



Raul Cârstocea/Éva Kovács (ed.)

Modern Antisemitisms
in the Peripheries
Europe and its Colonies 1880–1945

Beiträge des VWI zur Holocaustforschung
Band 6

Herausgegeben vom Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust-Studien (VWI)

new academic press, Vienna, Hamburg 2019

Editorial Board des wissenschaftlichen Beirats
Peter Black/Gustavo Corni/Irina Scherbakowa

Das Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust-Studien (VWI) wird gefördert von

 Bundesministerium
Bildung, Wissenschaft
und Forschung

WIEN
KULTUR 

 Bundeskanzleramt

Die Herausgabe dieses Bandes wurde weiters gefördert von

ZukunftsFonds
der Republik Österreich



NATIONALFONDS
DER REPUBLIK ÖSTERREICH FÜR OPFER DES NATIONALSOZIALISMUS

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

© 2019

new academic press, Vienna, Hamburg

www.academicpress.at

www.vwi.ac.at

Lektorat: Verena Pawlowsky/Tim Corbett

Cover: https://www.landkartenarchiv.de/satire.php?q=physiologie_comique_l_europe_animale

Druck und Bindung: Prime Rate, Budapest

Gestaltung: Hans Ljung

ISBN 978-3-7003-2074-6

Raul Cârstocea/Éva Kovács

Introduction 9

The Centre Does Not Hold: Antisemitisms in the Peripheries between the Imperial, the Colonial and the National

Conceptual Approaches

Christian S. Davis

The Rhetoric of Colonialism and Antisemitism in Imperial Germany 53

Tamás Kende

Jewish Communism versus Bolshevik Antisemitism 67

The Quest for the Right Adjective

Karin Stögner

Double Others 97

Relations Between Antisemitism and Misogyny in Theory and History

Antisemitic Radicalisation

Alfons Aragonese

Judaism and Spanish Identities 111

Between *Filosefardismo* and Antisemitism

Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe

Racism and Modern Antisemitism in Habsburg and Russian Ukraine 133

A Short Overview

Ionuț Biliuță

The ‘Jewish Problem’ in the Light of the Scriptures 161

Orthodox Biblical Studies and Antisemitism in Interwar Transylvania

Aron Szele

Racist Politicking and Antisemitism in Fascist Discourse 179

The Hungarian Case

Colonial Encounters

Katharina Hey

Vom Colonisé zum Juif 205

Zur maghrebinischen Antisemitismuserfahrung unter französischer Kolonialherrschaft im Œuvre von Albert Memmi

Kristoff Kerl

‘The Jew Carpetbagger’ 223

Kolonialisierungsdiskurse und Antisemitismus im US-Süden von der *Reconstruction Era* bis zum *Leo Frank Case*

Lukas Bormann

Das Judentum als inneres Kolonialvolk 247

Der Einfluss des Kolonialismus auf den Antisemitismus in Deutschland (1880–1914)

Timm Ebner

„... wie ein fleischgewordenes Fragezeichen“ 269

Aufstandsbekämpfung und Kannibalismus in der NS-Kolonialliteratur am Beispiel Hermann Freyberg

Paul Oliver Stocker

The British Radical Right 291

Anti-Zionism and the Imperial Conspiracy, 1922–1940

Perceptions of Centres and Peripheries

Philip Carabott

Antisemitism in Late Nineteenth Century Greece 309

Dimitrios Varvaritis

An Overlooked Work of Antisemitism 323

The Neophytos Tract in the Greek-Speaking World, 1818–1891

Elisabeth Weber

Befreier statt Barbaren 351

Rumänien, die Mittelmächte, die Entente und die Gleichstellung der rumänischen Juden während des Ersten Weltkriegs

Miloslav Szabó

Zentrum oder Peripherie? 371

Der Antisemitismus in Ungarn um 1900

Social-Economic Factors

Rory Yeomans

Purifying the Shop Floor 393

Kastner & Öhler Department Store as a Case Study of 'Aryanisation' in Wartime Europe

Irina Marin

Raubwirtschaft and Colonisation 427

The Jewish Question and Land Tenure in Romania in 1907

Closing Remarks

Natan Sznajder

The Burden and Dignity of Jewish Difference 449

Short Biographies of the Authors 459

Publications of Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies 463

Introduction

Raul Cârstocea/Éva Kovács

Introduction

The Centre Does Not Hold: Antisemitisms in the Peripheries between the Imperial, the Colonial and the National

“My father likewise hated Jews, all of them, even the old and humble ones. It was an ancient, traditional, and deep-rooted hatred, which he did not need to explain; any motivation, no matter how absurd, would justify it. Of course, nobody seriously believed that the Jews wanted to rule the world merely because their prophets had promised it to them (even though they were supposedly getting richer and more powerful, especially in America). But, of course, other stories were considered humbug: for instance an evil conspiracy, such as was described in the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, or their stealing communion wafers or committing ritual murders of innocent children (despite the still unexplained disappearance of the little Eszter Solymosi).¹ Those were fairy tales that you told to a chambermaid when she said she couldn’t stand it here anymore and would much rather go and work for a Jewish family, where she would be better treated and better paid. Then, of course, you casually reminded her that the Jews *had*, after all, crucified our Savior. But our kind of people, the educated kind, did not require such heavy arguments to look upon Jews as second-class people. We just didn’t like them, or at least liked them less than other fellow human beings. This was as natural as liking cats less than dogs or bedbugs less than bees; and we amused ourselves by offering the most absurd justifications.”²

1 See Miloslav Szabó’s chapter in this volume.

2 Gregor von Rezzori, *Memoirs of an Anti-Semite. A Novel in Five Stories*, translated by Joachim Neugroschel and Gregor von Rezzori, introduction by Deborah Eisenberg, originally published in 1979, this edition New York 2008, 194-195. All emphases are in the original, unless specified otherwise.

In 1969, Gregor von Rezzori published a short story about Bukovina in *The New Yorker*, entitled *Memoirs of an Anti-Semite*, which made him famous among English-speaking readers.³ In his semi-autobiographical book with the same title, the story appeared as the first chapter, now entitled *Skuchno* (an untranslatable Russian word meaning a specific type of melancholic boredom). In the book, in addition to Bukovina, he revisited other places of his childhood, adolescence, and youth, from Bucharest through Vienna and Berlin to Rome. The central motif of all these episodes was the so-called 'Jewish question' as it manifested itself in the last decades of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and as it remained the basic cultural code in East Central European societies during the interwar period. Meshing the micro and macro levels of everyday antisemitism and describing his own permanent ambivalence – his simultaneous deep desire for and rejection of his Jewish neighbours, friends, and lovers –, at the end of the book the author testified to his moral inability to recognise the tragedy of his banal misunderstanding during the Nazi era.

Gregor von Rezzori's book touches upon almost all the topics covered in our volume: from the antisemitic gaze through the rejection and neglect of Jewish assimilation, and from the reproduction of modern antisemitic stereotypes in the peripheries to the feeling of radical otherness identified with the Jews in the antisemites' imagination. In the passage quoted above, the author made a nuanced distinction between modern antisemitism as a cultural code of the aristocracy and the upper middle classes and the 'traditional' antisemitism of the poor benighted people, who believed in Jewish conspiracies and blood libels and who could be influenced by arguments such as that of the crucifixion of Jesus by the Jews. In contrast, the educated higher classes, as von Rezzori self-ironically put it, "did not require such heavy arguments to look upon Jews as second-class people".⁴ They simply did not like them.

Von Rezzori was born in Czernowitz, Bukovina (today Chernivtsi, Ukraine) in 1914. He was fluent in German, Romanian, Italian, Polish, Ukrainian, Yiddish, French, and English. In the course of his lifetime, von Rezzori was successively a citizen of Austria-Hungary, Romania, and the Soviet Union, before becoming a stateless person and then spending his final years as a citizen of the Republic of Austria. His family remained in the Bukovina region after it became part of the Kingdom of Romania in 1918; as a result, von Rezzori began his studies in Braşov and later continued them in Vienna. In the mid-1930s, he moved to Bucharest and in 1938 to Berlin where, as a Romanian citizen, he

3 Gregor von Rezzori, *Memoirs of an Anti-Semite*, in: *The New Yorker* (26 April 1969), 42. The first German edition of the book was published ten years later with the same title in translation (*Memoiren eines Antisemiten*, Munich 1979). However, the German publishing house changed the title in 1979 and, since then, the subsequent German editions have always used the new title, *Denkwürdigkeiten eines Antisemiten* [*Memorabilia of an Antisemite*].

4 von Rezzori, *Memoirs of an Anti-Semite*, 194.

escaped conscription into the Wehrmacht during the Second World War. Beginning in 1939, he published many novels about his memories of Bukovina, becoming one of the most important German-language authors representative of the multi-ethnic culture of this region, a multiculturalism that had gradually disappeared during the period covered in his fictionalised autobiography.

Being the child of a k.u.k. (“kaiserlich und königlich”, Austro-Hungarian imperial and royal) officer in the peripheries and born in the first year of the First World War, he was socialised within the above-mentioned ‘self-evident’ antisemitism of the fin-de-siècle Dual Monarchy and lived in the same antisemitic and aristocratic milieu in inter-war Romania and Austria – one that displayed a continuity of norms, lifestyles, and values with the period before the First World War and functioned as a greenhouse of ethnic and social prejudices, perpetuating the embeddedness of this antisemitism – but with ever higher levels of frustration. As von Rezzori described the initial cognitive glorification and later conflict of loyalty of his father:

“He felt exiled in the Bukovina – or rather, as a pioneer, betrayed and deserted. He counted himself among the *colonial officials* of the former realm of the Austrian-Hungarian Dual Monarchy; and it was the task of such officials *to protect Europe against the wild hordes who kept breaking in from the East*. ‘Civilization fertilizer’ was his bitterly mocking term for the function he ascribed to himself and his kind: they were supposed to settle in the borderland, form a bulwark of Western civilization, and show a bold front to Eastern chaos. He had come to the Bukovina as a young man, after growing up in Graz during the most glorious era of the Dual Monarchy; and everything that had become sad and dreary and hidebound after the collapse of 1918 was, he felt, represented in the land where he had been cast away. [...] It was obvious: my father could not love the Bukovina, because he had become a Romanian citizen after its defection from the Dual Monarchy. He had been compelled to commit an act of disloyalty, like the engineer Malik, who had changed his name. Only in my father’s case, the conflict was tragic: through loyalty to the hunt, he had been forced to be disloyal to his flag.”⁵

Antisemitism had a clear social function indeed in this case. On the one hand, it guaranteed the privileged position of the ruling elites in society by using a quite flexible but still nuanced differentiation between ‘us’ and ‘them’. On the other hand, it helped provide orientation in the broader spectrum of social, ethnic, and racial hierarchies, and therefore contributed to symbolically stabilising the shattered post-First World War European societies. As a member of the k.u.k. bureaucracy in Bukovina and as a self-identified “colonial official”, von Rezzori’s father followed the mission of the Westernisers in

5 von Rezzori, *Memoirs of an Anti-Semite*, 195-197 (emphases added).

the peripheries. In this respect, however, the only fly in the ointment was that the Jews – or at the very least, the assimilated part of them – found themselves in the same ‘civiliser’ position as entrepreneurs, shopkeepers, doctors, lawyers, intellectuals, and so forth. This aspect resulted in social, political, and economic competition among the different elite groups, which could be transformed into antisemitic resentment on behalf of the non-Jewish elite, at the latest after the First World War.

Embourgeoisement and assimilation have become key historiographic concepts in the description of the modernisation of European nation states during the nineteenth century. These concepts allow attention to be focussed on how these modernisation processes operated within the so-called ‘Golden Age’: the ‘assimilationist social contract’ between the political elite of the aristocrats and an economic elite that included many wealthy Jews. Although this concept no longer relies on the former nationalist approach, it focusses solely on the partners of the contract, ignores local differences, and interprets all social processes as an embodiment of assimilation. Jewish and non-Jewish cohabitation is often described with a sexual metaphor – similarly to Western attitudes toward the East in Edward Said’s concept of Orientalism.⁶ In this ‘love affair’, the political elite plays the role of the male, while the Jews play that of the female. They live together as an odd couple in some kind of a love/hate relationship, in similar fashion to how von Rezzori described his love affairs with Jewish women in his book.

The concept of the ‘Golden Age’ of Jewish assimilation did not include the lower classes in the social imaginary and it helped cement the colonial view of society. It is also given among historians that, after 1920, the Jewish assimilation process began to stagnate and was in some cases even reversed. Moreover, the assimilationist creativity of the Jewish upper classes no longer had a wide appeal in societies after the First World War. The markers of assimilation – changing one’s name, learning the language of one’s neighbours, dispensing with the old, religious dress and habits, and so on – which had been important messages directed at society about (the desire for) participation in common culture and deeds before the First World War, suddenly became unattractive and dubious for non-Jewish society. Von Rezzori’s almost perverse celebration of the beauty of the visible differences within the icon of the very old, very poor ‘Polish Jews’ was only one side of the coin. On the other side, assimilation appeared as a ‘camouflage’ in the pervasive gaze of post-First World War society:

“I am sure that man is not an engineer at all but just a cheap crook’, my grandmother used to say. ‘Probably a Jew who has changed his name.’ The suspicion that somebody could have changed his name already made him a Jew – provided, of course, *he was not an Englishman, like charming Mr. Wood, who one beautiful day became Lord Halifax*. It was typically Jewish to change your name,

6 Edward Said, *Orientalism*, London 1978.

for Jews quite understandably did not want to be taken for what they were. Since their names usually made it quite clear what they were, they had to change them, for camouflage. Had we been Jews, we should certainly have done the same, because it must be painful to be a Jew. Even well-bred people would make you feel it – either by their reserve or by an exaggerated politeness and coy friendliness. But fortunately we were not Jews, so, though we could see their point, we considered it a piece of insolence when they changed their names and pretended to be like us. [...] Jews who changed their names [...] were crooks and swindlers. Their camouflage was but a falsehood to which they were driven by their disgusting greed for profit and their repulsive social climbing. This was particularly the case with the so-called Polish Jews – the prototype of the greedy, pushing little Jew one met so often in Bukovina. There were crowds of them; you could not take a step without running into swarms. The elder ones and very old ones, particularly the very poor, were humbly what they were – submissive men in black caftans and large-brimmed hats, with curls at their temples, and in their eyes a sort of melting look which the sadness of many thousands of years seemed to have bestowed. Their eyes were like dark ponds. *Some of them were even beautiful in their melancholy.* [...] But the young ones, and especially the ones who were better off, or even rich, showed an embarrassing self-confidence. They wore elegant clothes and drove dandified roadsters, and their girls smelled of scent and sparkled with jewelry. Some of them even had dogs and walked them on leashes, *just as my aunts did.*⁷

No wonder that this overestimation of visible differences and the reproduction of alterity through hardly inconspicuous markers could easily bridge the gap between the old-fashioned antisemitisms of the peripheries and the new racisms emerging in the European centre. This phenomenon was amplified by the intense transfer of racist and colonial ideas operating between the centre and the peripheries and the impact of social networks on the antisemitic tropes and discourses developed in the peripheries. If in the colonial imaginary of European modernity the 'Black' body became sexualised and feminised, societies in the European peripheries created their own 'Blackness' through representations of internal 'savages' – such as 'Gypsies' – or in the immutable and unasimilable epitomes of alterity evoked by the image of 'Polish Jews'.⁸ In addition, the borders between human beings and animals became fluid in the age of high imperialism, with 'exotic populations' being put on display in human zoos (the so-called Völkerschau)

7 Ibid., 193-194 (emphases added).

8 See Sander L. Gilman, *Black Bodies, White Bodies. Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in Late Nineteenth-Century Art, Medicine, and Literature*, in: *Critical Inquiry. A Journal of Art, Culture and Politics* 12 (1985) 1, 204-242.

together with apes and other animals.⁹ The chapters in this volume that engage with the interplay of antisemitism and colonialism in the late nineteenth century European imagination draw attention to these intersecting, overlapping, and ever-changing representations, as well as to the boundaries they were meant to signify. This intersection between antisemitic and racial prejudices is also remarkably captured in a passage in *Memoirs of an Anti-Semite*:

“I accepted her Jewish features as part of her, just as I would have endured tattoos or brass disks grown into the lips, had it been possible for me to love a Central African native. Besides, the specifically Jewish quality in Jews had never repelled me so much as the attempt – doomed from the start – to hush it up, cover it over, deny it. The yiddling of Jews, their jittery gesticulation, their disharmony, the incessant alternation of obsequiousness and presumptuousness, were inescapable and inalienable attributes of their Jewishness. If they acted as one expected them to act, so that one could recognize them at first glance, one was rather pleasantly touched. They were true to themselves – that was estimable. One related to Jews in the same way as an Englishman to foreigners: one assumed they would not act like us. If they did so nevertheless, it made them look suspicious. It seemed artificial. It was unsuitable. Like the Englishman confronted with a foreigner behaving in an assiduously British manner, we saw the so-called assimilated Jews as aping us.”¹⁰

Conceptual Approaches

Most of the chapters making up this volume are case studies based on primary and secondary sources, and all of them rely explicitly or implicitly on solid conceptual premises. The methodological spectrum of the volume is wide-ranging: It comprises in-depth analyses of antisemitic movements, actions, and figures; studies based on micro-historical approaches that pose big questions in small places; relational approaches such as *histoire croisée*; narrative approaches characteristic of the history of ideas; case studies in social history; and approaches indebted to methods derived from literary studies and discourse analysis. The chapters also cover an impressive geographical and temporal scope, ranging from Europe’s eastern peripheries to its overseas colonies, while also dealing with the entanglements of antisemitism and racism in North America, and spanning the period between the emergence of modern antisemitism in the late nineteenth century to its catastrophic consequences in the Holocaust. While diverse in terms of the specificity of

⁹ Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire, 1875–1914*, New York 1987.

¹⁰ von Rezzori, *Memoirs of an Anti-Semite*, 112.

the contexts they focus on or in methodological approach, they all engage in multiple ways with the notion of ‘periphery’, whether defined geographically or otherwise, viewed from the ‘centre’ or self-perceived, as a positionality that was denied, contested, challenged, or embraced, but *always* negotiated with respect to different terms of reference.

Consequently, instead of separating our introductory remarks from the short descriptions of the contributions this volume consists of, we have decided to embed them in a presentation that is structured by some of the most important recurring conceptual approaches and themes, illustrated with examples and cross-referenced to the existing literature to which the chapters seek to contribute. Although some discrete units of analysis (Eastern Europe or North Africa) certainly display some consistency in the patterns that can be identified therein, and although temporally the global relevance of certain processes or events (from the imperialism of the late nineteenth century through the First World War and from the Russian Revolution to the Second World War and the Holocaust) does allow for identifying distinct periods within a purposely broad temporal framework, we have also decided against organising this volume either geographically or strictly chronologically. The justification for this ties in with our attempt to draw attention to some of the commonalities that emerge when casting the net so wide, as well as to the travel of antisemitic tropes and representations, not just from the centre to the peripheries but as a multi-vector process encompassing both the reverse direction and lateral transfers. *Not* separating geographical regions or chronological periods in this account of modern antisemitism in its modernising context allows capturing its *global* dimension at a time when Europe prompted the “transformation of the world” in its own image.¹¹ And if the global character of the modernisation process allows for these commonalities, sometimes encountered across quite surprising spaces and time periods, its *unevenness* across time and space testifies to and is emphasised by the local specificities that also become visible when read against such a broad and fluid background. As such, despite the inevitable artificiality of establishing neat separations between topics that are inherently related and intersectional (an aspect reflected in the frequent references to one chapter in multiple sections of this introduction), the following discussions aim to provide a tentative structure for the volume, topical as well as (roughly) chronological, while allowing for considerable variation along the temporal axis.

11 Jürgen Osterhammel, *Die Verwandlung der Welt. Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Munich 2009, especially Chapters 2 (Zeit: Wann war das 19. Jahrhundert?) and 3 (Raum: Wo liegt das 19. Jahrhundert?), 84-180.

Pre-Modern Legacies of Religious Exclusion

A crucial debate in the study of antisemitism relates to the continuities and ruptures characterising the relationship between pre-modern, religiously inspired anti-Jewish hatred and modern antisemitism. Despite repeated calls to distinguish between anti-Judaism and modern, secular antisemitism, even from authors emphasising the continuity between the two, confusion between the terms persists.¹² This is true whether referring to ‘old’ and ‘new’ antisemitism (a distinction presently superseded by one that posits – mostly – a dichotomy between historical and contemporary antisemitism);¹³ to religious and ideological antisemitism (where ‘religious antisemitism’ would stand for pre-modern);¹⁴ when using a term such as ‘proto-antisemitism’ for the period between the sixteenth and the early nineteenth centuries;¹⁵ or simply when using the same term to talk about medieval pogroms and Nazi violence.¹⁶ In this volume, while our understanding of antisemitisms follows Hannah Arendt in identifying it as a specifically *modern* phenomenon originating in the second half of the nineteenth century and distinguishing it from pre-modern, religiously inspired anti-Jewish prejudice,¹⁷ and concurs with Paul Hanebrink’s remark that the conflation of the two “into a history of the ‘longest hatred’ does little to explain either”,¹⁸ both the plural form of the noun and the focus on peripheries warn against too neat a separation between the two forms of prejudice.

As such, rather than a story of modern antisemitism displacing and replacing pre-modern anti-Judaism, the picture that emerges from the chapters making up the volume reveals the complex entanglement of modern antisemitisms with previous religiously inspired prejudice. As several chapters in this volume show (in particular those of Alfons Aragonese, Ionuț Biliuță, Philip Carabott, and Dimitrios Varvaritis), the uneven process of modernisation in the peripheries also translated into an uneven pace of secularisation,

12 See Robert Wistrich, *Antisemitism. The Longest Hatred*, New York 1991, for an account positing a continuity of modern antisemitism with pre-Christian prejudices against Jews. For a similarly broad scope but an argument against continuity between anti-Judaism and modern antisemitism, see David Nirenberg, *Anti-Judaism. The Western Tradition*, New York 2013.

13 Shulamit Volkov, *Antisemitism as a Cultural Code. Reflections on the History and Historiography of Antisemitism in Imperial Germany*, in: *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 23 (1978), 25-45.

14 Anna Sommer Schneider, *The Catholic Church, Radio Marija, and the Question of Antisemitism in Poland*, in: Alvin H. Rosenfeld (ed.), *Resurgent Antisemitism. Global Perspectives*, Bloomington 2013, 236-266.

15 Hubert Mohr, *Remarks on ‘the Jew’ as a Social Myth and some Theoretical Reflections on Anti-Semitism*, in: Hubert Cancik/Uwe Puschner (ed.), *Antisemitismus, Paganismus, Völkische Religion*, Munich 2004, 1-11.

16 Nico Voigtlaender/Hans-Joachim Voth, *Persecution Perpetuated. The Medieval Origins of Anti-Semitic Violence in Nazi Germany*, in: National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 17113 (2011); <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17113.pdf> (5 August 2018).

17 Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, originally published in 1951, this edition New York 1973, 3-120. See also Jacob Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction. Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*, Cambridge MA 1980.

18 Paul Hanebrink, *In Defense of Christian Hungary. Religion, Nationalism, and Antisemitism, 1890–1944*, Ithaca NY 2009, 6.

varying across space, religious denominations, and social groups. This corresponded to the coexistence and interpenetration of different temporal registers in modernising peripheries – of which we could emphasise here the historical, chronological, linear, and progressive temporality of the nation and the non-historical, cyclical, mythical time of religion –, resulting in a plurality of forms of imagining both ‘the nation’ and its ‘others’. On the one hand, as visible in the chapters dealing with cases of modern blood libel trials, elements of religious-based prejudice intertwined with the tropes characteristic of modern antisemitism, and medieval myths could be interpreted and enacted in distinctly modern forms. On the other hand, as the chapters by Philip Carabott and Ionuț Biliuță show, religion could also act as a vehicle for modern antisemitic tropes, even racial ideas that on the face of it would appear diametrically opposed to religiously inspired exclusion.

Engagement with religion was an integral part of nation-building, even when this process was avowedly secular. Alfons Aragonese’s chapter shows the ways in which traditional Catholic anti-Judaism morphed into modern antisemitism and was inextricably involved in the nation-building process in Spain. As such, the two competing narratives about the political identity of the modern Spanish nation, the liberal and the conservative, also entailed different positions towards Judaism, from the *filosefardismo* of the liberals, who retrojected a vision of religious tolerance onto medieval Spain, an idea of conviviality without much grounding in historical reality, to a conservative antisemitism that fused pre-modern Catholic prejudice with modern ideas and focussed on the notion of *Hispanidad* as a model of “religious and linguistic unity”. Aragonese’s chapter also significantly notes the clear distinction made between Sephardi and Ashkenazi Jews throughout modern Spanish history. While the former were constantly reclaimed as belonging to the Spanish nation, especially in connection with the late nineteenth century Spanish colonial project in North Africa and its engagement with the Ottoman Empire, the immigration of the latter from Central and Eastern Europe was discouraged or refused outright. Throughout this chapter, which offers a sweeping survey of the entanglement of the ‘Jewish question’ with the process of nation-building at various points in time, the importance of the “connection between religious and national identity” for the perception of the Jews in Spain is repeatedly emphasised by the author, all the way to the role played by religion in the persecution of Jews during the Second World War by the Franco regime.

Across the different Christian denominations, religion was an integral part of nation-building processes, as competing national projects tackled the crisis induced by secularisation. If the Lutheran court preacher Adolf Stoecker was “one of the main propagators of a modern political antisemitism founded on Christian ideology in the Second German Reich”, resulting in “Berlin’s first genuine antisemitic movement”,¹⁹ and

¹⁹ Wistrich, *The Longest Hatred*, 58.

if Hanebrink showed how the competing Catholic and Calvinist national projects addressed the 'Jewish question' in Hungary by linking pre-existing religious prejudices with modern nationalism,²⁰ some of the chapters in this volume – by Dimitrios Varvaritis, Philip Carabott, and Ionuț Biliuță – show similar developments in the case of Christian Orthodoxy, still relatively under-researched in this respect when compared to Catholicism or Protestantism. While continuity with a well-established tradition of pre-modern anti-Judaism is undeniable in all these cases, a close look at these nineteenth century manifestations reveals a religious antisemitism that is qualitatively distinct from it. As such, the core of religious antisemitism lies clearly in its modern, secular form, even when it incorporates religiously inspired tropes and even in cases where exclusion was grounded on religion rather than race.²¹ In contrast to pre-modern, irrational beliefs in fantasies of ritual murder, host desecration, or well-poisoning conspiracies, modern religious antisemitism incorporated pre-modern elements into a rationally structured ideological antisemitism. Hanebrink's premise for his analysis of the case of Hungary – that "ultimately, the competition between secular and religious nationalists to define the nation had the effect of linking different kinds of antisemitism – secular and religious, modern and premodern – together"²² – can thus be generalised across the peripheries, although the specific constellations of exclusionary narratives developed in response to modernity were always highly context-dependent.

Finally, a less explored feature but one that calls for further research is the extent to which a disavowal of religiously inspired anti-Jewish hatred and the adoption of tropes associated with modern antisemitism were themselves part of an attempt to 'prove' one's modernity in Europe's peripheries. After the Enlightenment, and certainly by the late nineteenth century, religious hostility had come to be regarded by many modernising elites as "something medieval, obscurantist and backward".²³ Consequently, in their quest for temporal alignment with the 'centres' they attempted to emulate across the intellectual and cultural field, the adoption of antisemitic paradigms that appeared "more neutral, objective, 'scientific' and in keeping with the liberal, enlightened *Zeitgeist*"²⁴ could paradoxically be regarded by some elites as 'progressive'. Adding to this the fact that international pressure in favour of emancipation was formulated at this time in terms of religious equality helps explain, for example, the insistence of Romanian elites at the time of the Congress of Berlin in 1878 that their grounds for discriminating against

20 Hanebrink, *In Defense of Christian Hungary*.

21 See Raul Cârstocea, *The Role of Anti-Semitism in the Ideology of the 'Legion of the Archangel Michael', 1927–1938*, PhD Dissertation, University College London, 2011, for an analysis of legionary antisemitism in interwar Romania that explores this form of exclusion.

22 Hanebrink, *In Defense of Christian Hungary*, 8.

23 Wistrich, *The Longest Hatred*, xv.

24 *Ibid.*

the Jewish minority were of a socio-economic rather than religious nature.²⁵ More than merely constituting pragmatic strategies of working around international intervention, such adaptations of local patterns of prejudice to 'European' developments were thus part and parcel of the ubiquitous attempts to reverse the self-perceptions of peripherality and backwardness evoked by the precarious position of peripheries in the international system.

Socio-Economic Aspects

The last paragraph already hints at one of the prominent characteristics of the new, modern antisemitism that became apparent by the late nineteenth century: its emphasis on socio-economic rather than religious factors. One of the standard accounts of modern antisemitism views it as a reaction against modernisation and the associated processes of rapid social and economic change. According to this account, modern antisemitism was spearheaded by the assorted 'losers' of capitalist modernity, whether peasants or artisans, who had most to suffer from the decline of their traditional occupations and from the ensuing acceleration of inequality that accompanied the onset of capitalism.²⁶ Consequently, antisemitism is to be viewed on the one hand as an anti-modern phenomenon, an attempt to 'stop the clock' if not actually return to a disappearing (and therefore largely imagined) pre-modern world,²⁷ and on the other as the result of real competition between emerging bourgeoisies, which were being nationalised at this time, and the Jews.²⁸ The latter aspect was mentioned as early as 1875 by the German economist Wilhelm Roscher, who emphasised the importance of this competition for the rise of antisemitism and linked it to the Jews' particular role in the economy during the Middle Ages. These phenomena were arguably particularly salient in Europe's peripheries, where the context of delayed capitalist modernisation accounted for the late emergence of national middle classes.²⁹

Following this line of argumentation, Jews appeared particularly vulnerable as targets of this protest movement against modernisation due on the one hand to their specific position in economic relations and on the other to pre-existing anti-Jewish stereotypes that singled them out for exclusion on religious grounds, doubled on occasion

25 Raul Cârstocea, *Uneasy Twins? The Entangled Histories of Jewish Emancipation and Anti-Semitism in Romania and Hungary, 1866–1913*, in: *Slovo* 21 (2009) 2, 64–85, here 71.

26 See Oded Heilbroner, *From Antisemitic Peripheries to Antisemitic Centres. The Place of Antisemitism in Modern German History*, in: *Journal of Contemporary History* 35 (2000) 4, 559–576, here 561–562, and references therein.

27 Shulamit Volkov, *The Rise of Popular Antimodernism. The Urban Master Artisans, 1873–1896*, Princeton 1978.

28 Pål Kolstø, *Competing with Entrepreneurial Diasporians. Origins of Anti-Semitism in Nineteenth Century Russia*, in: *Nationalities Papers. The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity* 42 (2014) 4, 691–707.

29 Werner Cahnman, *Socio-Economic Causes of Antisemitism*, in: *Social Problems* 5 (1957) 1, 25–26.

(such as in Russia or Romania) by exclusionary state policies. The former aspect, linked to the Jews' diasporic condition and their widespread function as a commercial class resulting from the various medieval prohibitions against their engagement in productive activities, prompted their spectacular success in the capitalist economy, as already noted by Werner Sombart in the early twentieth century and as invoked by antisemites and philosemites alike.³⁰ The association of Jews with capitalism was thus established and, when doubled by the frequent portrayal of Jews in popular culture as linked to usury, it could easily lead to what Eugen Weber termed the "semantic confusion"³¹ that allowed the identification of any and all economic "enemies and exploiters as 'Jews', despite their actual racial and ethnic identities".³² Viewed also in the context of secularisation and "the decline of the social function of religion"³³ that opened up social space to the influence of new ideologies, social antisemitism appears as a distinctly *modern* phenomenon, even if its modern character could accommodate an anti-modern orientation. This association of Jews with capitalism and the displacement of concerns about the latter onto the former led directly to Otto Glagau's dictum "Die soziale Frage ist einfach die Judenfrage" ("The social question is simply the Jewish question"), which offered, if not a solution, at least a simple explanation for the crises induced by capitalist modernisation.³⁴

As we illustrated earlier with examples from von Rezzori's novel, antisemitism had (and still has) an identifiable social function in those societies in which it is manifest. It was an integral part of a causal chain, the objective of which was to produce the social reality by which social groups maintained their exclusivity. Discourse on the 'Jewish question' is thus always a practice and "as such part of that wider societal practice that we call society".³⁵ Historically, an antisemitic worldview could accommodate conflicting goals, mobilising reactionary and radical sentiments at the same time. Reactionary antisemitism imagined Jews as symbols of unwanted revolutionary modernisation in society, while radical antisemitism believed that Jews represented the hated old regime. This fluid and dynamic character of antisemitism explains why one can find antisemites in all political camps, in left-wing and right-wing, conservative and liberal, socialist and fascist circles.

Moreover, antisemitism did not remain within these political circles. As a societal practice, it influenced the everyday life of local communities as well. Hence, antisemi-

30 Werner Sombart, *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben*, Munich 1912. See also Yuri Slezkine, *The Jewish Century*, Princeton 2004, for a view positioning the Jews in a global framework of such diaspora groups.

31 Eugen Weber, *Reflections on the Jews in France*, in: Frances Malino/Bernard Wasserstein (ed.), *The Jews in Modern France*, Hanover NH 1985, 12-13.

32 Nancy Fitch, *Mass Culture, Mass Parliamentary Politics, and Modern Anti-Semitism. The Dreyfus Affair in Rural France*, in: *The American Historical Review* 97 (1992) 1, 55-95, here 73.

33 Heilbronner, *From Antisemitic Peripheries to Antisemitic Centres*, 561.

34 Otto Glagau, *Des Reiches Noth und der neue Culturkampf*, Osnabrück 1879, 282.

35 Marcel Stoelzher, *Antisemitism and the Constitution of Sociology*, Lincoln/London 2014, 2.

tism was engraved into the collective memory of society at large over centuries; it 'easily' structured the verbal and habitual interface of Jewish and non-Jewish coexistence. As an unchangeable negative attitude toward the Jews that represented one of the basic indicators of national identity in general, antisemitism became not only one of the permanent elements of a societal worldview, but defined the social space where Jews and anti-semites met. While it is acknowledged that the manifestations of everyday antisemitism were controlled and disciplined by the ruling elite and the institutions of power, the reception of the institutionally prescribed antisemitic concepts did not lack some obstinacy and self-dynamics. A succinct example of these is the case study on the 'Aryanisation' of the Kastner & Öhler department store in Croatia by Rory Yeomans. His chapter describes the complex and ambiguous behaviour of employees in the company during the 'Aryanisation' process, in which some of the workers not only supported the removal of 'undesired' Jewish workers, but took an active part in denouncing them, for a variety of motives: social resentment, personal revenge, or support for the anti-managerial programme for workers' autonomy. Finally, the 'Aryanisation' led to increasingly militant demands and denunciations in the company. As Yeomans concludes, "the programme of economic cleansing conceived by the retinue of economists and social planners against 'undesired elements' was a highway on the state's journey towards genocide."

Examining socio-economic antisemitism in a very different setting, both spatially (in rural Romania rather than urban Croatia) and temporally (in the early twentieth century), Irina Marin's chapter provides yet another example of its everyday articulations at the interface between peasants and landlords. In a country with an extremely polarised land tenure system – split between great property and dwarf peasant property, together making up more than 78 per cent of all arable land – and an exploitative leasehold system, the Jews' position as middlemen between the *boyars* and an increasingly impoverished peasant population rendered them convenient targets both for popular resentment and for public laments over the exploitation of the peasantry. In a process of modernisation characterised by what the author identifies as a form of "internal colonialism" practiced "by its extractive political and economic elites and never trickled down to the great majority of the population", Jews were doubly exposed: to the exclusionary policies of a state that curtailed their rights so as to prevent competition while simultaneously allowing them a partial and tightly controlled participation in the modern, urban economy, and to popular wrath supported by ingrained patterns of prejudice. Moreover, while a minute minority of the Jews in Romania occupied this intermediary position as leaseholders, being almost always more directly engaged with (and thus also exposed to the violence of) the peasantry than distant and often absentee landlords, antisemitic discourse could render *all* Jews into a deflector shield, thus insulating the country's exploitative elite from "the dire consequences of this massive exploitation". Despite the very different settings and the distinctiveness of the forms of antisemitism portrayed by

Rory Yeomans and Irina Marin respectively, what both chapters share is a concern for the interplay between elite antisemitic formulations and their reception and articulation in everyday settings, a very important and often neglected topic that is briefly addressed in the following section.

Popular and Elite Antisemitisms in the Peripheries

There is a compelling argument for antisemitism as being primarily elite-driven. Leaving aside the inherent bias of intellectual history towards elites and their influence as opinion-shapers, it is hard to contest that antisemitism as an ideology and a modern political phenomenon first appeared on the elite level. The racial scientists who linked antisemitism to biology, the pamphleteers who popularised it, and the politicians who inscribed it in law were all elites with specific concerns and motivations associated with their class and social status.³⁶ As we have seen, von Rezzori's aristocratic milieu felt disdain towards the Jews, and their exclusion from 'high society' was complete and permanent. But the aristocracy felt the same way towards the lower classes (and all classes were lower than their own), not only the peasantry or the proletariat – which blend seamlessly into the landscape in his account, hardly deserving of more notice than a tree or the horizon – but also towards the bourgeoisie aspiring to accede to the polite pedigree society to which he belonged. Abundant proof of this is the author's honest mistaking of Mr. Malik – an engineer who turned out to be a Nazi and after the Anschluss became an SS-Sturmabführer – for a Jew on the basis of his attitude and behaviour (as "a cheap crook") and of a suspected name change.³⁷ In this respect, nefarious as it certainly was, antisemitism could not have transformed into a mass movement, and understanding antisemitism as the latter is both essential for grasping its escalation and a call for broadening the perspective to the reception of antisemitic ideas and their blending with popular forms of antisemitism.³⁸

Such forms could draw on a tradition of religious anti-Judaism, shared by the faithful irrespective of class and social status, that periodically manifested in outbursts of violence, real or symbolic, physical or verbal, temporally concentrated around particular moments in the Christian calendar: Carnival and Lent in the Catholic faith, Lent and

36 For an argument identifying antisemitism as "a phenomenon of high culture", see for example Elhanan Yakira, *Virtuous Antisemitism*, in: Alvin H. Rosenfeld (ed.), *Deciphering the New Antisemitism*, Bloomington 2015, 77-102, here 78.

37 von Rezzori, *Memoirs of an Anti-Semite*, 193-194 and 232-233.

38 Alternatively, the popular violence that found its expression in pogroms could equally manifest in violence directed against landlords and other elites who did not differ from the rioting peasants in either ethnicity or religion, albeit for other reasons, or indeed against both, when the categories did or seemed to overlap – as in the case of the Peasant Revolt of 1907 in Romania. See Irina Marin's chapter.

Christmas in the Orthodox.³⁹ Andrei Oișteanu noted, however, that in the case of Romania “the greatest excesses of brutality towards Jews occurred during the least Christian of ceremonies, namely those meant to put an end to the drought”.⁴⁰ Moreover, as the philologist, historian, and journalist Wilhelm Schwarzfeld remarked in 1889 in Iași, “these cruelties were committed by the *lower people* of Moldavia”.⁴¹ To this day, ‘traditional’ Romanian Christmas carols still contain anti-Jewish stereotypes, occasionally even inciting to violence.⁴²

It is thus incontestable that anti-Judaism and anti-Jewish attitudes more generally were part of a folklore rooted in popular religiosity in most parts of Europe. In their most extreme forms, these included what Gavin Langmuir has called the “chimerical assertions” (as distinct from either realistic or xenophobic ones) “that grammatically attribute with certitude to an outgroup and all its members characteristics that have never been empirically observed”, such as the desecration of the host, the poisoning of wells, or ritual murder.⁴³ Yet, without downplaying the importance and the occasionally murderous consequences of such popular prejudice, it remains a phenomenon distinct from the modern, ideological form of antisemitism that developed in the late nineteenth century. It is thus important to emphasise that while the reception of antisemitic ideas was facilitated by the relative continuity with pre-existing anti-Jewish prejudices, the eventual emergence of popular antisemitism was equally dependent on the interaction of such prejudices with new tropes that had a distinctly modern character. Consequently, antisemitism proceeded differently and at a different pace at the popular and elite levels (as shown with the example of religion discussed above), fluctuating in its manifestations not only across geographical peripheries, but also within societies. Moreover, while elite and popular antisemitism can be usefully distinguished analytically, as categories of

39 Helmut Walser Smith, *The Learned and the Popular Discourse of Anti-Semitism in the Catholic Milieu of the Kaiserreich*, *Central European History* 27 (1994) 3, 315-328, here 324; Andrei Oișteanu, *Inventing the Jew. Antisemitic Stereotypes in Romanian and Other Central-East European Cultures*, translated by Mirela Adăscăliței, Lincoln NE 2009, 431-436.

40 *Ibid.*, 430-431.

41 Wilhelm Schwarzfeld, *Acte de intoleranță [Acts of Intolerance]*, in: *Analele Societății Istorice “Iuliu Barasch” [The Annals of the “Iuliu Barasch” Historical Society]* 3 (1889), 194 (emphasis added). Such a statement should however be considered in the context of the intense state persecution of Jews in late nineteenth century Romania, complete with expulsions of prominent Jewish intellectuals who openly criticised it. Consequently, indicating ‘the lower people’ as the main culprits could have also been a safer option for the author. Nevertheless, the number of such accounts that make explicit reference to peasants make it impossible to overlook the extent of popular anti-Jewish prejudices, even when they were not crystallised in the form of antisemitism as such.

42 In 2013, a scandal erupted when a Romanian state television channel broadcast an explicitly antisemitic Christmas carol. See *Colinde antisemite la TVR Cluj. Jidovan afurisit / Nu l-ar răbda Domnul sfânt / nici în cer nici pe pământ [Antisemitic Carols at TVR Cluj. Damned Jew / May the Holy God not Suffer him / Neither in Heaven nor on Earth]*, in: *Știri de Cluj [Cluj News]*, 10 December 2013, <http://www.stiridecluj.ro/social/colinde-antisemite-la-tvr-cluj-jidovan-afurisit-nu-l-ar-rabda-domnul-sfant-nici-in-cer-nici-pe-pamant-video> (15 April 2018).

43 Gavin Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, Berkeley 1990, 328.

practice they always existed in interaction, drawing inspiration from, reshaping, and mutually reinforcing each other.

This aspect is important to note not least of all because, as we contend in more detail below, the radicalisation of antisemitism was made possible – among other factors – by the opening up of political space after the First World War. Moreover, the escalation of prejudice, social distance, and discrimination into policies of exclusion, deportation, and extermination would have been impossible in the absence of popular support for elite ideas. Far from occurring as a ‘bolt from the blue’ under the impact of Nazi ideology, this process was a slow and gradual one, played out at capillary level, on shop floors and leased estates, in villages and urban slums. Especially in a volume that deals with antisemitism in the peripheries, and seeks to do so by departing from a view that sees them primarily as geographically determined, drawing attention to social groups that remained peripheral both to elite concerns and to the modernising process within which antisemitism was integrated appears important indeed. The penetration of antisemitism at the level of everyday experience calls for attention to socio-economic factors, to the overlap of categories such as the innkeeper, the creditor, or the leaseholder with that of ‘the Jew’, channelling and further fuelling popular resentment in the presence of an overarching antisemitic ideology. In this respect, social history approaches that draw attention to non-elites, such as the two examples mentioned above, contribute significantly to a field that is still heavily indebted to an intellectual history methodology.

Antisemitism as a Cultural Code

One of the aspects of modern antisemitism that becomes visible in the chapters making up this volume is its capacity to act as a proxy for various fault lines within societies. As such, viewed from a cultural history perspective and following Shulamit Volkov’s influential formulation, its function in different contexts appears to be that of a “cultural code”, an ideological stance less concerned with the existence or behaviour of actual Jews, and more with positing an abstract representation of ‘the Jew’ as the root cause of other, real, and often intractable ‘questions’ raised by modernity.⁴⁴ Whether in Otto Glagau’s aforementioned pinning of all problems associated with capitalism unto ‘the Jews’ or in Heinrich von Treitschke’s dictum “Die Juden sind unser Unglück” (the Jews are our misfortune),⁴⁵ which managed to subsume *all* of the problems confronting Germany to the nefarious influence of Jews and additionally made the concept ‘respectable’ in German intellectual and academic circles, antisemitism came to *stand for* the numerous ‘questions’ confronting late nineteenth century European societies. As Volkov

44 Volkov, *Antisemitism as a Cultural Code*, 25-45.

45 Heinrich von Treitschke, *Unsere Aussichten*, in: *Deutsche Kämpfe. Schriften zur Tagespolitik*, Leipzig 1896, 1-28, here 27.

claimed, for von Treitschke equating the Jews with “every negative aspect of German life [...] by using a simple rhetorical technique, an unsatisfactory situation was suddenly made comprehensible”.⁴⁶ Karin Stögner’s chapter explores the relationship of antisemitism and misogyny along similar lines, showing how analogous tropes and metaphors were deployed to describe and/or associate ‘women’ and ‘Jews’ in diverse contexts, ranging from representatives of ‘nature’ to its opposite, a non-natural ‘civilisation’ associated with the emancipation of both groups, consistently linked, albeit in multiple ways, to notions of deviance. In tracing both their historical and theoretical implications, her study shows how easily such associations could travel across diverse spaces, not being limited to their place of origin or, indeed, to a European ‘centre’.

Stögner’s chapter thus emphasises the abstraction entailed by both antisemitic and misogynist tropes, as was also noted in the former case by Shulamit Volkov: For her, Wilhelm Marr’s very coining of the term ‘antisemitism’ was relevant in that it “did not refer directly to Jews or to Judaism. It spelled an opposition to ‘Semitism’ – an abstraction of all the presumed qualities of the Semitic race.”⁴⁷ Such abstractions gave modern antisemitism its specific ‘power’, translated into a quasi-infinite capacity for adaptation to contexts as diverse as early twentieth century Romania (as discussed in Irina Marin’s chapter) or the United Kingdom after the Second World War (see Paul Stocker’s chapter). The ambiguous status of the referent is simultaneously not synonymous with the actual ‘Jews’, however defined, and yet relentlessly points towards them. A reading of antisemitism as a cultural code through which societal antagonisms are displaced onto a marginalised social group that it marks out for even more radical exclusion is thus applicable beyond the German case study explored in detail by Shulamit Volkov.

In her *histoire croisée* study on the altering discursive function of the Jews during the First World War, Elisabeth Weber shows how the governments of the Central Powers, the Entente and eventually Romania discovered and rhetorically used (and abused) the ‘Jewish question’ in order to appear in a more favourable light in the international political arena. Unlike all of the other case studies in this volume, Weber’s chapter deals not with antisemitism itself but with the reaction to it, an anti-antisemitism that, while undoubtedly genuine on occasion, could also be mimicked for pragmatic purposes. Anti-antisemitism as a proxy and a simple rhetorical element could serve as a plea for civilisation, anti-barbarism, and democracy under certain political conditions of the war. In the Romanian case, after a long discriminatory, anti-assimilationist, and anti-emancipationist politics toward Jewish minorities, the newly developed anti-antisemitism – which was not necessarily coupled with tangible anti-antisemitic practices – helped the government on the one hand to sensitise the international political forums to

46 Shulamit Volkov, *Germans, Jews, and Antisemites. Trials in Emancipation*, Cambridge 2006, 99.

47 Volkov, *Antisemitism as a Cultural Code*, 38.

the new Romanian ambitions of territorial expansion, and on the other to discredit political enemies and stabilise domestic political life.

Consequently, the understanding of antisemitism (and anti-antisemitism) as a proxy hints towards its political function. When deployed by political organisations outside state structures or in opposition to the government, it enables combining commitment to a state or 'nation' with radical criticism of its prevailing conditions, "strong opposition to government policies [...] with an idolising of the state".⁴⁸ In such situations, the anti-semitic code allows the shifting of responsibility, whereby the failures of government officials can be accounted for by their being either 'blind' to the nefarious influence of 'the Jews' or, in more extreme cases, being directly in 'their service'. Such an interpretive scheme thus allows for radical denunciations of the political establishment without inflicting damage to the notion of a harmonious and unitary 'nation' (its failed representatives being either misguided fools or simply 'traitors'), thereby providing radical groups with significant opportunities for action in a field of competing nationalisms. Thus, in its function as a proxy, antisemitism has direct bearing on power structures, and its role in political power struggles is also vital for the understanding of these power struggles. At the same time, as we have seen from the chapters discussed so far, it is important to pay attention to how these proxies operated across different social groups and in different contexts. For if the peasants could hate their landlords in the Jews, the landlords the rising bourgeoisie, the workers the capitalists and the capitalists the workers (and each other), the meanings associated with antisemitism shifted across these fault lines, not only in their semantic content, but also in their political valence.

Colonial Encounters

Flexible Antisemitism: Functions in Nexuses of Knowledge and Power

Like the memory of the Holocaust, which can be approached with a view to its uniqueness, as a particular case of genocide, perhaps the paradigmatic one, or as a crime against humanity,⁴⁹ antisemitism can also be interpreted at different levels and with different reference points. As the chapters in this volume show, it can also be understood according to a tripartite distinction whereby antisemitism is at once a unique phenomenon despite being, as shown above, unrelated to particularities of the Jewish communities that would account for this uniqueness; an instantiation of forms of exclusion predicated on notions of radical otherness, sharing a common ground in this respect with racism (or present-day Islamophobia); and an instantiation of more general prejudice, meeting

48 Volkov, *Germans, Jews, and Antisemites*, 99.

49 We would like to thank Natan Sznajder for this insightful comment, made during his keynote speech at the conference that led to the publication of this volume.

at this point other discriminatory practices based on ethnicity, religion, class, or gender. Each of these aspects is highlighted in the various chapters in this volume, and the conclusion that can be drawn is that rather than treating them as mutually exclusive categories of analysis, a more productive understanding of antisemitism would rather see them as complementary and co-existing layers of this phenomenon.

It is on the one hand undeniable that there is indeed something exceptional about antisemitism – without even reading this backward from the uniqueness of the Holocaust (although this itself could account for the special position of antisemitism among other forms of prejudice), it can be safely said that no other form of exclusion is so radical and comprehensive in constructing the representation of an arch-enemy of virtually everything that is found wanting in a modern society, as visible for example in conspiracy and world domination ‘theories’. This is, once again, not related to any inherent characteristics of the Jews, although Yuri Slezkine’s interpretation of modernity as “the Jewish age” could potentially establish a link with actual Jews, but rather to the possibilities offered by its abstract character.⁵⁰ Increasingly detached from any relationship with its signified beyond the purely formal one, the signifier ‘antisemitism’ can be employed to stand for civilisation’s numerous discontents, operating fluidly between the opposing extremes of capitalism and communism, tribalism and cosmopolitanism, primitiveness and hyper-modernity, and so on. No other form of prejudice has historically been as flexible and protean.

Yet, as the chapters in this volume dealing with colonial encounters show, the exceptional character of antisemitism did not preclude its entanglement in webs of exclusion aimed at groups seen as radically different in the European imagination. The association of antisemitism and racism, the multiple ways in which antisemitism intersected with colonialism, the travelling tropes between antisemitism and other forms of exclusion, all beg for a reading of antisemitism as part of a broader complex of exclusionary practices aimed at (and constitutive of) what could be termed ‘radical otherness’. Moreover, if the uniqueness of antisemitism enabled its distinctive political function referred to earlier, an understanding of antisemitism in the framework of racial hierarchies could offer valuable insights into their role in the establishment of structures of domination and the colonisation of both overseas territories and the metropolitan lands at a time when the peak of European imperialism coincided with aggressive nationalising projects. As Christian S. Davis discusses in his chapter addressing the political uses of colonial lan-

50 Slezkine, *The Jewish Century*, 11. However, it is important to note that in Slezkine’s interpretation Jews are seen as part of a broader category of “Mercurians” or “service nomads” to be found across the globe, “permanent strangers” among the sedentary, agrarian societies in the midst of which they resided, “performing tasks that the natives were unable or unwilling to perform”. *Ibid.*, 14. If Jews eventually came to epitomise ‘Mercurianism’, it was because they were the foremost such group in Europe. As such, modernity as “the Age of Universal Mercurianism became Jewish because it began in Europe”. *Ibid.*, 47.

guage in imperial Germany, antisemites often compared Jews to non-White peoples under White control (often Black people but also other colonised groups, such as Arabs) in order to illustrate an ostensible Jewish threat and to advance an argument for the revocation of Jewish emancipation.

This aspect hints at the third and broadest reading of antisemitism, as a form of prejudice distinct from yet comparable to classism, sexism, xenophobia, and religious intolerance. Intersecting and overlapping with other such categories, antisemitism appears in this light as an integral part of broader efforts at defining the boundaries of the body politic. Aimed at establishing clear notions of who constitutes 'the people' or 'the nation', such efforts were particularly salient in peripheral spaces during the period under consideration in this volume (1880–1945), all the more so since it was often in such spaces that the aforementioned boundaries were fuzzy, shifting, and thus particularly difficult to pin down. In this context, it is important to note a certain anti-egalitarianism that such forms of prejudice had in common, regardless of the criteria on the basis of which the dividing lines were drawn.

While each of these views of antisemitism – as a unique phenomenon, as a form of radical othering, or as one example of more general prejudice – helps refine and nuance the others, and might be useful as a category of analysis in its own right, in practice the three coexist as different dimensions of antisemitism, even if one particular form can be seen to prevail at a given moment in a specific context. Along these lines, it is important to note the relative salience of antisemitism in different spaces and at different times, as well as to draw attention to its entanglements with other forms of exclusion and the corresponding political functions that these performed. Finally, it is important to reiterate that, in all of these manifestations, the present volume treats antisemitism as a modern phenomenon, inseparable from the context in which it emerged and distinct from pre-modern, religiously inspired anti-Judaism, although elements of the latter constantly fused with its modern, ideological incarnation, resulting in the particularities that varied from place to place, and across time, in the 'peripheries'.⁵¹

51 See Robert Nemes/Daniel Unowsky (ed.), *Sites of Modern Antisemitism in the Age of Mass Politics, 1880–1918*, Waltham 2014, for a similar reading that, however, emphasises "the emergence of mass politics across the continent" as the determining factor for understanding antisemitic politics. *Ibid.*, 5. Without neglecting the importance of political mobilisation, as this volume shows, this aspect was neither the single most important nor indeed a necessary precondition for the emergence of modern antisemitism in all of the spaces making up Europe's 'periphery', and antisemitism in such spaces often antedated any meaningful notion of mass politics.

The Gaze of the Observers and the Construction of Visible Difference

Antisemitism, however, does not remain on the level of semantic content or symbolic politics against abstract social groups or values. The discursive cultural coding can target the Jewish subject itself, its body and mind, constructing Jewish ‘difference’ through visualisation and marking Jews as profoundly different in the eyes of others. In the gaze of the modern nineteenth century observer, ‘Jewish character’ marked the ‘Jewish body’: Their visualised biological difference made it possible to supposedly ‘see’ their ‘corrupt souls’. Anthropologists, physiognomists, and other scientific scholars assumed that Jews, like ‘Blacks’, could be identified by their visible bodily differences.⁵² Moreover, it is commonly accepted that stereotypical labelling of a social, cultural, or religious group always calls for a compensatory coping response from which no one of that group can be immune: Looking back to the observer, the eye of the targeted subject mirrors these stereotypes. The alleged ethnic ‘inferiority’ of the Jews has a long tradition in European iconography. It tenaciously survived modernisation and secularisation, although it is also observable that in the age of photography, it moved closer and closer to the physical body of the individual, as evident in the journal illustrations and caricatures analysed in Miloslav Szabó’s chapter.

Another telling example of the power of the antisemitic gaze can be found in the case study on the ‘Jewish carpetbagger’ in Kristoff Kerl’s chapter. The exclusively pejorative term of carpetbagger/Yankee, the figure of the Northern Democratic modernisers who were politically active as Republicans in the South – including educated free ‘Blacks’ – retrospectively became a synonym for the Jews during and after the Civil War. They were accused of political conspiracy, unscrupulous business habits, and were blamed for the misery of the South as a consequence of their promotion of racial integration in the eyes of the Southerners. The intersection of antisemitic habits and resentment toward the ‘carpetbaggers’ was based on a common imagination of the ‘other’ and was deeply rooted in the American South. As an economic daily entitled *The Yankees of the Orient* joked in 1890 in reference to the Northern modernisers: “Twist a Yankee and you make a Jew.”⁵³

Kristoff Kerl’s chapter analyses the Leo Frank case between 1913 and 1915, in which a Jewish man in Atlanta was placed on trial and convicted of raping and murdering a thirteen-year-old white girl who worked for the National Pencil Company, of which he was the manager. Frank was lynched two years later because of the wild antisemitic atmosphere emerging throughout the United States at the time. As Kerl argues, Frank’s case was not only a miscarriage of justice but also symbolised the South’s fears of Northern economic and political influence.

52 Sander L. Gilman, *The Jew’s Body*, New York 1991.

53 *The Yankees of the Orient*, in: *Peninsula Enterprise*, 22 November 1890, 4.

Timm Ebner's literary case study brings us into another domain of antisemitic discourse. He describes in detail how counter-insurgency and cannibalism as topics of earlier colonial literature were smoothly adopted by National Socialist antisemitic propaganda. The interplay between colonial adventure fiction and Nazi propaganda was not an exception of the imagination about the faraway colonies. Indeed, in the increasingly race-conscious societies of the interwar period, the dehumanisation of the other's body had gone so far that, in the end, some of the visualised attributes of the 'other' became labels of Nazi experiments and racial identification.

European Jews as members of the colonisers' community found themselves in an ambivalent societal position in the power structure of the colonies: They experienced both double loyalty and double condemnation. Katharina Hey's chapter about the oeuvre of Albert Memmi describes the "schizophrenic" experience of antisemitism and colonialism lived by the Jews in the Maghreb: On the one hand, these Jews were representatives of the French colonial hegemony in the eyes of the colonised communities; however, as Jews from 'Christian' France, they remained 'others' in the social order of the colonisers and simultaneously targets of their antisemitism. In this position, they developed a double loyalty: first towards the colonisers but second towards the colonised. On the other hand, during the Second World War, they experienced double condemnation because of the experiences of pogroms, discrimination, and expulsion by both the indigenous Muslims and the Vichy administration of Algiers. Thus, the emblematic life and oeuvre of Albert Memmi, who came from a poor Jewish family in Tunis and was educated in French culture, shows how European Jews could find themselves in the ambivalent – if not anomalous – position of a Jew among Muslims, an Arab among Europeans, a poor Jew among the bourgeoisie, and so on.

Forms and Meanings of Antisemitism as a 'Travelling Idea'

The variations of antisemitism outlined above were produced at the intersection of local conditions and transnational transfers of ideas, characteristic of a period that saw intensifying communication among all parts of Europe, as well as with its overseas colonies. This transfer can be read, within the overarching framework of the (uneven) processes of modernisation, in two distinct ways, each of which can in turn be unpacked to reveal multiple vectors of transmission.

First, the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries witnessed the transfer of antisemitism. Scholarship has to date mostly focussed on one-way transfers from the European 'centre' to the 'peripheries', through the import of antisemitic ideas, tropes, and 'theories', faithfully reproduced by local elites from pamphlets and newspaper articles published in France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and so forth. From the echoes

of the Dreyfus Affair reaching all the way to shtetls in the Russian Empire⁵⁴ to its importance in the shaping of Hungarian⁵⁵ and Polish antisemitism,⁵⁶ for the beginnings of Zionism⁵⁷ or, within France, for the spread of antisemitism in popular culture,⁵⁸ to the reproduction of ideas from German antisemitic newspaper articles and pamphlets in the Romanian press and in the parliamentary debates regarding emancipation,⁵⁹ the transfer of antisemitism from West to East and from elites to the general public is relatively well documented.⁶⁰

However, there were other directions of transfer that are equally important to the understanding of antisemitism in its European dimension. For one, there are also the numerous reverse transfers, from the peripheries to the European centre (and beyond), the most notable being the infamous *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, the early twentieth century forgery widely attributed to the Russian Okhrana, the Tsarist secret police, and published not only in Berlin, London, and Paris, but also in Japan, the United States, and South Africa.⁶¹ The chapters by Tamás Kende, Áron Szele, Ionuț Biliuță, and Paul Stocker draw attention to the impact of the *Protocols* in White Russian émigré circles and among anti-communist Eastern European activists more broadly; among Hungarian fascist pamphleteers; Romanian theologians and clergymen; or in the anti-Zionism of the interwar British radical right. The case of late nineteenth

54 Sholom Aleichem, *Dreyfus in Krasilevka*, in: *The Old Country*, translated by Julius and Frances Butwin, New York 1946, 260-264.

55 Hanebrink, *In Defense of Christian Hungary*.

56 Antony Polonsky, *The Dreyfus Affair and Polish-Jewish Interaction, 1890–1914*, in: *Jewish History* 11 (1997) 2, 21-40.

57 Yoram Mayorek, *Herzl and the Dreyfus Affair*, in: *The Journal of Israeli History* 15 (1994) 1, 83-89.

58 Fitch, *Mass Culture, Mass Parliamentary Politics, and Modern Anti-Semitism*, 55-95; Brigitte Sion, *Postcards from the Dreyfus Affair. Mass Media and Modern Antisemitism*, in: Maya Balakirsky Katz (ed.), *Revising Dreyfus*, Leiden 2013, 343-358.

59 Cârstocea, *Uneasy Twins?*, 74-75.

60 Balázs Trencsényi/Maciej Janowski/Monika Baár/Maria Falina/Michal Kopeček, *The Merger of Ethnicism and Conservatism. The Emergence of Political Anti-Semitism*, in: Balázs Trencsényi/Maciej Janowski/Monika Baár/Maria Falina/Michal Kopeček, *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe. Negotiating Modernity in the 'Long Nineteenth Century'*, Oxford 2016, 382-390.

61 Benjamin W. Segal, *A Lie and a Libel. The History of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, translated and edited by Richard S. Levy, Lincoln NE 1995; Stephen Eric Bronner, *A Rumor about the Jews. Reflections on Antisemitism and the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, New York 2000, especially 98-128. Recent scholarship on this subject argues against the widely-held assumption of the Okhrana origins of the *Protocols*, claiming instead that Pavel Krushevan, a notorious Bessarabian antisemite associated with the 1903 Kishinev pogrom, was the author or at least one of the co-authors of the text. This renders the origins of this “arguably most influential antisemitic [text] ever produced” even more peripheral than previously assumed, originating in the borderland of the Tsarist Empire, “an agricultural depot on the empire’s edge”, with figures “viewed as marginal, as rabble-rousers on the fringe of the Russian right”. Steven Zipperstein, *Pogrom: Kishinev and the Tilt of History*, New York 2018 (146, 182, 147). See also Michael Hagemester, *“Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion” vor Gericht. Der Berner Prozess 1933–1937 und die “antisemitische Internationale”*, Zürich 2017; Béla Rásky, *Plagiierte Höllendialoge. Die Fälschungs- und Wirkungsgeschichte der “Protokolle der Weisen von Zion”*, in: *Jüdisches Museum der Stadt Wien* (ed.), *Die Macht der Bilder. Antisemitische Vorurteile und Mythen*, Vienna 1995, 264-271.

century blood libel trials is another example of a powerful and particularly disturbing antisemitic trope originating in Europe's 'peripheries' and making its way back to the 'centre'.⁶²

The chapter by Miloslav Szabó uses such an example of a 'ritual murder' case occurring in 1899 in the then-Hungarian town of Námesztó (today Námestovo in Slovakia) not only to show how a typically medieval type of accusation was reported in the media following modern patterns of antisemitism, but to question the very dynamic of centre/periphery with regards to the travel of antisemitic ideas. As Szabó argues, in such cases local actors from the 'periphery' could portray themselves as 'experts' towards antisemitic centres, and Budapest in the 1880s could appear to Paris or Vienna as an antisemitic centre, reversing (and antedating) the situation that would prevail fifteen years later. Szabó's chapter also discusses the concepts of 'semiosphere' and 'double periphery', which are crucial for understanding the travel of ideas between centres and peripheries in the overall economy of this volume. As Yuri Lotman's concept of the 'semiosphere' implies, the semantic centre also receives impulses from the periphery in order to subsequently codify and canonise them.⁶³ Lotman defined the boundary of the centre/periphery divide as "an area of accelerated semiotic processes", a place of exchange and mutual influence between the two; moreover, the limit entails contact, and it enables centres and peripheries to relativise, or indeed to exchange, their roles.⁶⁴ Because of its position on the periphery of the hegemonic culture of the liberal era, the antisemitic semantics of the late nineteenth century looked for peripheral references, to which end the ritual murder allegations seemed to have been particularly appropriate. While liberalism was associated with the urban, supposedly decadent, and degenerate 'Jewish civilisation', the rural population were identified as the 'healthy people', repositories of the 'authentic' virtues of the nation, thus having an identity-shaping effect. In this context, the 'Jewish ritual murder' could be interpreted as the threat posed by an ominous (modern and urban) civilisation, a conclusion that suggests the modernisation of the traditional narrative. As the history of Hungarian antisemitism around the turn of the century shows, it is therefore necessary to speak of a double periphery in this context. Philip Carabott's chapter also shows how the blood libel myth in nineteenth century Greece (both in relation to local incidents and to echoes of the 1882 Tiszaeszlár trial in the Hungarian part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy) played out between its "rich

62 See Hillel J. Kieval, Representation and Knowledge in Medieval and Modern Accounts of Jewish Ritual Murder, in: *Jewish Social Studies* 1 (1994) 1, 52-72, for an overview of such cases occurring during the modern period, nearly three centuries after their medieval precedents. All of these cases took place between 1882 and 1914 in areas typically considered 'peripheries' or 'borderlands' of the European 'core'. This stands in stark contrast to their medieval counterparts, which were encountered mostly in Western Christianity.

63 Yuri Lotman, On the Semiosphere, in: *Signs Systems Studies* 33 (2005) 1, 205-229.

64 *Ibid.*, 212, 214.

and varied tradition” in Greek lands and the political mobilisation using it to instigate mass violence against Corfiot Jews.⁶⁵

The examples of turn-of-the-century blood libel trials, as explored in the chapters in this volume and elsewhere, point toward yet another type of travel of antisemitic ideas, perhaps the most under-researched to date, namely that of lateral transfers across ‘peripheries’. In addition to their reception in Europe’s political and cultural centres, blood libel trials were also covered extensively in the press in Central and Eastern Europe, for example in Romania, where the historiography has not yet singled out any mediated cases of this type. Moreover, their importance for understanding antisemitism in the peripheries is also conferred by their role in popularising antisemitism among the (primarily peasant) ‘masses’: If the reaction of elites was often one of understandable scepticism, the reproduction of such medieval accusations played into popular prejudices and preconceptions, backed up by a religious tradition averse to alterity. The chapter by Dimitrios Varvaritis explores just such a case: the transnational travel of an early nineteenth century antisemitic tract allegedly written by a Christian Orthodox monk and first published in Romanian in Iași, the capital of the principality of Moldova, in 1803. Tracing the impact of its numerous editions and translations (initially to Greek, subsequently to Arabic, Bulgarian, Dutch, French, Italian, and Karamanli) in the Ottoman Greek-speaking world and beyond, Varvaritis’ chapter follows the evolution of a pre-modern text grounded in religious prejudice and acting as an “authoritative source for the blood libel myth” to its employment by late nineteenth century antisemites. As such, his research shows that an indigenous corpus of antisemitic literature existed and travelled extensively in the Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean, among the Christian Orthodox subjects of the Ottoman Empire, antedating the transmission of antisemitic ideas from Western Europe.

Second, as already anticipated above, the transnational dimension of modern antisemitism is not only visible in the transmission of antisemitic ideas as such, but rather extends to its entanglement with other forms of exclusion. The emergence of modern antisemitism coincided both with the advent of scientific racism and the heyday of European imperialism, all of which were underwritten to varying degrees by anthropology as a scientific discipline. While this volume seeks to distance itself from interpretations that posit too close a connection between antisemitism and racism, in its attempt to show how the former could take a variety of other forms in ‘peripheral’ spaces, this does not preclude attention to the communication between these forms of exclusion, or to the power dynamics in which they were embedded. Along these lines, the simultaneous attempts at colonisation, both domestic and overseas, can be read as defined by the tension between the opposing tractions of efforts at homogenisation and hierarchisation,

65 See also Mary Margaroni, *The Blood Libel on Greek Islands in the Nineteenth Century*, in: Robert Nemes/Daniel Unowsky (ed.), *Sites of European Antisemitism in the Age of Mass Politics, 1880–1918*, Waltham 2014, 178–196.

whereby some groups were deemed to be assimilable and others radically 'other' (and, according to the prevailing view of the time, invariably 'inferior'). The position of Jews, as "citizens who combined spectacular success with irredeemable tribal foreignness",⁶⁶ along this continuum of inclusion/exclusion always appears uncertain, oscillating between that of the prime candidates for assimilation to their radical exclusion on the basis of categories as rigid as those employed to identify 'racial difference'. And if actual Jewish communities escaped such categorisations by positioning themselves at various points along a continuum ranging from full assimilation to complete (self-)exclusion, it was along these binary lines that their imaginary representation in antisemitic discourse operated, complete with the fear of either extreme. As the chapters in this volume dealing with the entanglements of antisemitism and colonialism show, the transfers of ideas operating between the two took a variety of forms, in contexts further complicated by intensified migration between colony and metropolis.

When shifting the attention to the peripheries, the colonising gaze becomes yet more problematic and unstable, torn between wild expansionist fantasies, for example of a Greater Bulgaria, Serbia, or Romania, or of Megali Greece,⁶⁷ and the fear of colonisation, backed up both by previous historical experience and an acute awareness of the fragile status of such new states in the international system.⁶⁸ From this perspective, the perception of the 'centre' as at once something to be imitated (as evident in the ubiquitous obsession of 'catching up' with Western modernity) and to be feared (as translated in the equally obsessive quest for some illusory 'national specificity') resulted in highly uneven and constantly shifting patterns of transmission. At a time when states in the periphery and centre alike were involved in processes of internal colonisation of Eugen Weber's "peasants" who were yet to be made "into Frenchmen" while attempting to draw the constantly expanding boundaries of the state along ever more rigid lines, the quest for both could appear extremely problematic in areas that were by definition multi-ethnic, multi-confessional, and lacking the resources for the development of effective nationalising institutions.⁶⁹ Caught in the crossfire of the attempts to reproduce Western Europe's colonising thrust and the fear of seeing it applied to themselves, Jews (and other select internal 'others') could be portrayed alternatively by peripheral nationalising states as *standing for* both: as 'backward' populations to be colonised and agents of colonisers aiming to subvert and undermine national aspirations.

66 Slezkine, *The Jewish Century*, 12.

67 The Megali (or 'Great') idea was an irredentist concept of Greek nationalism that sought to establish a state that would include all the areas historically inhabited by ethnic Greeks, including the territories that had been part of ancient Greece. This notion, which was tantamount to a restoration of the Byzantine Empire, was central to Greek politics from the time of its independence until the First World War.

68 Andrei Sorescu, *Visions of Agency. Imagining Individual and Collective Action in Nineteenth Century Romania*, PhD Thesis, University College London, 2018, 79-88, 167-185.

69 Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen. The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914*, London 1977.

Notions of the ‘valorisation’ of both colonised populations and internal ‘others’, as explored in Lukas Bormann’s chapter through the lens of a Jewish German intellectual and his engagement with the German colonial project and its anthropological bases, became very important in this context, having their counterpart in the debates in Central and Eastern Europe about the ‘usefulness’ of Jews to the state.⁷⁰ In cases of internal colonial projects, such as that described in Irina Marin’s chapter with regards to the Romanian economy at the turn of the century, some states also found the Jews ‘useful’ in deflecting and externalising their exploitative practices onto ‘domestic foreigners’ barred from citizenship. Finally, the chapters by Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe and Áron Szele show, in the cases of interwar Ukrainian and Hungarian radical right-wing thinkers, the complex entanglements and transfers of ideas between antisemitism and notions of scientific racism encompassing Jews, other ethnic groups singled out for exclusion, and the respective ‘national communities’ they were trying to define along racial lines.

All of these considerations nuance prevailing views of a one-way transfer of antisemitic, racist, and other exclusionary discourses from the centre to the peripheries, arguing instead for a perspective that sees the travel of these concepts as multi-directional and pluri-polar, encompassing the ‘reverse direction’ as well as numerous cases of lateral transmission. This interpretation thus places the focus squarely on the *agents* who enacted such transfers, on the *transnational networks* they established, and on the *vehicles/media of transmission*.

Diachronic Timescapes: The Changing Nature of Antisemitism after the First World War

Intersections: Antisemitism and Anti-Communism

After the 1917 Russian Revolution, a pervasive new trope made its way into the already wide range of accusations making up modern antisemitism: that of ‘Judeo-Bolshevism’. While associations of Jews with the socialist movement and socialism in general (as a creation of ‘the Jew’ Karl Marx) were as old as antisemitism itself, their mutation into notions of ‘Judeo-Bolshevism’ led the latter to acquire new connotations, at once associated with a specific historical reality (that of the Bolsheviks and the Soviet Union as the world’s first socialist state) and convertible into ‘universal’ notions of a ‘world conspiracy’ drawing significantly on the already widely known *Protocols*. The powerful notion of ‘the Jew as capitalist’ was matched by an equally powerful one of ‘the Jew as communist’ and, despite their evident incompatibility, the two were often combined in anti-

⁷⁰ See for example William A. Oldson, *A Providential Anti-Semitism. Nationalism and Polity in Nineteenth Century Romania*, Philadelphia 1991.