read. He has interesting things to say on a variety of topics and events from the 1920s (Weimar Germany) for well over the ensuing six decades. His description of his experiences as a young refugee in England in the earliest years of the Hitler regime is especially illuminating. But the whole is well worth reading, even if he does tend towards an overuse of quotations.

HAROLD POLLINS

JEAN-CHRISTOPHE ATTIAS and ESTHER BENBASSA, *Israël Imaginaire*, 392 pp., Flammarion, Paris, 1998, 120 French francs.

It is rare to come across a work on Jewish history which breaks so much new ground or which so successfully conceals the scholarship that has made it possible. The theme is one which has been given new relevance by the ramifications of the Middle East peace process and the deep

## BOOK REVIEWS

divisions in Israeli society over what sacrifices of land are a proper price to pay for peace. But the roots go back to the extraordinary, indeed unique, experience of the Jewish people from biblical times. It was a people originating from outside the land of Israel and who believed that it was the will of God which gave them possession of it after Joshua's conquests. But the union of people and land was not a permanent one. The kingdom of David and Solomon came to an end, and the centre of Jewish life was then among the Babylonian exiles. The restoration of the Jews to the land and the construction of the Second Temple ended with a wider dispersion after the Roman suppression of the last vestiges of Jewish secular authority.

As we know, this was not the end of the story although from time to time, many thought that it was. Until the beginning of Zionist colonization not much more than a century ago, the Jews in the Holy Land were a tiny minority. But the Jewish people had undergone in the Diaspora a variety of experiences — many tragic but some fortunate and leading to an efflorescence of Jewish culture: for instance, in Moorish Spain and later in Eastern Europe as well as in some centres in the Arab world. Throughout this period of exile, the image of a Holy Land and of Zion as its capital figures largely in the Jewish liturgy and the Jewish imagination. Even the least observant of Jews is familiar with 'Next Year in Jerusalem'. But what, over nearly two millennia, did the Jews think of the land whose images their prayers invoked? How seriously did they take the possibility of a literal return and how far was the land a metaphor for a godly state? It is this question which the two authors elucidate through their study of prayer and ritual and the literature that developed alongside them.

The authors make another compelling point. Hebrew has of course two words for land: *eretz*, a geographical stretch marked by boundaries, and *adama*, the soil itself from which man draws his sustenance. In most of the Jewish communities of the Diaspora, the soil and its demands were absent. Jews generally — either because of legal obstacles or from habit — engaged in all kinds of occupations other than agriculture. What the Zionists did was to bring *eretz* and *adama* together so that the fructifying of the land became part of the ideology of the Return — for the non-religious element in the *aliyah*, a major part.

How the exiles imagined the land itself when the experience of those from Eastern Europe might have been of frosts and snows and what impact was made upon them by discovering the difference between what they knew of land and what they found is again important for understanding both those who succeeded in their land to which they had 'returned' and those who failed and sought asylum elsewhere.

Or again, how does the revival of classical Hebrew as a spoken language and the culture based on its exploitation explain the divergences between those who wished the new Jewish State to be a state like any

## BOOK REVIEWS

other and those for whom its people were the bearers of a universal message?

So important is the light this approach throws on Jewish history and the problems of the Jewish present that one must hope that the book will be translated into English — the language of the largest and most influential part of the Diaspora. Given the co-operation shown to the authors by Israeli scholars, a Hebrew translation should be a matter of course.

MAX BELOFF

SYLVIA KEDOURIE, ed., *Elie Kedourie CBE, FBA 1926–1992. History, Philosophy, Politics*, xii + 132 pp., Frank Cass, London and Portland, Oregon, 1998, n.p.

The contributors to this memorial volume are unanimous in their admiration for Elie Kedourie. Cynics might comment that in a memorial work edited by his widow, only praise would be expected or included. However, in this case there is no doubt that all those who reflected on their friendship, or on their encounters, with Elie Kedourie had been impressed by his scholarship, his incisiveness, his integrity, his wit, or his kindness — and sometimes by all these virtues. Most of them look back in awe at his scholarly achievements and some have commented on his reserve and distaste for gossip or professional intrigue.

The Editor states in her Foreword: 'Contributors to this volume worked independently of one another and did not have access to what each was writing. Consequently there is bound to be overlapping of material, but I decided to leave each essay as written in order not to break the flow of the argument'. The overlapping, unavoidable in the circumstances, soon becomes evident. For instance, several of the authors refer briefly, or in some detail, to Elie Kedourie's decision to withdraw his doctorate thesis when he was at St. Antony's College in Oxford. (Alan Beattie tells us that the 'fruits of his doctoral studies' were later published as *England and the Middle East*.)

Some of the contributions are very brief: Michael Leifer's 'A Personal Note' appears on pages 29–30 and David Pryce-Jones's 'A Master All His Own' on pages 38–39. The most extensive is Alan Beattie's 'Elie Kedourie's Philosophical History' (pp. 109–32); the Editor tells us that Beattie's essay was commissioned by the British Academy and that part of it was published in the *Proceedings of the Academy*, No. 87 (p. xii).

It was refreshing, after many encomiums, to read of one student who stood his ground when he first went to report to his tutor (pp. 59, 60). Noël O'Sullivan tells us that when he was a 19-year-old undergraduate at the London School of Economics, he waited in the corridor outside Elie's room and heard him 'severely castigating a student who had

## BOOK REVIEWS

obviously done an appalling term's work'; that student 'sloped past me, and it was my turn. Elie was still angry. He glared at me and said, "Why haven't I heard from you before?"'. At this I immediately began to feel mildly indignant and irritated . . . and replied, "I am here because I was wondering why I have not heard from you either", at which there was a sort of stalemate'. Elie Kedourie asked him to write an essay. O'Sullivan was doing an Accountancy degree and he complained that he could not understand the terms used in books on comparative politics; asked for an example, he quoted the description by Almond and Coleman of 'a riot as an anomic expression of interest articulation. He immediately shook with laughter . . . I remember him saying that what this meant was that they could not tell the difference between a riot in London and a riot in Bangkok'.

The Editor wisely chose to include in the volume two unpublished items written by Elie Kedourie: 'a short address he gave to a small group of colleagues who entertained him to dinner at his retirement from the LSE. . . . The second is an article based on a public lecture which he gave at Brandeis University in the spring of 1999' (p. xi). That article is entitled 'The Jews of Babylon and Baghdad' and appears on pp. 11-23. The dozen pages contain a wealth of data expressed concisely and elegantly.

Elie Kedourie was for many years a member of the Advisory Board of this Journal and an occasional contributor. When his advice was sought, he read the submitted paper carefully and wrote in his neat handwriting an incisive assessment of the virtues or failings of the author. He never refused to evaluate a contribution; he was not only a great scholar, but also a generous friend.

JUDITH FREEDMAN

BONNIE J. MORRIS, *Lubavitcher Women in America: Identity and Activism in the Postwar Era*, x + 186 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, N.Y., 1998, n.p.

The feminist historian, Bonnie Morris, deals in this book with hassidic women in the Lubavitch sect from 1950 to 1990. Although she does not tell us much about the daily life of women in a hassidic community, her study gives us a valuable insight into the mentality of militant women in a movement which is well-known for its missionary activities among Jews, under the impetus of their famous Rebbe, Menachem Mendel Schneerson (1902-1994).

The author notes that in spite of the fact that 'in a culture that revered learning, female scholarship was suspect, irrelevant' (p. 32), the Lubavitcher established in New York in the 1940s schools for girls (called Beth Rivkah), 'not from any recognizance of female academic ability,

## BOOK REVIEWS

but to strike a balance against the onslaught of secular forces in American education' (p. 38). In 1980 in Crown Heights, Brooklyn, where the Rebbe lived, Beth Rivkah had some 600 pupils. Today, Beth Rivkah pupils study Bible, Midrash, Hebrew, hassidic philosophy, Jewish history, *Shulhan Arukh* (the Code of Jewish Law), the works of Rebbe Schneerson and his predecessors — as well as secular subjects, such as science, mathematics, English, and geography. Moreover, the Rebbe did not hesitate to let women play a role in the outreach programme. After establishing a first yeshiva for male *baalei teshuvah* (those who return to active Orthodox Judaism) in 1962, the Lubavitcher founded a similar yeshiva for women in 1974. The Rebbe was well aware of the emerging feminist movement in the United States and that gave him the incentive to provide a yeshiva for women — since by then female education had become a vital part of Lubavitch culture.

With the blessing and encouragement of the Rebbe (nothing of any importance could occur without the approbation of that leader, who was revered as an anointed one) the female Lubavitcher organized from 1956 onwards annual conventions in the movement's headquarters in Crown Heights. Women came from all parts of the United States as well as from abroad; they numbered about one thousand and the convention lasted for four days. The purpose of those conventions was to concentrate on the missionary aims defined by the Rebbe; but the meetings meant that for four days the women also enjoyed festivities and vacations which were essentially feminine activities. The highlight of the convention was the audience (*yehidus*) with the Rebbe on the Sunday morning, when he addressed directly the assembled women. It was the only opportunity for them to be sitting downstairs in the main Lubavitch synagogue, since that is reserved exclusively for men — as is also usually the case in Orthodox synagogues, where women sit in the gallery.

In 1963, the struggle against feminism became a subject of special preoccupation for the Lubavitch female activists; they claimed again and again that '... Jewish women needed no liberation, and indeed received more recognition in Jewish law than they did in the secular legal system of Western civilization' (p. 62). In pursuit of its missionary activities, the Lubavitch movement started in 1958 a women's quarterly, *Di Yiddishe Heim*, edited by female members. However, most of the articles printed in that publication were written by men who were rabbinic leaders of the Lubavitcher, while the women contributed features about their daily experiences, which confirmed the statements made by the scholars of the movement. The quarterly showed no concern with American politics: it did not refer to the fight for civil rights for Black Americans or to the war in Vietnam; but it did comment on the changing morality of American society. Its readers were encouraged to believe that it was 'only lack of religious education which had enticed young people away from an Orthodox Jewish lifestyle and into protest movements' (p. 84).



## BOOK REVIEWS

However, in spite of that rejection of secular feminism, seeds of the American women's rebellion crept in: *Di Yiddishe Heim* reported in 1983 on a seminar in the course of which there were discussions on the sharing of domestic duties; although all the participants agreed that a wife should help her husband to develop his potential, those among them who were newly married said that they welcomed the assistance of their husbands with domestic chores.

In summary, the Lubavitch women remain submissive to masculine authority: to their fathers, then to their husbands, to the local rabbi, to the Rebbe's assistant, and finally to the Rebbe himself. However, the fact that the Rebbe sought their collaboration for Lubavitch missionary activities, with all that such activities imply — publishing a quarterly magazine, participating in women's conventions, the education of female *baalei teshuvah* in a women's yeshiva, etc. — reflected their increasing social contribution to the Lubavitch movement.

Moreover, in a religious group which includes women who have 'returned' to Orthodox Judaism but who had previously lived outside the hassidic cocoon and often held academic and professional qualifications, the influence of the global context willy nilly penetrates the hassidic community. But so far Lubavitcher women still conform to the role assigned to them by the traditional male perspective of the status of women in Judaism — as do almost all women who are part of other hassidic and ultra-orthodox movements.

JACQUES GUTWIRTH

MILTON SHAIN, *Antisemitism*, vi+124 pp., Bowerdean Publishing Company, London, 1998, n.p.

Milton Shain's short work is part of a series of Bowerdean Briefings, described on the cover as 'short books which explain and clarify complex contemporary subjects, written for non-specialists by experts in their fields'. The author, at the University of Cape Town, has written, inter alia, *The Roots of Antisemitism in South Africa* (1994) but here he takes a much longer and broader view of the subject. Incidentally, he is to be praised for insisting on rejecting the hyphen in the title of his subject, there being no such entity as semitism, to which antisemitism is opposed.

His approach, while infused with theoretical analysis, is mainly historical as the titles of the four chapters indicate: Concepts and Theories; Anti-Judaism; Antisemitism; and Antisemitism since the Holocaust. The intention is to examine how hostility towards the Jews developed over time and the reasons for it as propounded by numerous writers on the subject. His twelve-page bibliography of works in English (one is in Hebrew) includes work published as recently as 1997.

The historical approach is preferred to three major types of theoretical explanations of antisemitism which he examines briefly in the first

## BOOK REVIEWS

chapter: psychoanalytical/psychological — prejudice as a product of pathology; socioeconomic/political — Jews as a target because of discontent and frustration, Jews as the scapegoat (in the process his mask of impartiality between the different views slips and he takes a little swipe at the interactionist approach of such writers as Colin Holmes and Albert S. Lindemann: 'Such explanations come perilously close to blaming the victim' (p. 13)); and cultural/historical explanations — making use of social psychological and cultural studies. In this last group the emphasis is on the notions of 'otherness' and of stereotyping.

While the author prefers the historical approach there is evidence in his book, which he uses, to support some of these explanations. Thus, economic competition is mentioned on several occasions; one important example is that of Poland and Lithuania whose rulers had welcomed Jews, expelled from western countries, notably Germanic ones, to assist in economic growth. By the sixteenth century, in addition to religious accusations of ritual murder and desecration of the host, hostility towards them grew for their role as middlemen and managers, acting on behalf of the nobility. As a result, during the Thirty Years War in the mid-seventeenth century, the Jews became targets. Estimates of Jewish deaths in the war vary between 40,000 and 100,000.

In his exposition the author adopts the stance of those who distinguish between anti-Judaism and antisemitism. The former, the subject of chapter 2, is essentially about the clash between Judaism and Christianity, with side glances at paganism and at Islam. He shows that a simple, linear view of the Middle Ages is inadequate. There were changes over time influenced inter alia by developments within Christianity itself as well as by such factors as economic competition between Jews and Christians. The fourteenth century in particular is identified as a time when Christian hostility increased. One explanation he refers to is that Christianity and Islam were both expanding and on a collision course. Jews, it is said, were regarded as 'acting in collusion with Muslims in a joint attempt to undermine Christendom' (p. 42).

The change to antisemitism from anti-Judaism — 'The secularisation of hatred', p. 48 — can be dated, perhaps, from the Spanish notion of *limpieza de sangre*, purity of blood. This was introduced to identify and to inhibit the *conversos*, those Jews who whether by force or voluntarily had converted to Christianity, many of whom nevertheless secretly practised Judaism. Other writers, such as Jerome Weidman, argue that such notions can be extended, for example, to Martin Luther, whose hostility to Jews he suggests is similarly biological as much as religious. In this view racial antisemitism is not, as has for long been thought, a nineteenth-century phenomenon but can be found as early as the sixteenth. Other writers, however, do not agree with this formulation and stress the persistence of elements of the old anti-Judaism. But there were changes in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries under the impact of the

## BOOK REVIEWS

Enlightenment; one can talk of philosemitism. There was talk of toleration. Except that the objective of such writers as John Toland, a disciple of John Locke, was to extinguish Jewish particularism. Moreover, the rationalists in the Enlightenment attacked religion and thus Judaism. An extreme version of this was produced by Voltaire who argued that Jews, in Milton Shain's words, were 'subversive of European tradition and hoplessly alien' (p. 54). Voltaire was not alone in his attitudes and one important view is that the eighteenth-century *philosophes* laid the foundation for nineteenth-century racial doctrines.

The remainder of the Antisemitism chapter, covering the later nineteenth century up to and including the Holocaust, will be very familiar and the author succinctly covers the major themes. Among other aspects of the discussion, he examines the varying history of antisemitism in different countries, indicating the specific historical context of each. But he does generalize and pays particular attention to Todd Endelman's analysis of 'illiberal anti-modernism' (pp. 74–76). In this view Jews were less tolerated in countries, such as Germany and Austria from the 1870s, where the 'fundamental ideas of bourgeois liberalism . . . failed to attract widespread support': these ideas included religious toleration and equality before the law. Milton Shain obviously applauds this emphasis on ideology rather than, say, Jewish particularism or on material and cultural clashes (here he takes another adverse look at interactionist approaches). That chapter ends with the Holocaust. There will be those who think that a mere half-dozen pages on the subject cannot possibly be adequate. Yet the author does manage to summarize a variety of opinions on its causes without over-simplifying them.

His concluding chapter, on post-Holocaust antisemitism, traces its fluctuations, from its general reduction after 1945 to a recrudescence in some countries, notably after the Six-Day War of 1967, associated with anti-Zionism. In the earlier period the Second Vatican Council in *Nostra aetate* changed the Church's long hostility to Jews by, inter alia, no longer holding all Jews, forever, responsible for the death of Jesus. Since the 1960s, not least associated with the Arab-Israeli conflict, there have been signs of the old hostility. Some of the old medieval slanders have reappeared in Arab propaganda; there are the Holocaust-deniers; and more recently the economic and social turbulence in Russia has led to a more overt antisemitism.

Milton Shain's last paragraph ends depressingly: 'Prejudice and xenophobia, of which antisemitism is a distinctive dimension, appear to be characteristic of the human condition' (p. 105). While the author is quite properly mainly dealing with opinions, ideas, and analysis, as well as actual historical events, I wonder if he has not been over-impressed by the words of recent antisemites. They wound, of course, but one needs to ask: what damage do they do? Opposed to the long history and

## BOOK REVIEWS

persistence of hostility towards Jews is, as he notices briefly, the history of philo-Semitism as well as the growth of toleration in many societies.

The purpose of this short book, to explain and clarify a complex problem — as its series intends — is certainly achieved. It is well within the compass of the non-specialist and also makes a useful teaching aid.

HAROLD POLLINS

## CHRONICLE

The Board of Deputies of British Jews published in 1998 *A Profile of British Jewry. Patterns and trends at the turn of a century* by Marlana Schmool and Frances Cohen. The estimate for the Jewish population in 1996 is given as 283,000; '55% of the estimated Jewish population is female compared with 51% of the general population of England and Wales' (p. 5). The average (median) age at death for Jewish males was 79 and for women, 82. The comparable medians for the general population of England and Wales were 73.6 and 79.6 and the authors conclude that therefore 'Jewish men live 5.4 years longer than the national average and women 2.4 years longer' and they note that the difference in longevity is related to general socio-economic factors. Moreover, the majority of Jews nowadays live in the south of England, where there is a longer life expectancy (p. 6).

The data on Jewish marriages 'is restricted to those celebrated under synagogue auspices in Great Britain'. In 1997, the total number of synagogue marriages was 986, with the majority (581) under Central Orthodox auspices and the smallest number (43) in Sephardi synagogues. The number of circumcisions in 1996 was 1,475 and the estimated number of female births in that year was 1,422, giving a total of 2,897 Jewish births (p. 32).

There were 365 congregations in Great Britain in 1996; more than half (193) are in the Greater London area while Greater Manchester has 41 congregations. The total membership of the 365 synagogues was 93,447. The Masorti (Conservative) synagogue group had six congregations with a total membership of 1,413 and the Sephardim had 15 congregations with a total membership of 3,169. The largest synagogue group was the Mainstream Orthodox, with 191 congregations and a membership of 56,895 (p. 14).

\*

In September 1996, a new Sephardi rabbinical college Beth Yosef College, was established in London; it was announced in June 1998 that the college had ordained its first two rabbis, who received their semichah from the London Beth Din. The founder and principal is Tunisian-born and he stated: 'Our students come from Israel, Iran and Britain and follow the Sephardi tradition' and it is planned that in two or three years the students will achieve semichah from the Jerusalem Beth Din. The principal is also the minister of the Hechal Leah synagogue, whose congregation came mainly from Iran and Azerbaijan, with some members from Aden, Morocco, and Tunisia. Beth Yosef College had financial backing from the Hechal Leah congregation.

\*

The Spring 1998 issue of *Les Cahiers du Judaïsme*, a quarterly published by the Alliance Israélite Universelle in Paris, is the first number of a new series: *Les Nouveaux Cahiers* were published in 1965-97. The first section of the new

## CHRONICLE

issue (pp. 3–77) is entitled 'De Prague à Odessa'; it has articles on Prague; Bratislava; Hungary; Poland; Odessa; and on Lithuania, Ukraine, and Romania. In the article on Hungary, the author (Victor Karady) states that Budapest has the only rabbinic college for traditional Orthodox Judaism, in the whole of Central and Eastern Europe. There are three Jewish lycées, a Jewish weekly, and two Jewish cultural and political periodicals which enjoy a readership also among non-Jews.

The article on Poland is by Paul Zawadzki and states that on Yom Kippur 1997, there were some 300 worshippers in Warsaw's synagogue. A Union of Jewish students was established in 1992 and it had about 150 members in 1997. A Jewish monthly, *Midrasz*, has been launched and it covers a wide field, from sociology and literature to religious commentaries, as well as giving news of Jewish provincial communities in Poland.

In the article on Odessa, Steven Zipperstein notes that the State Archives of Odessa contain a wealth of documentation on the history of the town's Jews: registers of trade and commerce going back to the 1820s, bank records, police reports on Zionists, minutes of the proceedings of various Jewish organizations, etc.

A short contribution on the Jews of Romania is by Dan Regenstreif. He states that in 1996 there were only about 10,000 Jews in the country, accounting for 0.04 per cent of the total population. More than two-thirds of them (70 per cent) were over 70 years of age and the prediction is that Romanian Jewry will have ceased to exist in a few years. Antisemitism is clearly noticeable: some newspapers claim that Jews brought communism to the country and destroyed Romanian culture while bookshops sell *Mein Kampf* and *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

The situation of Jews in Lithuania is in marked contrast with that of those in Romania. The article on Lithuania is by Izraelis Lempertas, who is emeritus professor of the University of Vilna and a member of the Executive of the Jewish community of Lithuania. He states that the Government has been striving to redevelop a Jewish cultural life. There is now a Jewish National Museum, which organizes exhibitions; there is a state Jewish school with nine classes and some 200 pupils; the country's National Library has an exceptionally large section of Judaica; and a Centre of Jewish Studies has been established in Vilnius University. On the other hand, there is still some antisemitism: there are now and then antisemitic slogans and swastikas defacing the walls of Jewish institutions and some Jewish graves have been desecrated.

The bicentenary of the death of the Gaon of Vilna was marked by many celebrations, inaugurated by a special session of the country's parliament, and there were many exhibitions, including one in the National Library, with about 50 books by or about the Gaon.

\*

The Winter 1997–98 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states: 'Tourism will be the leading creator of jobs in the 21st century, and will account for one in every nine jobs worldwide'. The Graduate school of Business Administration of the University has therefore launched a Travel, Tourism, and Franchising programme; it is pointed out that contrary to popular belief, the tourism

## CHRONICLE

trade does not offer only menial, low-wage employment: there are more than '170 career paths, including sophisticated high-tech and management positions'.

The Sixteenth Inter-University Conference on the Study of Folklore in Israel was held at Tel Aviv University. It focused on popular culture in large urban centres rather than on the folklore of distant tribes and cultures. The topics covered included magical beliefs, ceremonies and rituals, and popular street shows.

This issue of *Tel Aviv University News* has a special section on foreign workers in Tel Aviv. It is estimated that there are about 250,000 migrant workers in Israel — 10 per cent of the total work force. In Tel Aviv, the municipality puts the number at about 60,000 — 14 per cent of the city's total population. None of the migrants have Israeli citizenship and it is believed that about half of the total are in the country illegally. Some of them enter into fictitious marriages with Jews in order to acquire a legal status while others are marrying among themselves and raising families in Israel. The immigrants at first made arrangements for private tuition for their children but now many are sending them to Jewish state schools. The Municipality of Tel Aviv is complying with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (which Israel ratified in 1991) which requires that children must be given appropriate health, education, and welfare services 'regardless of their — or their parents or guardians' — race, religion, national origin or legal status'.

The migrants come from many countries; in Tel Aviv, 28 per cent come from Africa, mostly from Ghana; 26 per cent from East Asia: Thailand, the Philippines, and India; 22 per cent from South America: Bolivia, Ecuador, and Colombia; 20 per cent from Eastern Europe: mainly Romania; and about three per cent from Turkey and Arab countries. The majority of the migrants in Tel Aviv live in the run-down neighbourhoods of the old central bus terminal, in Neve Sha'anán (where they constitute 70 per cent of the population) and in part of the Yemenite district. The Jewish residents of Neve Sha'anán resent the new migrant workers: 75 per cent of them blame them 'for social deterioration, prostitution, drunkenness, drug-related problems, and the decline in the real estate value of the area'. On the other hand, three-quarters (74 per cent) of these Jewish residents were pleased 'that migrants reduce Israel's dependency on Palestinian workers from the territories'.

\*

The Third International Colloquium on the Cultural Interaction of Christians and Jews in medieval Spain was held at Tel Aviv University under the joint auspices of that University, Harvard University, and the two Spanish universities of Salamanca and Complutense (Madrid). One of the Israeli participants at the Colloquium commented on the inter-relationship between Arabic and Hebrew scientific literature in Islamic Spain in the twelfth century and noted that the vast body of Hebrew scientific literature produced then was explained by the high level of tolerance which Jews enjoyed in Spain during that period.

\*

## CHRONICLE

Oslo University runs an International Summer Seminar, with 540 students attending from around the world. That Summer Seminar includes each year a 'Shalom-Salaam' Project: six students from Israeli universities and six from Palestinian institutions of higher learning are invited and they attend lectures and take exams like all the other participants in the Seminar; but in addition, the Palestinian and Jewish students from the Project organize gatherings, lectures, and discussions on the Israel-Palestinian issue for the benefit of the other participants in the Summer Seminar. 'The Israeli students from the Summer 1997 Shalom-Salaam Project make efforts to maintain telephone contact with their Palestinian friends, but complain about the difficulty in obtaining Israeli entry permits for Project graduates from Gaza, Hebron, Chalchul, and Nablus' according to the report published in the *Tel Aviv University News* issue of Winter 1997-98.

\*

The Spring 1998 number of *Tel Aviv University News* states that the University has entered into four new agreements for academic co-operation: with 'Universitat Autonomas de Barcelona; the Fachhochschule Magdeburg; Erasmus University, Rotterdam; and the Bilkent University, Ankara'.

The Fall 1998 issue of *Tel Aviv University News* states that the Third Canada-Israel Law Conference was held at the University 'to mark the historic convergence of three 50-year anniversaries — of the State of Israel, of the Supreme Court of Israel, and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. ... Leading Israeli and Canadian jurists, from both the judiciary and academia, met to compare the impact on society of Israel's Basic Laws and Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Other topics discussed were equality rights (gender, minorities, and multiculturalism); the constitutional status of social and economic rights; the criminal justice process; and the constitutionalization of politics and politicization of the judiciary.'

\*

An Editorial in volume 32, no. 1, 1998 of *Studia Rosenthaliana, Journal of the History, Culture and Heritage of the Jews in the Netherlands* states that that is the first issue of the Journal to appear under the imprint of the Amsterdam University Press. 'The journal is now published under the aegis of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana Foundation, with financial support from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research in the Hague, the Menasseh ben Israel Institute for Jewish Social and Cultural Studies in Amsterdam and various other sponsors. ... In future, each issue of *Studia Rosenthaliana* will contain two or three extensive ARTICLES, together with a new section of HISTORICAL SOURCES. The Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana, the Municipal Archives and Amsterdam Jewish Historical Museum will publish from their holdings and will announce new acquisitions. This section is also designed for related bibliographical, art-historical or archival studies and for the publication of unpublished historical sources in the various languages used by the Jews of the Netherlands. The NOTARIAL



## BOOKS RECEIVED

RECORDS relating to the Portuguese Jews in Amsterdam will form an integral part of this section.'

\*

It was announced in May 1998 that a joint honours degree in Jewish and Islamic studies was to be introduced at the University of Wales in September 1998. 'Jewish studies options for students in the theology and religious studies department will include biblical Hebrew, classical texts, modern Judaism, contemporary Israel, American Jewish literature and Jews among the Greeks and Romans. . . . On the Islamic side, the choices will include Arabic, texts such as the Koran, contemporary Islam, Islamic law and society, philosophy and mysticism.'

## BOOKS RECEIVED

(Books listed here may be reviewed later)

- Issachar Ben-Ami, *Saint Veneration Among the Jews in Morocco*, 388 pp., Wayne University Press, Detroit, 1998, n.p.
- Esther Benbassa and Aron Rodrigue, eds., *A Sephardi Life in Southeastern Europe: The Autobiography and Journal of Gabriel Arié, 1863-1939*, translated by Jane Marie Todd, xv + 317 pp., University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1998, \$25.00 (paperback).
- Elizer Ben-Rafael, *Crisis and Transformation: The Kibbutz at Century's End*, xii + 282 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1997, \$21.95.
- Fredrick E. Cohen, *The Jews in the Channel Islands During the German Occupation*, 128 pp., published by the Institute of Contemporary History and Wiener Library in association with the Jersey Jewish Congregation, 1998, n.p.
- Marwan Adceb Dwairy, *Cross-Cultural Counseling: The Arab-Palestinian Case*, xxi + 225 pp., Haworth Press, Binghamton, N.Y., and London, 1998, \$19.95 (paperback).
- Seth Forman, *Blacks in the Jewish Mind: A Crisis of Liberalism*, x + 273 pp., New York University Press, New York and London, 1998, \$35.00.
- Robert R. Friedman, ed., *Crime and Criminal Justice in Israel*, xiii + 437 pp., State University of New York Press, Albany, 1998, n.p.
- Robert Hauptman and Susan Hubbs Motin, eds., *The Holocaust: Memories, Research, References*, v + 320 pp., Haworth Press, New York and London, 1998, \$49.95.
- Kurt Jonassohn with Karin Solveig Bjornson, *Genocide and Gross Human Rights Violations in Comparative Perspective*, xiv + 338 pp., Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick and London, 1998, n.p.
- Yossi Katz, *Between Jerusalem and Hebron: Jewish Settlement in the Hebron Mountains and the Eizion Bloc in the Pre-State Period*, Revised and updated version of the book published in Hebrew by Bar-Ilan University Press in 1992,

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

- translated into English by Gila Brand, 295 pp., Bar-Ilan University Press, Ramat-Gan, 1998, n.p.
- Ernest Krausz and Itta Tulca, eds., *Jewish Survival: The Identity Problem at the Close of the Twentieth Century*, xvii + 269 pp., Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick and London, 1998, n.p.
- Uzi Narkiss, *Soldier of Jerusalem*, xviii + 250 pp., translated by Martin Kett and with a Foreword by Herman Wouk, xviii + 250 pp., Vallentine Mitchell, London and Portland, Oregon, 1998, n.p.
- Durrenda Nash Onolemhemen and Kebede Gessesse, *The Black Jews of Ethiopia. The Last Exodus*, xix + 126 pp., The Scarecrow Press, Lanham, Md. (and available from Shelwing Ltd., 4 Pleydell Gandens, Folkestone, Kent), 1998, £37.55.
- Anna Maria Piussi, ed., *E Li Insegnerai Ai Tuoi Figli. Educazione Ebraica in Italia Dalle Leggi Razziali ad Oggi*, 226 pp., Editrice La Giuntina, Florence, 1997, n.p.
- Ivan Strenski, *Durkheim and the Jews of France*, ix + 215 pp., University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1997, n.p.

## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Dr JACQUES GUTWIRTH is Directeur de recherche honoraire au Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS) in France.

Mr HAROLD POLLINS is a retired Senior Tutor at Ruskin College, Oxford.

Dr ROBERT A. ROCKAWAY is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Jewish History of Tel Aviv University.

Dr HILARY L. RUBINSTEIN is a part-time lecturer in modern Jewish history at the University of Wales, Lampeter.

Professor W. D. RUBINSTEIN is in the Department of History and Welsh History at the University of Wales at Aberystwyth.

THE  
JEWISH JOURNAL  
OF  
SOCIOLOGY

EDITOR: Judith Freedman

VOLUME FORTY 1998

Published by Maurice Freedman Research Trust Ltd

## CONTENTS

Book Reviews	97	Notes on Contributors	113
Books Received	111	Notice to Contributors	4
Chronicle	107	Philosemitism in Britain and in the English-speaking World, 1840-1939 by <i>W. D. Rubinstein</i> and <i>Hilary L. Rubinstein</i>	5
Essential Outsiders: Chinese and Jews by <i>Harold Pollins</i>	87		
Hasidism Reappraised by <i>Jacques Gutwirth</i>	79		
Nation of Islam and the Jews, The by <i>Robert A. Rockaway</i>	48		

### BOOKS REVIEWED

Aronsfeld, C. C., <i>Wanderer From My Birth</i>	97	Kedourie, Sylvia, ed., <i>Elie Kedourie CBE, FBA 1926-1992</i>	100
Attias, Jean-Christophe and Esther Benbassa, <i>Israël Imaginaire</i>	98	Morris, Bonnie J., <i>Lubavitcher Women in America</i>	101
Chivot, Daniel and Anthony Reid, eds., <i>Essential Outsiders: Chinese and Jews</i>	87	Rapoport-Albert, Ada, ed., <i>Hasidism Reappraised</i>	79
		Shain, Milton, <i>Antisemitism</i>	103

### AUTHORS OF ARTICLES

Gutwirth, J.	79	Rockaway, Robert A.	48
Pollins, H.	87	Rubinstein, W. D. and H. L.	5

### AUTHORS OF BOOK REVIEWS

Beloff, M.	98	Freedman, J.	100
Gutwirth, J.	79, 101	Pollins, H.	97, 103

# The Board of Deputies of British Jews

Commonwealth House, 1-19 New Oxford Street, London WC1A 1NF (East Entrance)  
Tel : 0171-543 5400 Fax : 0171-543 0010 e-mail : info@bod.org.uk



## A Profile of British Jewry Patterns and Trends at the Turn of a Century

A compendium  
by Marlena Schmool and Frances Cohen

This publication brings together statistics and other data about British Jewry as it faces the challenge of a new century. It draws on both the regular data collection of the Board of Deputies' Community Research Unit and major community surveys undertaken in the past six years. In so doing it provides a series of charts and tables, with full explanatory commentary.

The authors particularly seek to answer the many questions that they regularly receive in the course of their work at the Community Research Unit. Following the highly successful and widely used *British Jewry in the Eighties*, the contents of this latest publication will be of particular use to those involved in local government planning processes, community care and social work as well as those looking to market a product or service to the Jewish community

July 1998 ■■ ISBN 0907 104 18 5

---

'An impressive publication': Professor Bernard Reisman, Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University

---

	Cost	£12.00
Postage	UK	£1.00 for 1st copy and 50p for each additional copy
	Europe (printed post airmail)	£1.00 Per copy
	Rest of World (printed post airmail)	£2.00 Per copy