

CHAPTER TEN

Breaches in Franco-Judaism

MARKED BY THE MASSIVE ARRIVAL of new immigrants, the birth of modern anti-Semitism, the Dreyfus affair, and the emergence of Zionism, the end of the nineteenth century destabilized the model of Franco-Judaism that until then had been inseparable from integration *à la française*.

IMMIGRATION

The assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881 and the pogroms that slaughtered the Jews in its wake, the restrictive measures adopted in Romania, then the Kishinev pogrom in 1903 and the crushing of the Russian Revolution of 1905 triggered very large waves of emigration. Of the 3.5 million Jews who left central and eastern Europe between 1880 and 1925, 2.65 million settled in the United States, 210,000 in England, 150,000 in Argentina, 112,000 in Canada, and 100,000 in France. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, the United States was considered by Jewish immigrants to be a sort of promised land—something that was not yet the case with France.

In Paris, prior to World War I, the immigrants numbered 30,000 to 40,000—nearly half of the total number of Jews in the capital, and in any case representing a major change in the composition of the Parisian Jewish community. Nonetheless, on the eve of the war, Jewish immigrants from eastern Europe represented only a fifth (17 percent) of the total number of immigrants in Paris. Until the 1920s, the Jewish migratory movement was transatlantic. France remained chiefly a stopover for Jewish migrants en route to the United States and Argentina. At this time, the noninterventionist policy of the western countries meant that border controls were not strict. Jewish immigrants were not, however, well regarded. They were considered revolutionary agitators and typically treated as anarchists.¹

The development of modern anti-Semitism also dates from the 1880s. French Jews, now that they were on the verge of achieving integration for themselves, feared the arrival of Jews whose appearance reminded them of what they themselves had looked like before emancipation. Concerned that a concentration of Jewish immigrants whose customs seemed to belong to another time would arouse anti-Semitic feelings, they sought to

BREACHES IN FRANCO-JUDAISM

135

direct this immigration toward other countries. During the same period a wave of xenophobia broke out in reaction to economic crisis and the subsequent rise in unemployment, also to uncertainty and worry in the face of modernization, which led to the foreigner being made a scapegoat. In reality, given their small numbers, Jewish immigrants represented no danger. The fact remained, however, that they were foreigners.

This immigration caused the non-Jewish world to discover the existence of a Jewish proletariat—even if most Jews did not work in factories—at a time when there was a great deal of talk in the non-Jewish press about Jewish banking, finance, and commerce. In fact, the newcomers were mainly skilled workers and artisans—typically leather craftsmen, hatters, furriers, woodworkers, cabinetmakers, jewelers, and clothing manufacturers. French-born Jews remained silent on the subject of these immigrants, from whom they were separated by linguistic, cultural, and economic barriers. These were Jews who spoke Yiddish, who were still attached to Jewish traditions, and who were poor; to them, the indigenous population seemed very un-Jewish. French Jews adopted a paternalistic attitude, hoping to make the new arrivals share their devotion to the culture and civilization of their new homeland—to make of them French men and women of the Jewish faith. The schools of the consistory and the lay school system of the republic succeeded in realizing this aim.

The years that followed Dreyfus's rehabilitation, from 1906 until the Great Depression in the 1930s, were a time of respite for immigrant Jews, happy to be able to "live like God in France" (*Lebn vi Got in Frankrykh*), as the Yiddish proverb put it. This climate encouraged their integration, which had to proceed on two fronts: integration with both the new host society and the French Jewish community. Immigrants did not ask themselves whether they were Jewish: naturally they were, without supposing this to be incompatible with either their attachment to France or their feelings of gratitude toward it. Each wave of immigration thus reawakened a sense of Jewishness within the increasingly secularized Jewish population of France.

The integration of these new immigrants was accompanied by social mobility, more often than not into the middle classes. Their children succeeded in the liberal professions, public administration, and the academy. In the case of certain sons of immigrants, such as André Citroën (1878–1935), who was born of Polish parents in Paris, the climb up the social ladder was spectacular.

In reaction against the rejection that they met with among French-born Jews, the newcomers created specifically immigrant organizations that would be capable of responding to their needs and help mitigate the indifference of French and French Jewish institutions. They founded their own periodicals (thirteen newspapers between 1906 and 1914), their own

cultural organizations, including a Yiddish theater in 1907; their own mutual aid societies, including societies of fellow countrymen (*landsmanshaft*), a kind of association for the defense of common interests; their own philanthropic societies, including the Asile Israélite de Paris; their own pedagogical organizations; their own oratories; their own nonconsistorial synagogue; and their own restaurants and kosher butcher shops.² The Fédération des Sociétés Juives de Paris, a group of twenty-two immigrant associations, was created in 1913. It signalled the desire for independence on the part of immigrant groups in relation to French-born Jews and their interest in managing their own affairs.

Additionally, they organized their own trade union movement on the eve of the First World War. The ideological currents that swept through the Jewish and non-Jewish worlds during the period were imported by immigrant groups, among them Bundists (members of the Bund),³ anarchists, revolutionary socialists, and Zionists.

This period also saw the emergence of largely Jewish neighborhoods in Paris, such as the *Pletzl* (little square) in the Marais. The solidarity born of the immigrant experience in these neighborhoods went hand-in-hand with plurality in religious and political expression.⁴

Francophone Jews from the Levant—practitioners of the Sephardic rite—also made their way to Europe, especially after 1909, fleeing the obligatory military service instituted in the Ottoman Empire and later the Balkan wars of 1912–13. In 1911, they numbered 4,568 in the Seine department.⁵ These descendants of the Jews expelled from the Iberian peninsula in the fifteenth century naturally looked to France, whose language and culture they had learned in the schools of the Alliance Israélite Universelle and in the French congregationist schools established in the Near East. Some North African Jews—particularly Algerians, French since the *décret Crémieux* of 1870—joined these groups of immigrants. The Levantine Jews (or *Orientaux* as they were usually called) were concentrated in the eleventh arrondissement, in the neighborhood bounded by the Place Voltaire, the rue Popincourt and the rue Sedaine, and adjacent streets.

Less numerous than the Jews of central and eastern Europe, who adhered to a different rite, they too built their own synagogues and created their own associations. In 1909 they founded the Association Culturelle Orientale de Paris, responsible not only for supervising religious practice but also for bringing moral and material assistance to Ottoman Jews arriving in the capital. The integration of these immigrants was straightforward, for they already knew French before they arrived, and so they rapidly ceased to appear to be foreigners.

In the beginning of the twentieth century, many Jewish artists, painters, and sculptors settled in Paris: Louis Marcoussis (1883–1941) in 1903, Jules

Pascin (1885–1930) and Sonia Dalanay (1885–1979) in 1905, and Amadeo Modigliani (1884–1920) in 1906. Jacques Lipchitz (1891–1973) and Ossip Zadkine (1890–1967) in 1909, Moïse Kisling (1891–1953), Marc Chagall (1887–1985), and Chaïm Soutine (1894–1943) in 1910, Chana Orloff (1888–1968) in 1911, Michel Kikoïne (1891–1968) in 1912, and Mané-Katz (1894–1962) in 1913 were followed after the war by many others, such as Jean Atlan (1913–60) and Marcel Janco (1895–1984). In the years preceding the Great War, La Ruche, a circle of artists whose studios were located in the Passage Dantzig in Montparnasse, offered shelter to Jewish artists such as Marek Schwart (1892–1962), Joseph Tchaïkov (1888–1986), and Léon Krémégne (1890–1981), who tried to create a new Jewish art: their group was known as the Mahmadim (The Precious Ones) after the title of the journal they had founded. In the years following the Dreyfus affair, Paris was the triumphant capital of art and liberty; Jewish immigrants participated in the great artistic movements that blossomed in the city and contributed to the renown of what was improperly called the School of Paris, also known in the 1920s as the Jewish School. The fact that during this same period there was a large number of Jewish art dealers and critics drew an anti-Semitic reaction at a time when nationalism and conservatism were rife.

Foreign-born Jews massively signed up as volunteers during the Great War: they numbered about 8,500, of whom 2,000 or so were to die in combat.⁶ In a way, then, they had repaid their debt to the country that had welcomed them and demonstrated their patriotism to their fellow, French-born Jews.

ANTI-SEMITISM

The anti-Semitism that began to develop in France in the 1880s was a sort of composite result of the Christian anti-Judaism of right-wing and clerical circles, the Judeophobic anticapitalism of the socialists and working classes, and the elaboration of the pseudoscientific concept of race. This last concept, which derived from recent discoveries in biology and owed much to the success of positivism and Darwinism, led to a theory of racial inequality according to which the “Jewish race” was inferior to the “Aryan race.”

An obscure journalist named Édouard Drumont united all these elements and brought them to the attention of the widest possible audience. Anti-Semitism gathered momentum in the context of the industrial revolution, under the pressure of urbanization and the upheavals it brought about in a country that was traditionally rural and Catholic. It fed on the worries aroused by the economic depression of the last quarter of the

century and the fears generated by unemployment, on the political crises that shook the government, the secularization of society, the growth of the workers' movement, anarchist scares, the triumph of science and new technologies—all this against the background of a singular mixture of nationalism and xenophobia in Europe and, in France, nervousness and anxiety.

Anti-Semitism had taken root earlier in central and eastern Europe with the development of pan-Slavism and pan-Germanism before attracting a following in France. In 1878, the first anti-Jewish party was founded in Berlin by the Lutheran minister Adolf Stöcker and the journalist Wilhelm Marr. Marr was the first to use the word "anti-Semitism," a term of contempt expressing all the hatred and resentment felt by Germans discontented with their lot in relation to the Jews, whom they regarded as inferiors. His example was imitated with enthusiasm in other countries.

It certainly cannot be said that France at the end of the nineteenth century was fundamentally anti-Semitic. Even so, French popular culture was still influenced by Judeophobic clichés inherited from the past. Jews were not yet seen, despite their integration and acculturation, as a full-fledged citizens—even though governments had looked favorably upon them since the reign of Louis Philippe. Christian and right-wing anti-Semitism persisted in a latent state. It manifested itself during the Damascus affair of 1840 and the Mortara affair of 1858 and reappeared whenever the church felt itself threatened, as it had under the July Monarchy. During the Third Republic it became virulent, beginning in 1879 with the reaction to the secular reforms undertaken by the new government. Thus opened an era of denunciations of Jewish conspiracy, a recurrent theme that was supposed to explain all the dysfunctions of society and politics and that soon was to be inseparable from the twin theme of masonic conspiracy. The Jew-Freemason tandem was long-lived, with the Jew being considered the architect of revolution and anticlericalism, the persecutor of the clergy, and the destroyer of Christian religion and civilization.

From the beginning of the century onward anti-Judaism in its modern form produced a substantial literature: it grew in size under the Second Empire with the appearance in 1869 of *Le Juif, le Judaïsme et la Judaisation des peuples chrétiens* (The Jew, Judaism, and the Judaization of the Christian Peoples) by the aristocrat Henri Gougenot des Mousseaux, which was to become the bible of anti-Semitism; aided by the press, it kept growing in the years ahead with the appearance of newspapers such as *La Croix*, a daily founded in 1883 that exploited the Jew-Freemason angle. Such publications had the effect of exacerbating the ambient anti-Semitic sensibility.

The left was susceptible to similar inclinations—not until the Dreyfus affair would it renounce them once and for all. The industrial revolution and the subsequent emergence of the problem of the workers produced a new theme that supported left-wing anti-Semitism: anticapitalism.

The Jews as a whole were identified with the Rothschilds. Certain Saint-Simonian Jews had in fact been ardent promoters of the industrial revolution and of mechanized production. Socialists such as Charles Fourier and Pierre Joseph Proudhon denounced the consequences of this revolution as well as the train of injustices that followed in its wake, and advocated a return to the preindustrial stage.

Alphonse Toussenel, a disciple of Fourier, stigmatized the reign of money in *Les Juifs, rois de l'époque: histoire de la féodalité financière* (The Jews, Kings of the Age: History of Financial Feudalism), a two-volume work published in 1845 by the Librairie de l'École Sociétaire. It was reissued in 1847 and subsequently in 1886 and 1888, a period that saw the rise of a venomous anti-Semitism. Toussenel's work inspired extremists such as Drumont as well as a conservative and rural anti-Semitism that later found its most perfect expression in the Action Française. Georges Duchêne, a close friend of Proudhon, also followed in Toussenel's footsteps. At the beginning of the Third Republic, the most important anti-Semitic writings came from the pens of socialists such as Albert Regnard, Gustave Tirdon, and Auguste Chirac. While certain early socialists confused Jews and Jewish bankers with capitalism, others became anti-Semites owing to anti-religious convictions. The Rothschilds fueled the fantasies of anti-Semites on both the left and the right, together with the corollary dread of occult Jewish power.

Pseudoscientific anti-Semitism, with its hierarchies among races, idealized the Aryan while making the Jew—visibly afflicted by the physical signs of his inferiority—the negation of the Aryan. It found ardent defenders not only in Germany but also in France, notably in the person of Édouard Drumont, who succeeded in giving it a very large audience, drawing as he pleased upon a variety of authors including Hippolyte Taine and (though his thought was much more complex and nuanced) Ernest Renan. Maurice Barrès was to base his particular brand of anti-Semitism in turn on Drumont's popular pseudoscientific racism.

These various anti-Semitic tendencies fed on events from 1880 on and converged in a *fin de siècle* characterized by political, social, and economic transformations that destabilized French society. The crash in 1882 of the Union Générale, a Catholic bank created in 1878 by Paul-Eugène Bon-toux, a former employee of the Rothschilds, was attributed to them, even though at trial Bon-toux was found guilty of fraudulent dealings. The right and the Catholic press flew into a rage against the Jews. In fact, the Jews were only scapegoats and the crash only a pretext. It was followed by the eruption in 1892 of the Panama scandal, a case of corporate corruption extending over a five-year period (1888–93) in which several Jewish businessmen were implicated, ending in the ruin of thousands of small savers. From this point on, anti-Semitism was feverishly deployed in all its forms.

Anti-republicanism became merged with anti-Semitism, all the more since with the advent of anticlerical republicans the clergy and aristocratic elements had been removed from power. An all-out religious war between Catholicism and rationalism was at hand. The Jewish conspiracy served both as explanation and justification for the discontent in Catholic circles. Between 1882 and 1885, three attempts were made to start up anti-Semitic newspapers, two in Paris—*L'Anti-Juif* and *L'Antisémitique*—and one in Mondidier—*Le Péril social*—none of which lasted beyond the first few issues.⁷

Between the Union Générale crash and the Panama scandal, a genuine turning point occurred with the publication in 1886 by Marpon and Flammarion of Drumont's major work, *La France juive*. Issued in two volumes and totalling 1,200 pages, it crystallized all the new anti-Semitic tendencies. The work turned out to be a remarkable publishing success: the initial printing of 2,000 copies was bought up at once; within two months more than 70,000 copies had been sold and more than 100,000 by the end of the year. By 1887 the book was already in its one hundred forty-fifth printing. Dozens of reprints and run-on editions followed. By 1914, the number of printings exceeded two hundred. Given that each printing consisted of between 1,000 and 5,000 copies, the impact of such a work may readily be imagined.⁸ The massive circulation of the book, which initially was published at the author's personal expense, is explained by the fact that the public was already disposed to be receptive to the arguments developed by the author, without any vigorous promotion having to be done on its behalf. The press, now freed from its shackles by the law of 1881 limiting journalistic criminal liability, did its part to contribute to the work's success, though this was slowed by the author's death in 1917 and the United Front (*Union sacrée*) of the war years. In the 1930s, however, its theses came to be adopted by the many newspapers and various other publications of the extreme right.

The anti-Semitism advocated by Drumont rallied the disunited Catholic and working class forces of the nation in combat against a republic that was seen as capitalist, Judaized, and—naturally—anti-Catholic. As it developed into an ideology and political program capable of explaining crises and absorbing discontent, it came to crystallize French national identity in opposition to the Jew, who was now perceived as a menace to the integrity of the nation. The extreme right was henceforth to exploit this line to the fullest.

In 1889, Drumont and Jacques Biez organized an anti-Semitic society that was dissolved a year later, however, for lack of support. In 1892, Drumont started his own newspaper, *La Libre Parole*, which publicly broke the Panama scandal. Notable for its highly anti-Semitic and polemical tone, its

sales were weak despite an initial print-run of 200,000 copies.⁹ The various Parisian and regional editions of *La Croix*, published by the Assumptionists, and of the *Pèlerin*, amounting to some 500,000 copies, and associations such as the Ligue Antisémitique, which claimed as many as 11,000 members in July 1898, helped bring about the boom in popularity of an anti-Semitic movement that had only to be fed by the press in order to explode during the Dreyfus affair.¹⁰ For its part, the left did not yet condemn anti-Semitism during this period and remained susceptible to certain of its overarching themes.

THE AFFAIR

The Facts

Anti-Semitism was nonetheless far from being a violently hostile phenomenon in the mid-1890s when the Dreyfus affair erupted, in a nation that included some 130,000 Jews (60,000 of them in Algeria).¹¹ At the end of September 1894, army intelligence accused Captain Alfred Dreyfus (1859–1935), a French Jew and artillery officer attached to the general staff, of authorship of a letter—the famous *bordereau*—addressed to the military attaché of the German embassy in Paris. Dreyfus was arrested on 15 October, committed to Cherche-Midi prison, convicted of treason on 22 December 1894, and sentenced to deportation and imprisonment for life in a fortified compound. He protested his innocence. An appeal for review of the case was nonetheless rejected as unwarranted. Anti-Semitic passions broke loose during Dreyfus's public degradation on 5 January 1895—a ceremony that was to make a powerful impression on the future founder of Zionism, Theodor Herzl, who witnessed the scene as a correspondent for the Viennese newspaper *Neue Freie Presse*. Dreyfus was deported to Devil's Island, off Cayenne on the Guyana coast.

At the outset the matter was considered to be an ordinary case of treason. Dreyfus's sentencing failed to arouse controversy. Then in 1896 the affair took a new turn. Army intelligence intercepted a telegram—the *petit bleu*—sent by the German embassy to a Major Esterhazy, who had been placed under close surveillance. The new chief of the intelligence section, Lieutenant Colonel Georges Picquart, discovered in the course of his inquiry suspicious contacts between Esterhazy and the embassy's military attaché. On reopening the secret dossier on Dreyfus, he became convinced that Esterhazy was the real author of the *bordereau* attributed to the Jewish officer. Suspecting a miscarriage of justice, he tried in vain to sway his superiors, who refused to reopen the case. Picquart was exiled to Tunisia.

Picquart's assistant, Major Hubert Henry, handed over to the deputy chief of the General Staff a document that was damning for Dreyfus—a document that Henry had, in fact, fabricated himself: the *faux Henry*.

Meanwhile the captain's brother, Mathieu Dreyfus (1857–1930), had furnished the journalist Bernard Lazare, a French Jew and anarchist sympathizer, with a series of documents in February 1895 that established Alfred's innocence. Lazare reported the results of his investigation in a pamphlet published on 6 November 1896 under the title *Une erreur judiciaire: La vérité sur l'affaire Dreyfus* (A Miscarriage of Justice: The Truth about the Dreyfus Affair). By this act, Lazare—an intellectual with a passion for justice—atoned for his earlier writings, which had a whiff of anti-Semitism about them, and so redeemed himself as a French citizen of the Jewish faith. As in the case of other Jewish intellectuals, the affair gave him the opportunity to change direction and commit himself to the struggle as a Jew—and later as a Jewish nationalist of a particular type—without, however, disavowing his anarchist convictions. His stance was far from characteristic of the attitude of his fellow Jews, who at first preferred to avoid stirring up trouble by denouncing the court's mistake, blindly trusting in the fairness of the French legal system.

France Divided

Evidence of a miscarriage of justice divided France into two camps, Dreyfusards and anti-Dreyfusards. There was also a third faction made up of what might be called “Dreyfusians”—those who wished to see an end put to the affair and hoped things would return to normal for the sake of social and political order, followed by the secularization and transformation of the political class.¹² Events took another dramatic turn when, the mistaken verdict having been exposed, military authorities continued to cover up the facts of the matter to protect the honor of the army, the ultimate guarantor of the country's security. The Dreyfusards sought to bring about the victim's rehabilitation and thereby to defend justice and the rights of man. The anti-Dreyfusards, citing reasons of state and the national interest, opposed any reconsideration of the case. Thus two political ideologies clashed: democracy, defended by the Dreyfusards, and authoritarian government, advocated by the anti-Dreyfusards, who had recruited a very mixed group of supporters including not only republicans but also Communards, anti-Semites, revolutionary syndicalists, and anarchists. The leading thinkers of this new nationalist and anti-Semitic right were Maurice Barrès and Charles Maurras. Catholics and the military bolstered their ranks while the opposing camp enlisted antimilitarist and anticlerical

forces. The political struggles of the years prior to the affair found themselves perpetuated in this new confrontation. Over time the left detached itself from the nationalist values it had previously defended as part of the Jacobin tradition of patriotism—values that were subsequently to become those of the right. Early on, however, Dreyfus's conviction aroused indignation neither on the part of the socialists nor of the anarchists.

On 13 January 1898, Emile Zola published his open letter to the president of the republic in Clemenceau's newspaper, *L'Aurore*, under the title “J'accuse.” Zola attacked the military hierarchy, denounced the reasons of state behind which it had sought to hide as well as the flagrant injustice of the case fabricated against Dreyfus, and proclaimed the captain's innocence. At the same time he criticized the shameful exploitation of anti-Semitic passions. Zola's letter provoked numerous demonstrations against its author, against the Jews, and on behalf of the army. Anti-Semitic violence also broke out in Algeria. Petitions calling for the case to be reopened circulated as well. The intellectual left was born. Zola's trial (7–23 February 1898) ended with a sentence of one year in prison and a fine. On 4 April the court of appeal annulled the verdict on a technicality. In the aftermath of this decision, on 4 June, the *Ligue des Droits de l'Homme* was founded; it stood firmly behind Dreyfus. At the same moment the anti-revisionist forces were mobilizing. On 31 December 1898 they created the *Ligue de la Patrie Française*; a year later, its membership stood at 500,000.¹³ Large public demonstrations for and against reexamining the case were organized by the two leagues.

The anti-Dreyfus movement soon turned in the direction of nationalism, inseparable in this instance from anti-Semitism. Anti-intellectual, anti-individualistic, anti-Protestant, antiparliamentary, xenophobic, and militaristic, it looked to authoritarian nationalism to rescue the country from its decadence by rallying support for its institutions, chiefly the army and the church, in the context of a strong state resting on traditional values. The system of values its supporters hoped to reconstruct was based on order, authority, and country. Protestants, Jews, Freemasons, and foreigners posed a danger to the national community of ordinary decent folk—all those left behind by economic growth—who made up the bulk of the anti-Dreyfus forces. From the political point of view, Dreyfusism became merged with the defense of republican institutions and democratic values, clarifying the dividing line between left and right. From this point on, the left also had to stand in opposition to anti-Semitism, now the monopoly of the right.

On 8 August 1899, Dreyfus's second trial opened in Rennes. He was found “guilty of complicity with the enemy, with extenuating circumstances” and sentenced to ten years in prison. On 19 September, he was

pardoned by President Émile Loubet, anxious to calm the passions aroused by the affair. But Dreyfus continued to ask for rehabilitation. Finally, on 12 July 1906, he was formally rehabilitated and reinstated in the army.

Dreyfus's brother and wife fought hard during these long years on his behalf with the unanimous support of the Dreyfusards. The affair, which so deeply divided France, was a relatively insignificant matter at the beginning. It ended up marking a turning point in the history of the country. But what did it mean for the Jews?

The Affair and Anti-Semitism

The Dreyfus affair surely cannot be treated simply as a Jewish question. Anti-Semitism nonetheless played an important role in the captain's being found guilty, even if several kinds of anti-Semitism were involved. But for a long time Jews refused to see this. The captain himself did not attribute his downfall to anti-Semitism, at least not to judge from his journal, *Cinq années de ma vie* (1894–1899), which appeared in 1899. And those who took up positions alongside Dreyfus did not do so at the time in order to denounce anti-Semitism. It must not be forgotten, however, that already in 1892 Drumont's newspaper *La Libre Parole* had launched a campaign against Jewish officers in the French army, provoking duels and deaths. Upon Dreyfus's arrest, the anti-Semitic press accorded great importance to the identity of the accused. The captain's own brother wrote, "If Alfred were not a Jew, he would not have gone to Devil's Island."¹⁴ Bernard Lazare likewise denounced the anti-Semitism underlying the sentencing and the refusal to review the case.

What is to be said, however, about the cautious attitude of the Jews toward the affair? First of all, it was probably less cautious than is usually supposed. In defending one of their own, neither French Jews nor their leaders wished at this point to risk putting in doubt their loyalty and their attachment to the country that had granted them emancipation. Hence the silence about the Jewishness of the accused for a certain time. Intellectuals and bourgeois Jews gradually came to take up Dreyfus's cause for various reasons. And at least among certain sections of French Jewry, the affair was to have lasting repercussions.

Anti-Semitism was used as a weapon by the anti-Dreyfusard camp, even if some anti-Semites individually declared themselves in favor of reopening the case; indeed it reached a new peak during the affair. The affair invested anti-Semitism with new functions and captured the attention of the general public, including the working classes, which were influenced by all sorts of anti-Jewish prejudices. Anti-Semitism thus came to achieve widespread popularity, and not only in cities in France. One of its most

striking manifestations was the erection of a monument to Major Henry—the man who had earlier forged the evidence that was to damn Dreyfus—following Henry's suicide in 1898. A subscription was also taken up among anti-Dreyfusards to help his widow cover the costs of various legal actions she had initiated. It must nonetheless be acknowledged that anti-Semitism was not the principal motivation behind the Henry memorial—better seen as an expression of the nationalism that took shape during the 1880s—and that it was not the only tendency to feed the anti-Dreyfus movement.¹⁵

Between Dreyfus's rehabilitation and the end of the First World War, anti-Semitism subsided somewhat. Even so, *La Libre Parole* continued to appear. Action Française, a monarchist movement founded by Charles Maurras during the affair in 1898, organized a league in 1905 and three years later began publication of the anti-Dreyfusard and anti-Semitic daily *L'Action française*. It also sponsored violent demonstrations. The anti-Semitic press continued to broadcast the themes of Judeo-Masonic conspiracy, Jewish invasion, German Jewish espionage, and ritual murder under the bylines of authors such as Léon Daudet and Albert Monniot. Catholic circles remained susceptible to anti-Semitic propaganda as well.

In Algeria, the Esterhazy trial and the publication of Zola's "J'accuse" triggered anti-Semitic unrest in January 1898. The year before, in Mostaganem, a clash broke out during a cycling race that led to the pillage of the Jewish quarter by Moslems and Europeans. Max Régis, the new president of the Anti-Jewish League and the future mayor (elected in 1898) of Algiers, sent his supporters into the city's Jewish neighborhood with cries of "Long live the army! Down with the Jews!"; more than a hundred people were injured, and Jewish stores were looted. Bloody riots followed in Algerian cities with Jews as their targets. Suppression of the violence was halfhearted. The toll was heavy. This climate of unrest was to last for several years. Did the Dreyfus affair help give greater scope to an anti-Jewish movement that already existed in embryonic form? The same Max Régis had also started *L'Anti-Juif*, a newspaper inspired by Drumont's ideas with a print-run of 20,000 copies—an exceptional figure at the time in this country. Drumont himself was triumphantly elected, with Régis's support, *député* in the second district of Algiers in 1898; three other candidates on the same slate won elections in Algiers, Oran, and Constantine. Thus, four of the six Algerian deputies in the Chamber of Deputies belonged to the anti-Semitic camp. In Algeria, anti-Semitism came close to being a mass movement.¹⁶

The First World War diluted anti-Semitism in the patriotic fervor of the United Front advocated by Barrès. In the same spirit, Barrès consented in 1917 to include the Jews among the various spiritual families of France—*Les Diverses Familles spirituelles de la France*, the title of the book he published that year.

Zionism under the leadership of Theodor Herzl was primarily a diplomatic movement aimed at finding a solution to the question of Palestine (under Ottoman rule until 1917) in negotiation with the great powers. It needed therefore to take into account the interests of France, a ubiquitous presence in the Ottoman Empire, particularly from the commercial point of view; in addition, France was the custodian of the Ottoman debt and the protector of the holy places in Jerusalem. At first, however, political Zionism had a hard time gaining a foothold in France.

The Zionist Federation of France, founded in 1901, was notable for its recruitment of Jewish immigrants (especially intellectuals) from eastern Europe. On the eve of the First World War, it included eight associations in Paris, one in Nice, and two in Tunis. Apart from André Spire (1868–1966) and Bernard Lazare, who joined the movement for a brief time, Zionist leaders in France were foreign-born from the beginning: Alexandre Marmorek (1865–1923), who in 1899 started the newspaper *L'Écho sioniste* (1899–1905/1912–14, appearing between 1916 and 1921 under the title *Le Peuple juif*), Baruch Hagnani (1885–1944), and Myriam Schah (1867–1956). French Jews—brought up to respect the ideals of the French Revolution, proud of their emancipation, concerned to present the image of a thoroughly integrated group, and obsessed with proving their patriotism in a country that was experiencing a rise in anti-Semitism—could greet the young movement founded in Basel in 1897 only with skepticism, indeed anxiety. Ultimately, it risked calling into question the very principles of universalism and patriotism that the French Jewish community stood for. Opposition to Zionism was not clear at all levels of French Jewish society, however, and a number of different positions emerged.

The old established Jews and their institutions, such as the consistory and the Alliance Israélite Universelle, long resisted Zionism. The Quai d'Orsay more often than not found support for its attitude toward Jewish nationalism in the anti-Zionism of the spokesmen of the French Jewish community and, in particular, of its two main institutions, which did little to encourage it to take an interest in a movement that it considered to be of minor importance. Yet the Cambon Declaration of 11 June 1917,¹⁷ drafted by foreign ministry officials, came only shortly before the Balfour Declaration, and indeed precipitated it—without, however, leading to any concrete result. By contrast, the statement on 2 November 1917 by the British Foreign Secretary, Arthur James Balfour, that Great Britain looked favorably upon the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine marked a major turning point in the history of Zionism.

The Balfour Declaration aroused little enthusiasm among native-born

French Jews and, in some, hostility. The Jews of France resisted Zionism, sometimes attacking it vigorously. In this connection the comments made in February 1919 by Sylvain Lévi, a distinguished scholar and member of the central committee of the Alliance Israélite Universelle representing all French citizens of the Jewish faith before the Council of Ten at the Paris Peace Conference, were typical. While recognizing the benign purpose of Zionism in seeking to colonize Palestine on behalf of the unfortunate Jewish masses, he insisted on the difficulty of the Zionist enterprise and, in calling attention to the political and economic pitfalls facing it, restated some of the objections voiced by western Jews. "It seems to me shocking to both reason and feeling," he added, "that scarcely have we gotten past the stage of waiting to obtain equality of rights, we should now demand privileges and exceptional circumstances for the Jews of Palestine. Every exception always ends up backfiring on the person who asks for it and who benefits from it."¹⁸ The Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann (1874–1952) reacted angrily to this speech, going so far as to describe Lévi as a "traitor."

Palestine came under British administration in 1920. The British presence in Palestine was made official in 1922 by the mandate entrusted to it by the League of Nations, providing for the creation of a national homeland and the formation of representative institutions for the whole population with a view eventually to establishing self-rule. France thus lost out, though the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 had granted it control of part of Palestine. Attempts at reconciliation were made in the 1920s, but it was not until the Second World War that the Quai d'Orsay grasped the full implications of the Zionist program.

The Zionists, for their part, displayed great coolness toward France. Moreover, this reserve was part of a francophobic tendency that was widespread in the Jewish world as a whole at the end of the nineteenth century and apparent in Herzl's thinking. The Dreyfus affair probably accounted for a large part of it. Herzl showed a clear liking for Germany, on the other hand, and even greater fondness for Great Britain. Despite intermittent episodes of rapprochement between France and the Zionists, this tendency was predominant in Zionist policy until the Second World War.

This missed encounter—missed on both sides—is primarily explained by ideological and cultural incompatibility. The mistrust was to last after the founding of the State of Israel in 1948; even though Israel showed some signs of flexibility toward France, France leaned more to a policy oriented toward the Arab world. Past disagreements thus continued to poison Franco-Israeli relations.

Curiously, however, Zionism in its early days met with a favorable response in anti-Semitic circles influenced by Drumont's ideas. They saw in it a solution to the Jewish problem in France, through massive emigration to Palestine.