

Melilah

MANCHESTER JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

EDITORS

Daniel R. Langton and Renate Smithuis

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Simon Mayers

Title: *Zionism and Anti-Zionism in the Catholic Guild of Israel*: Bede Jarrett, Arthur Day and Hans Herzl

Author(s): SIMON MAYERS

Source: *Melilah*, Vol. 10 (2013), pp. 12-25

Published by: University of Manchester and Gorgias Press

URL: <http://www.melilahjournal.org/p/2013.html>

ISBN: 978-1-4632-0282-8

ISSN: 1759-1953

A publication of the Centre for Jewish Studies,
University of Manchester, United Kingdom.

Co-published by



ZIONISM AND ANTI-ZIONISM IN THE CATHOLIC GUILD OF ISRAEL: BEDE JARRETT, ARTHUR DAY AND HANS HERZL

Simon Mayers*

ABSTRACT: This article examines Zionism and Anti-Zionism in the discourse of key members of the Catholic Guild of Israel, an English Catholic movement for the conversion of the Jews. The central theme in the discourse of the Guild was Jewish 'power'. It was argued that the Jews had great vitality, zeal and energy, which made them dangerous outside of the Church, but an asset if they could be brought into it. This idea was disseminated by Bede Jarrett and Arthur Day, the two most senior and prolific members of the Guild. Their notions of Jewish power influenced their views about Jews and Zionism. They both saw Jewish power and Zionism as a threat and opportunity, but Jarrett placed the emphasis on threat, whilst Day placed the emphasis on opportunity. One prominent member of the Guild who did not gravitate to their views was Hans Herzl, a convert to Catholicism and the son of the Zionist leader, Theodor Herzl. On the surface Hans adopted the anti-Zionism of Jarrett. Unlike Jarrett, however, Hans believed in Jewish nationalism, although he interpreted it as a spiritual rather than political movement. His ideal Jewish nation was a 'Christian theocracy of Jewish faith' with the Pope as sovereign and protector.

During the early decades of the twentieth-century, Jews were often stereotyped and mythologized in English Catholic newspapers, books, sermons and pastoral letters, as usurers, cowards, bolsheviks, conspirators, Christ-Killers and Antichrists.¹ From 1917 onwards, following the Balfour Declaration, these myths and stereotypes combined with criticisms of Zionism to form a new composite construction: 'the Zionist Menace'. This construction drew upon contemporary stereotypes, suggesting that 'the Jew' was exploiting his political power, commercial expertise and dominance in finance, in order to wrest control of Jerusalem from Christians and Muslims. There was an explicitly religious dimension to these representations. Why, it was asked, was the scene of the Passion being handed over to the hereditary enemies of Christianity, and how could Zionism be supported when the Jews had desired the sacrifice of Christ?² However, whilst these stereotypes and myths were characteristic of the broader English Catholic discourse, there were exceptions. One organisation that did not quite correlate with the broader English Catholic discourse was the Catholic Guild of Israel.

* Independent scholar. Currently investigating antisemitism in English Catholic newspapers during the nineteenth-century, supported by a research grant from the Vidal Sassoon International Centre for the Study of Antisemitism. <http://simonmayers.com/>

¹ These myths and stereotypes were examined in Simon Mayers, 'From "the Pharisee" to "the Zionist Menace": Myths, Stereotypes and Constructions of the Jew in English Catholic Discourse (1896-1929)' (PhD thesis, University of Manchester, 2012). See also Simon Mayers, 'From the Christ-Killer to the Luciferian: The Mythologized Jew and Freemason in Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century English Catholic Discourse', *Melilah* 8 (2011).

² Constructions of 'the Zionist Menace' in English Catholic newspapers from 1917 to 1922 were examined in chapter five of Mayers, 'From "the Pharisee" to "the Zionist Menace."'

The Catholic Guild of Israel, an organisation that has received very little attention from historians, was dedicated to the conversion of the Jews. Protestant evangelists were active amongst Jews in England throughout the nineteenth century. The decision to form a similar Catholic movement was in comparison remarkably late in coming. Father Bede Jarrett noted in an article published in June 1917 that English Catholics seemed to have agreed with Luther that there is no salvation for Jews, as almost no attempt had been made to convert them.³ Six months later in December 1917, Father Jarrett formed the Catholic Guild of Israel. This initiative received the blessings of Benedict XV, Pius XI, and the Archbishops of England and Wales.⁴ The vision for the Guild was a more proactive movement than the Sisters of Zion and the Arch-Confraternity of Prayer for the Conversion of Israel. The Sisters of Zion and the Arch-Confraternity of Prayer were Catholic organisations whose mission was merely to pray for the conversion of Israel.⁵ The leaders of the Catholic Guild of Israel were content to leave to the Sisters and the Arch-Confraternity the work of praying for the conversion of the Jews, so that the Guild could concentrate on the more proactive work of bringing Israel into the Church.⁶ This proactive work had many dimensions. Until it was forced by the Second World War to suspend its activities in 1939, the Guild was involved in publishing booklets and articles, and presenting sermons and lectures at churches, Catholic conferences, and meetings of the Catholic Evidence Guild and the Catholic Truth Society. Members of the Guild also addressed children at Catholic schools. The objective of these publications and presentations was to impress upon Catholics the importance of bringing Israel into the Church. One aspect of this was to try to overcome hostile images of the Jew. For example, according to a Guild pamphlet addressed to children, ‘there is something very precious and holy about the Jews’. The pamphlet observed that there are many people who view the Jews as either dirty pawnbrokers, or ‘millionaires who have made their money by exploiting Christians, and by all sorts of low, dirty tricks’. The pamphlet concluded that ‘certainly, some Jews are like that – but many Christians are not much better’.⁷ The Guild was also proactive in the East End of London, setting up open-air platforms on street corners and parks to address Jews, with the goal being an exchange of views on religious subjects, through which, it was hoped, the Jews would be tempted by Christianity.⁸

³ Bede Jarrett, ‘The Jew, part I’, *Universe*, 29 June 1917, 5.

⁴ See Report of Guild Meeting, 27 November 1923, 8-9, Catholic Guild of Israel Archives, Sion Centre for Dialogue and Encounter, London (hereafter cited as CGI Archives).

⁵ The Sisters of Zion was founded in 1842 and the Arch-Confraternity of Prayer in 1903. The only ‘condition of membership’ for the Arch-Confraternity was ‘the daily recitation’ of a prayer for the conversion and redemption of the Jews. In return, the volunteers were promised ‘300 days indulgence and a plenary indulgence each month’. Report of Guild Meeting, 27 November 1923, 7-8, 33, CGI Archives.

⁶ Guild Minute book, entry for 25 January 1921, 35-36, CGI Archives. The Sisters of Zion worked closely with the Catholic Guild of Israel, and the Guild regularly met at the Convent of Our Lady of Zion. It was Mary Judith, the Reverend Mother of the Sisters of Zion, who encouraged Bede Jarrett to found the Guild. A Member Of The Community [pseud.], *Memoir of Mother Mary Judith: Congregation of Our Lady of Zion, 1847-1932* (London: Longmans, Green, 1936), 135-143. The Sisters of Zion still exist, but their mission since Vatican II has been to help improve Jewish-Catholic relations.

⁷ [Reverend Mother Mary Judith?], ‘Ideas for Addresses to Children on the Conversion of the Jews’, pamphlet, undated, 1-4, CGI Archives. The pamphlet also contained the image of the energetic Jew whose zeal could be an asset to the Church: ‘The Jews, as a rule, are very clever and ardent and eager in all they do. See how successful they are in business. What will they not do for the world when they apply their great gifts to the spread of the Kingdom of our Lord?’ (ibid., 3).

⁸ Ulrike Ehret estimates that by 1924, the Guild’s presence in the streets of London had reached about 150 meetings a year, with up to 100 listeners at each, mostly from the working-class. Ulrike Ehret, ‘Catholics and Antisemitism in Germany and England, 1918-1939’ (PhD thesis, University of London, 2006), 55.

The discourse that emerged from the Catholic Guild of Israel had some distinctive features from the broader English Catholic discourse. Superficially there were similarities. Jews were portrayed in some Guild publications as usurious, bolshevist and anti-Christian. However, these deprecating stereotypes were peripheral features of the discourse of the Guild. The central theme was Jewish 'power'. Jewish power *was not* the central theme in the broader English Catholic discourse, but when it was broached, it was almost universally portrayed as a dangerous and destructive force (for example, as part of a Jewish-Masonic conspiracy or the manifestation of Antichrist). Conversely, Jewish power *was* the key feature of the discourse of the Catholic Guild of Israel, but it was portrayed in ambivalent rather than unequivocally hostile terms; a dangerous force if left to run wild outside the Church, but an asset if brought into the Church. This ambivalent construction of Jewish power produced correspondingly mixed views about Zionism.

Despite the attempts to present Jews in a more favourable light, ambivalence and power almost always found their way into Guild publications. The Jews, it was argued, had great vitality, zeal and energy, which made them dangerous outside of the Church, but a potential asset if they could be brought into it. This idea was disseminated by the two most senior and prolific members of the Guild: Father Bede Jarrett (1881-1934), head of the English province of the Dominican Order and the founder and president of the Guild, and Father Arthur Day (1866-1946), an English Jesuit, vice-president of the Guild and the author of several booklets and articles on 'the Jews'. Their notions of Jewish power influenced their views about Jews and their policies on various matters such as Zionism. Significantly, whilst they shared very similar views about the dangers and merits of Jewish power, they reached opposing positions about Zionism. The first two sections of this article examine the notions of Jewish power adopted by Day and Jarrett, and how it influenced their views on Zionism. Day and Jarrett have been selected for this article for two reasons. Firstly, whilst their discourse about Jews expanded over the years, certain key themes, such as their intertwined views about Jewish power and Zionism, remained stable and consistent. Secondly, they were not only the two most senior members of the Guild, they were also the two most prolific authors in the Guild. Most of the Guild booklets, pamphlets and articles were written by Day or Jarrett, and those that were written by other authors,⁹ usually adopted similarly ambivalent views about Jewish zeal and power. However, one member who did not cohere to the worldviews of Jarrett and Day was Hans Herzl (1890-1930), the son of the Zionist leader, Theodor Herzl. The third section of this article examines the Catholicism and anti-Zionism of Hans Herzl. On the surface, Hans Herzl seems to have shared the anti-Zionist views of Bede Jarrett (and many other English Catholics of that time), but unlike Jarrett and Day, his views on Zionism had little to do with Jewish power. His views were determined by his personal conceptions of identity, purpose, Jewish nationality and Catholicism. Whilst Day and Jarrett represent the central core of the discourse of the Catholic Guild of Israel, with most other members gravitating towards their views, Hans Herzl represents the outer boundary of the Guild's discourse.

This article aims to present the reader with a window into the largely unexamined Catholic Guild of Israel. It will thus present a distinctive segment of the English Catholic discourse, and improve our overall understanding of English Catholic attitudes towards Jews and Zionism during the early twentieth-century. It is of course impossible to present

⁹ For example, Hugh Angress, Stanley James, John Arendzen and Dudley Wright.

the entire discourse of the Catholic Guild of Israel, or a detailed analysis of every member of the Guild, in a single article. And whilst power and ambivalence were key features of the discourse, other important aspects – such as a reoccurring portrayal of Judaism as incomplete Catholicism – have had to go largely unexamined in this article. Whilst the picture that will emerge will inevitably be incomplete, it is hoped that by focusing on these key features, and by presenting the views of the two most prolific and central members of the Guild, combined with the views of a prominent individual who was on the periphery of the discourse, as representative an image of the Catholic Guild of Israel will be constructed as is possible.

Bede Jarrett and Arthur Day: Jewish Power

Bede Jarrett, the founder and president of the Catholic Guild of Israel, believed that the Jews were not merely a foreign presence in England; more importantly, he argued, they were a ‘power’ to be reckoned with. ‘It is time that we realised the power of the Jew here and elsewhere’, he argued, ‘and remembered that this power will increase’. The biggest threat, Jarrett reasoned, was the ‘liberal Jew’. When he referred to liberal Jews, Jarrett did not have Liberal Judaism in mind. In Jarrett’s worldview, Jews were either converts to Christianity (i.e. good Jews), ‘orthodox’ (i.e. religious Jews – portrayed as bad but relatively harmless) or ‘liberal’ (i.e. non-religious Jews – portrayed as dangerous, revolutionary, and either socialist or capitalist).¹⁰ The ‘orthodox Jew’ was relatively inconsequential because his power was turned in upon himself. According to Jarrett, ‘the orthodox Jew, hating Christ and loving the Law, is driven in upon himself, and consequently is harmless’. Jarrett explained that as long as he ‘remains separated from the world by the walls of the Talmud, his anti-Christianism is limited to his own atmosphere’. In a modern refinement of the well poisoning accusation, Jarrett explained that ‘the liberal Jew is the active enemy of Christian ideals and hopes, and works for their overthrow’. He stated that the liberal Jew ‘does not poison the wells of drinking water, as mediaeval Europe believed; [but] he does endeavour to poison the living springs of Christendom’.¹¹

Jarrett seemed to perceive the so-called ‘power’ of the Jews as something akin to a racial possession, and simultaneously feared and desired it. He expressed a desire to tap into this reservoir of Jewish energy for the benefit of the Church. In 1917, he argued that the Church has ‘great need of the Children of Israel’, in particular ‘their flaming zeal’ and their ‘fixed constancy’ which has endured ‘through the vicissitudes of these thousands of years’. He went on to explain that: ‘It is these people who still have something of the zeal and the flame which perhaps our own hearts lack. It is something of that fire, something of that flame, that we ask the Mother of God to bring into our midst’.¹² In 1921, he stated that ‘the Jew is nearly always a man of ideals, not wholly devoted to finance. He has shown himself a capable artist, a musician, a political leader; he has been a General in the British Army, a Lord Chief Justice, a Prime Minister’. Jarrett suggested that it may be deduced

¹⁰ Liberal Judaism does not fit comfortably into Jarrett’s schema.

¹¹ Bede Jarrett, ‘The Jew, part I’, *Universe*, 29 June 1917; Bede Jarrett, ‘The Jew, part II’, *Universe*, 6 July 1917.

¹² Report of sermon delivered by Bede Jarrett to the Arch-Confraternity of Prayers, in ‘The Conversion of Israel’, *Universe*, 4 January 1918, 6.

that 'the Jew' has 'climbed to power through injustice', but this, he argued, only strengthens the need for converting him. He concluded that 'the Catholic Church needs at this present moment, more than anything else, apostles such as the Jews have shown themselves to be, incisive, enthusiastic, unhampered by convention, able to throw themselves with ardour and whole-heartedly into the service of any ideal that can inspire and inflame'.¹³ In 1927, he again expressed his fears that 'the Jewish people' were the cause of 'extraordinary mischief in the world, but he reiterated his belief that 'in an especial way, the Jew is an apostle by nature. He carries fire and enthusiasm with him. A great number of movements to-day have their most active flame-bearers in the Jews, for they are the most religious of all races; either in defence of it or in violent antagonism to it, the Jew cannot be kept clear of God'.¹⁴

Arthur Day, the vice-president of the Guild and the Guild's principle author, expressed similar ambivalent sentiments about Jews and Jewish power. For Day, the issue was the 'Jewish mentality', which he regarded as pervasive, anti-Christian, and at times violent.¹⁵ In 1924, Day expressed admiration for Hilaire Belloc's book, *The Jews* (1922),¹⁶ which he suggested presented the Jew in a 'scientific and judicial' manner, rather than as an 'idealised pastille portrait'. He agreed with Belloc that the Jews must accept some of the blame for the antipathy that has been felt towards them. Father Day stated that 'the fact that their ancestors had rejected Christ was necessarily a bad introduction' and 'their strict retentiveness of their ancient Eastern customs was often embarrassing for their hosts'.¹⁷ Father Day acknowledged that 'past experiences at the hands of ill-advised Christians' was possibly the reason why 'Jews are extraordinarily difficult to convert'. He concluded that Jewish resistance can be removed, because Catholics 'can show them, in a kindly way, that if they persist in that attitude of rigid exclusion towards Christians they cannot expect us to include them with any cordiality into our social system'.¹⁸ Day regularly referred to Jewish hostility to Christians to balance out Christian hostility to Jews. He suggested in 1925 that 'if Jews object to Christians being "anti-Semitic," they should set us the example of not being "anti-Christian."¹⁹ In 1930, he referred to a 'story ... told of a [Jewish] father in Prague who burnt his child because it had been baptized', as an illustration that Jews

¹³ Bede Jarrett, 'The Catholic Guild of Israel', *Month* 138 (September 1921): 197; Bede Jarrett, 'The Catholic Guild of Israel', *Harvest*, November 1921, 299.

¹⁴ Bede Jarrett, 'The Attitude of the Church Towards the Jews', *Tablet*, 27 August 1927, 266-267.

¹⁵ Arthur Day often referred to the Jewish 'mentality'. For example, after a heated exchange of letters with Cecil Roth (published in the *Jewish Guardian* on 28 December 1928 and 4 January 1929) about forced baptisms and the Mortara Affair, in which Roth refused to accept Day's position that under certain exceptional circumstances forced baptisms and the removal of the Jewish children from their families might be justified, Day concluded that the episode furnished a 'useful object-lesson regarding Jewish mentality when confronted by the Catholic claim'. Arthur Day, 'The Mortara Case', *Month* 153 (June 1929): 501. For a summary of the heated debate, see Simon Mayers, 'Cecil Roth, Arthur Day and the Mortara Affair', blog report, last updated 28 April 2014, <http://simonmayers.com/2014/02/23/cecil-roth-arthur-day-and-the-mortara-affair-1928-1929>. In his memoirs, Day argued that 'even a Jew who professes to be an atheist ... may yet retain an anti-Christian complex rooted in a substratum of subconscious religion'. Arthur Day, *Our Friends the Jews; or, The Confessions of a Proselytizer* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1943), 48.

¹⁶ In this book, as well as in the *Eye Witness*, Belloc claimed that the role of Jewish finance behind the Boer War, the Dreyfus Affair, the Russian revolution, and other episodes, was glaring. Jewish secrecy, he argued, has 'almost passed into an instinct throughout the Jewish body'. According to Belloc, bolshevism was Jewish 'racial revenge'. His proposed solution, which he called 'recognition' or 'privilege', was segregation. See Hilaire Belloc, *The Jews* (London: Constable, 1922); Hilaire Belloc, 'The Jewish Question', *Eye Witness*, 7 September – 26 October 1911.

¹⁷ Arthur Day, 'Jews and Catholics', *Month* 143 (January 1924): 1-3.

¹⁸ Report of Guild Meeting, 27 November 1923, 5-6, CGI Archives. The address was also reported in 'Catholic Guild of Israel', *Tablet*, 8 December 1923, 744.

¹⁹ Arthur Day, 'Jews & Blasphemy: Anti-Christian Attitude Causes Anti-Semitism', *Universe*, 13 February 1925, 7.

were not always blameless.²⁰ Referring to the crucifixion and the ‘stiff-neckitis’ of Jews, Day stated in 1932 that ‘the Jew, with a few glorious exceptions, having chosen Barabbas, has never reconsidered his decision’.²¹ Father Day’s attempts to convince his readers of the bilateral nature of violence in the Jewish-Catholic dynamic, and that ‘provocation was not always lacking’ when Jews were ill-treated, continued into the late 1930s²² and early 1940s.²³

Like Jarrett, Day also argued that the Jews would be a powerful asset if brought into the Church. In 1924, in an article in the *Month*, a Jesuit periodical, he referred to his ‘pro-Jew proclivities’, described Jews as ‘interesting and attractive’, and expressed admiration for the works of the prominent Anglo-Jewish author, Israel Zangwill. He stated that the Jews are ‘a race that is on the whole more idealistic and versatile than we are’.²⁴ In his memoirs, Day concluded that the lives of Jewish converts demonstrate even to the most ‘incredulous’ that ‘a choice Jewish soul ... has qualities, intellectual and spiritual, that fit it pre-eminently to shine in the Catholic firmament’. He observed that the percentage of such souls was by no means a small percentage of the Jewish population.²⁵ Like Jarrett, Day argued that Jews are imbued with qualities that would make them an asset to the Church. ‘The Jew’, he stated, is ‘a hard nut to crack’, but the ‘kernel’ is ‘sweet’. He encouraged Catholics to look and listen for ‘the golden quality of the Jew’.²⁶ At a Guild meeting in 1923, he stated that ‘the Jew is gifted on an average with rather keener intelligence than the Gentile’.²⁷ And at a Catholic Truth Society meeting in Liverpool in February 1927, Day argued that ‘considering their small numbers – fifteen millions scattered over the world – Jews exercised enormous influence’. ‘Catholics, he reasoned, ‘should have some hand in directing this [influence]’.²⁸

²⁰ Arthur Day, ‘A Jewish Jesuit’, *Month* 156 (July 1930): 18.

²¹ Minutes of Catholic Guild of Israel meeting, *Our Lady of Zion* 37 (October–December 1932): 6-7. Issues of *Our Lady of Zion* can be found in the CGI Archives. Some issues are also available at the British Library.

²² In a Catholic Truth Society booklet published in 1938, Father Day argued that Jewish hostility towards Christians should be kept in mind when Jews feel ‘tempted to complain of the cruelties of the Inquisition’. According to the booklet, in 1854, the family of two young Jewish converts to Catholicism had used violence to force them to abandon the Church. Day stated that one uncle attempted to strangle one of the boys. ‘Whilst threatening the boy’s life, he kept exclaiming at the top of his voice: “Renounce, renounce!”’ Day claimed that another uncle assaulted the other boy with an iron bar and it was only the intercession of some passing soldiers which prevented a ‘martyrdom’. Arthur Day, *Twin Heroes of the Vatican Council* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1938), 5-7.

²³ In his memoirs published in 1943, Father Day acknowledged that it would be anti-Jewish to revive the accusation that ‘the Jews’ murder and sacrifice Christian children, but he argued that it would not be unreasonable or anti-Jewish to ‘suggest that there may have been ... isolated cases of such child-murder committed in the Middle Ages by Jews addicted to Black Magic’. He also concluded that ‘it is not inconceivable that superstitious Jews ... may have violated consecrated Hosts’. Day, *Our Friends the Jews*, 49.

²⁴ Arthur Day, ‘Jews and Catholics’, *Month* 143 (January 1924): 1, 5.

²⁵ Day, *Our Friends the Jews*, 13.

²⁶ Report of paper delivered by Arthur Day at the National Catholic Congress, in ‘The Conversion of the Jews’, *Catholic Times*, 18 August 1923, 4.

²⁷ Report of Guild Meeting, 27 November 1923, 6, CGI Archives. In 1930, Day referred to a Jewish Jesuit who was marked by his intelligence, memory and judgement. ‘He was’, Day concluded, ‘a true chip of the old Abrahamic stock!’ Arthur Day, ‘A Jewish Jesuit’, *Month* 156 (July 1930): 18.

²⁸ Report of lecture by Arthur Day to the Catholic Truth Society, Liverpool Branch, in ‘The Church and the Jew’, *Catholic Times*, 18 February 1927, 3.

Bede Jarrett and Arthur Day: Zionism and anti-Zionism

Jarrett and Day's obsession with Jewish power, influence and zeal, fed into their discourses about Zionism. Significantly, on this issue, they adopted opposing views. Whilst Jarrett only referred to Zionism occasionally, he did seem to lean towards the construction of a 'Zionist Menace'. He observed in 1917 that the consequences of Zionism should be a matter for 'profound reflection'. Zionism, he suggested, would mean the 'influence of eight millions of Jewish brains' let loose in an undeveloped land. He implied that a repeat of the so-called 'mischief' that occurred in Russia would probably ensue. He concluded that 'it may be a blessing and lead to a sudden and torrential widening of the Kingdom of God, or it may prove the inauguration of a great anti-Christian campaign in the west'.²⁹ In 1921, he argued that the influence and dominance of 'political Judaism' is everywhere, not only in England, but also in 'India, and of course Palestine'. Jarrett blamed the Jew for the anti-Christian revolution in Russia and the so-called Judaizing of Christianity in England, and he questioned why the Jew should even worry about Zionism. 'There is then no reason for wondering at the power the Jews wield today', he observed, for 'the Jew finds himself in a civilization which is based on capitalism, that is, on a system in which money counts most – and money is his flair'. He argued that it was ludicrous for the Jew to head back to Palestine, where survival would be based almost entirely on agriculture, when banking and capitalism were his speciality. 'Indeed', he concluded, 'why should he worry over Palestine when he has the world at his feet?'³⁰

Significantly, Arthur Day's ambivalent perception of the so-called Jewish mentality led him to the opposite conclusion. Day was one of a small number of English Catholics during the 1910s and 1920s to approve of Zionism (along with Mark Sykes³¹ and G. K. Chesterton³²). At the Catholic Truth Society meeting in Liverpool in February 1927, Day referred to the 'wonderful transformation' of the Jew which was being effected in Palestine, and he recommended that the Zionist movement should be kept under critical but sympathetic observation.³³ During a debate on the subject of Zionism at a meeting of the Catholic Citizen's Parliament at Vauxhall in December 1927, Day argued that it is an abnormal state of affairs for a people with a historic past to be without a country to call their own. He reasoned that in addition to 'arguments drawn from prophecy', which he suggested were 'cogent' enough on their own, Palestine was the 'natural seat of the race' and a 'natural Homeland and spiritual centre'. Like Jarrett, Day's reasoning was connected to his ambivalent perception of Jewish power. He explained to his Catholic audience that 'if the Jew had under the stress of adversity degenerated to the status of a

²⁹ Bede Jarrett, 'The Jew, part I', *Universe*, 29 June 1917, 5.

³⁰ Bede Jarrett, 'The Catholic Guild of Israel', *Month* 138 (September 1921): 194-195; Bede Jarrett, 'The Catholic Guild of Israel', *Harvest*, November 1921, 297-298.

³¹ Mark Sykes (1878-1919) was an official in the British government. Sykes had occasionally repeated deprecating stereotypes about Jews, but he supported Zionism, and assisted negotiations between Zionist leaders and the Vatican.

³² Though by 1925, Chesterton had abandoned Zionism as his preferred solution to the so-called 'Jewish problem', in favour of distinctive clothing and Belloc's idea of special 'recognition' or 'privilege' (i.e. segregation).

³³ Report of lecture by Arthur Day to the Catholic Truth Society, Liverpool Branch, in 'The Church and the Jew', *Catholic Times*, 18 February 1927, 3.

gipsy,³⁴ we might regard him as a negligible factor; but so far from this being the case, he is generally credited with exercising great influence for good and evil'. 'Selfish considerations alone', he explained, 'should suffice to force us to grapple with the problem of relieving Jewish discontent, and thereby exercising that "malaise" which it engenders'. Furthermore, he suggested, the Jewish pioneers will find themselves 'surrounded not only by Old Testament memorials but also by those of the New Covenant'. 'Sunshine and sweat – two splendid medicines – will remove, where it has existed, the obsession of bitter memories, and Jews will be in a far better frame of mind for considering the merits of Christianity', he concluded.³⁵ He argued in 1931 that 'however much we may dislike the religion or the irreligiousness of Jews', the revival of their Hebrew language and their return to 'the tiling of the soil on which the Saviour trod, is calculated sooner or later to bring them nearer to the heart of truth'.³⁶ In his memoirs, Day stated that Zionism has 'some fine achievements to its credit'. He praised the fact that it had brought a vast number of the 'scattered Children of Israel' back to 'their native soil', and argued that 'sunshine and starlight have gladdened their hearts, and honest toil, in all weathers, has weaned them from the false charm of a parasitic existence'. He referred to the brave work of the pioneer colonists, who had drained the marshes at risk to their own lives. He saluted those who had paid the price 'in death and disease', concluding that it was not too big a price to pay considering that as a result they were on the brink of winning back the country of their ancestors. He concluded that the prospects for Zionism were still fraught with deadly perils, and he offered his prayers that the Jews would emerge triumphant from the adventure.³⁷

Hans Herzl: Zionism and Catholicism

In a somewhat ironic twist, Hans Herzl, the son of the Zionist leader, Theodor Herzl, stood opposed to Zionism, whilst being mentored as a recent convert to Roman Catholicism by Father Day, an advocate of Zionism. Hans Herzl's path to – and from – Catholicism was not a straight one. For Hans, the Church proved to be but a brief sojourn in a life spent searching for a core belief to sustain him. During his life, he tried Theosophy, Anglicanism, a Baptist community in Vienna, Catholicism, Quakerism and Liberal Judaism. Even after he formerly left the Church in 1925, he did not entirely turn his back on Catholicism. However, none of his religious commitments brought him lasting happiness, or purged his feelings of angst and uncertainty, and at the age of thirty-nine, he committed suicide.³⁸

³⁴ A year earlier, Day has stated that if the Jews had 'not been gifted with a most remarkable character and watched over by a special providence, they would almost inevitably have degenerated into gipsies'. Arthur Day, *Jews and Catholics* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1926), 1.

³⁵ Report of a debate at the Catholic Citizen's Parliament at Vauxhall, 'Priest's Defence of Zionism: Fr. Arthur Day, S.J., Advises Catholics to Support it', *Universe*, 9 December 1927, 9.

³⁶ Arthur Day, 'The Re-Birth of Hebrew', *Month* 158 (November 1931): 415

³⁷ Day, *Our Friends the Jews*, 64-65.

³⁸ Hans Herzl shot himself the day before the funeral of his sister Pauline Herzl. He felt guilty for not being able to help Pauline to overcome her emotional problems and addiction to drugs. However, whilst the occasion was his sister's funeral, the likely cause was his prolonged depression, exasperated by his inability to find a lasting faith to give his life meaning and direction. At the time, Hans and Pauline were both considered an embarrassment to their father's legacy (Hans because he converted to Christianity and committed suicide, and Pauline because she had a

According to Hans, his mother had a 'leaning towards religion', but his father was influenced more by the 'habits of Free Thought'. He explained that he and his sisters 'were only taught two or three simple and short prayers'. Living in England after the death of his father, he 'outwardly observed the principal Jewish customs', whilst losing whatever 'inward religion' he possessed. He described his life during this period as 'in the main a futile existence', becoming largely 'apathetic in the matter of religion'.³⁹ In fact, Hans felt himself in desperate need of a faith to sustain him. Ilse Sternberger, in her book about Theodor Herzl's children, observed that Theodor had regarded the need for God a 'passing weakness', but that Hans needed 'the security of a supra-human power to give his life the motive and direction he could not find within himself. There was, Sternberger convincingly observed, a sense of internal emptiness that Hans was desperate to fill with a 'core of certainty, a centre of gravity', and this led him on quest to find 'a religious faith which would totally sustain him'. According to Sternberger, 'it was a quest that would leave him disillusioned, drained and desperate'. In his letters and diaries, he frequently recorded his feelings of worthlessness, stated that he 'despised' himself, and expressed thoughts about suicide. As early as 1910, he had written to an uncle explaining that he felt himself 'unfit for life', and that he often thought about putting 'an end to so miserable an existence'. In 1919, he wrote a letter to his sister Pauline, informing her that he had come to the conclusion that he had 'lived too long', that his life had been 'unsuccessful' and 'sinful', and that his 'psychic energy' had been exhausted. He was extremely self-critical in his diary, condemning his 'hankering after distinction' and 'greatness', which he observed had led to his missing 'all the realities of life'. He recorded that he needed to learn to respect people, that he was full of 'all sorts of contempts, spites, hatreds', and that there was something 'warring' within him. 'Oh God, I am so ugly!', he declared.⁴⁰ Father Day had also observed and reported this melancholic side to Hans Herzl's nature, and his 'habitual self-deprecation'. Day observed that Hans was 'was a continual self-tormentor', and that he suffered from a 'strain of melancholia in his temperament'.⁴¹

After the First World War,⁴² Hans felt completely uncertain about the course of his life. He set out to find a definite religious creed to bolster his sense of identity and to give direction to his life. During the war he attended the Anglican Church, theosophical meetings, and spiritualist séances, but none of these maintained a lasting hold over him. It was during the early 1920s that he developed his attraction for Catholicism, having been impressed by meetings of the Catholic Evidence Guild in Hyde Park. He did not however immediately convert to Catholicism, which he claimed was partly because he felt 'unworthy

problem with drugs and a controversial love life), and were denied their final wish: to be interred with their father. However, in 2006, their coffins were disinterred from Bordeaux and reburied on Mount Herzl. According to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, their reburial in Israel was 'hailed by JAFI officials, Israeli government representatives and members of the French Jewish community as a historic moment'. 'Decades After Their Deaths, Bodies of Herzl's Children Brought to Israel', *JTA*, 21 September 2006, <http://www.jta.org/2006/09/21/archive/decades-after-their-deaths-bodies-of-herzls-children-brought-to-israel>

³⁹ Hans Herzl, 'How I Became a Catholic', *Universe*, 7 November 1924, 1, 12; Hans Herzl, 'How I Became a Catholic', *Tablet*, 8 November 1924, 604.

⁴⁰ Ilse Sternberger, *Princes Without a Home: Modern Zionism and the Strange Fate of Theodor Herzl's Children 1900-1945* (San Francisco: International Scholars, 1994), 163-164, 341, 366-369. For more about his identity struggles, inner-conflict, persistent depression and thoughts about suicide, see also pages 156-175, 189-192, 202-205, 336-341, 413-415. I am indebted to this volume for extracts from Han Herzl's diaries and letters (which are held at the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem).

⁴¹ Arthur Day, 'Hans Herzl', *Our Lady of Zion* 34 (1932): 4, 7; Day, *Our Friends the Jews*, 19, 22.

⁴² Hans served in the British Army during the war.

of being a Catholic'. However, he did embrace Christianity, being baptized by a Baptist community in Vienna. The happiness he gained from joining the Baptist community was short-lived. Before long he doubted his decision, arriving at the conclusion that it was not enough to accept the Christian faith, he must also embrace the Catholic Church in order to become a member of 'the larger community of Christians'.⁴³ According to Sternberger, after a momentary elation, he 'relapsed into darkness', felt doubt about his conversion into the Baptist community, and doubted 'the world as he doubted himself'.⁴⁴ Hans returned to England and discussed his feelings of doubt with a cousin, who put him in touch with Father Day.⁴⁵ Day provided him with guidance and instruction for joining the Catholic Church. He was received into the Church at the Chapel of Our Lady of Sion (the home of the Catholic Guild of Israel) on 19 October 1924.

In 1924, the Catholic Guild of Israel was still a relatively new organisation. Whilst it had received the blessing of popes and archbishops, it was finding the actual work of converting the Jews to be difficult and slow.⁴⁶ The securing of Hans Herzl, a Jewish convert with a very distinguished name, was thus a much needed propaganda coup for the Guild. As Day later acknowledged, this 'good news' was spread, albeit on a 'modest scale', and Hans was 'induced' to 'write a short account of his adoption of Catholicism'.⁴⁷ This account appeared in two prominent English Catholic newspapers, the *Tablet* and the *Universe*, in November 1924.⁴⁸ Five months later, in March 1925, Hans published another article in the *Universe*, discussing Zionism and the Mandate for Palestine, which he believed should be passed to the Holy See. It seems unlikely that this article was induced by Father Day, as Day supported Zionism, but it is possible that Jarrett encouraged Hans to write it. Hans stated that he was opposed to the Balfour Declaration because he believed that 'the Jewish people no longer require a national home in Palestine'. Hans observed that from 1881 onwards, the Jews poured out of Russia into Western Europe in order to escape persecution, setting up Jewish colonies in various cities, creating 'a minor Jewish problem wherever they appeared, setting up that local irritation which alien bodies produce in living organisms'. He suggested that his father had recognised that this irritation led to a so-called 'legitimate anti-Semitism'. Hans believed that his father's solution, political Zionism and the setting up of a 'Jewish National Home in Palestine', was no longer necessary, because 'there no longer exists a Jewish problem in Eastern Europe'. Hans argued that Jewish money and sentiment should be channelled to Russia rather than Palestine. 'If those large sums which wealthy American Jews are now pouring into the

⁴³ Hans Herzl, 'How I Became a Catholic', *Universe*, 7 November 1924, 1, 12; Hans Herzl, 'How I Became a Catholic', *Tablet*, 8 November 1924, 604; Sternberger, *Princes Without a Home*, 339.

⁴⁴ Sternberger, *Princes Without a Home*, 349.

⁴⁵ See Hans Herzl, 'How I Became a Catholic', *Universe*, 7 November 1924, 12; Hans Herzl, 'How I Became a Catholic', *Tablet*, 8 November 1924, 604; Sternberger, *Princes Without a Home*, 353; Arthur Day, 'Hans Herzl', *Our Lady of Sion* 34 (January-March 1932): 5.

⁴⁶ At the annual meeting of the Guild in 1923, Father Day informed the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster that Jews were extremely difficult to convert and that the work was progressing very slowly. He repeated these observations in a booklet in 1926. Report of Guild Meeting, 27 November 1923, 5, CGI Archives; Arthur Day, *Jews and Catholics* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1926), 6. In 1932, Day compared the task of bringing Israel into the Church to that of moving an iceberg: 'As with an iceberg the progress is slow. If we were working alone, the process might take 5,000 years; but we are counting on securing the kind and efficient services of the physician Archangel Raphael'. Minutes of Catholic Guild of Israel meeting, *Our Lady of Sion* 37 (October-December 1932): 7.

⁴⁷ Arthur Day, 'Hans Herzl', *Our Lady of Sion* 34 (January-March 1932): 5-7.

⁴⁸ Hans Herzl, 'How I Became a Catholic', *Universe*, 7 November 1924, 1, 12; Hans Herzl, 'How I Became a Catholic', *Tablet*, 8 November 1924, 604.

Zionist coffers were diverted towards the restoration of Russia', he argued, then 'that country which has so long been the national home of the Jewish people in the past could be made habitable for them in the future'. He stated that the only 'sort of Mandate in the Middle East' that he could personally conceive of was for 'the custody of the Holy places' to be 'held by the Holy See'.⁴⁹ Significantly, shortly after writing this article, he left the Church.

According to Day, Hans Herzl's 'full membership' of the Church cannot have lasted more than six months.⁵⁰ This would suggest that he started to abandon the Church around April 1925 (i.e. approximately one month after the article). Day explained that 'H. H. got it into his head that his conversion had been too much boomed by the Catholic Guild of Israel'. He observed that Hans could be over-sensitive, at times morbid, and was hurt by the Guild's rejoicing at the securing of a distinguished Jewish convert. After he left the Church, Hans accused the Guild of 'fanaticism' in his diary on account of being pressured to write about his conversion to Catholicism. According to Day, Hans claimed that his Catholicism collapsed because he felt the Guild was more interested in making converts than actually steering souls to God, and because he 'had never been convinced of the Divinity of Christ'.⁵¹ Sternberger observes that even though he was no longer admitted to holy communion after his departure from the Church, he still regularly attended mass throughout his life. Sternberger also refers to a number of near reconciliations with the Church. On one occasions, Hans claimed he was considering an offer to help form a special episcopate of Jewish converts to Catholicism in Jerusalem. Towards the end of his life, he talked to a Catholic priest, Father Rigby, about being reconciled to the Church, though it led to nothing.⁵² Father Day also observed that Hans Herzl remained loosely affiliated with the Church. According to Day, whilst his complete membership of the Church only lasted about six months, his falling away from Catholicism was a more gradual process.⁵³ According to Day, he and Hans continued to be friends after Hans's departure from the Church, and Hans continued to attend Catholic services. Day observed that Hans often expressed a desire to be reconciled with the Church, but that this was thwarted by his inability to overcome his 'pet objections against Catholic theology'.⁵⁴

Hans Herzl's rejection of Zionism continued after his departure from the Church, and he continued to maintain the belief that the Catholic Church should hold the mandate for the Holy Places in Palestine. After he left the Church, he became friends with a Jewish journalist, Marcel Sternberger. According to Marcel's wife, Ilse Sternberger, Hans explained to her husband that he believed Zionism had become imperialistic, territorial, and covetous for land, having lost the national idealism which would unite the Jewish people. He argued that Jewish nationalism should be more about a love for the Jewish people, and not tied to territory. Despite his departure from the Church, he still believed that 'the Jewish nation' would be best served by affiliating with 'the Papal State', 'the Synagogue' becoming a 'constituent member of the World-Church', with 'the Pope, as

⁴⁹ Hans Herzl 'National Home for the Jews', *Universe*, 20 March 1925, 1, 6.

⁵⁰ Day, *Our Friends the Jews*, 18.

⁵¹ Arthur Day, 'Hans Herzl', *Our Lady of Zion* 34 (January-March 1932): 5-7; Day, *Our Friends the Jews*, 20-21.

⁵² Sternberger, *Princes Without a Home*, 362-363, 401-404.

⁵³ Day, *Our Friends the Jews*, 18.

⁵⁴ Arthur Day, 'Hans Herzl', *Our Lady of Zion* 34 (1932): 5-6; Day, *Our Friends the Jews*, 20.

sovereign of dispersed Jewry'. Hans concluded that the Pope 'would be the surest guarantor of Jewish human rights'.⁵⁵

Conclusion

Jewish 'power' was clearly something that Day and Jarrett simultaneously feared and desired to bring into the Church. Whilst they shared similar views about Jewish power, they reached opposing views about Zionism. Whilst Jewish power (or zeal, fire, flame, energy and vitality) was a key factor, there were other considerations that fed into their reasoning. Like Day, Jarrett wanted to bring this energy into the Church, but he seems to have been driven more by his fear that liberal Jews – i.e. non-religious, non-orthodox Jews – were poisoning the 'living springs of Christendom'. For Jarrett, traditional Judaism was a good thing, but only because he believed that the orthodox Jew's energy and so-called hatred for Christianity was turned in upon itself and rendered harmless by it. He feared that with the Jews abandoning the Talmud, this energy would be – or was being – turned against Christendom in a series of violent anti-Christian revolutions. 'He is giving up his Talmudic faith', he warned, and 'without any other to take its place he will be, is, violently revolutionary in the varying extremes of anarchism and chaos'. His solution was to give the Jew another religion, to 'give him Catholicism', as then 'there is a chance for some steadiness in our political and social life'. In essence therefore, Jarrett believed that Judaism was good because it neutralised the Jews' power, but with the Jews abandoning Judaism, the only other solution was to bring them – and their zeal and energy – into the Church. As one Jewish Catholic observed in 1917, Jarrett seemed to sound 'the call to arms for the conversion of the Jew' as an act of 'self defence' on behalf of the Church.⁵⁶ He believed that the liberal Jews had caused extraordinary mischief in Russia, and the last thing he wanted was for them to be given an opportunity to run rampant again, causing mischief in the Holy Land.

Day conversely, whilst sharing similar views about Jewish power and the so-called Jewish 'mentality', seems to have been driven by awe rather than by fear. For Day, Judaism was not a set of walls to render the Jew harmless. He considered Judaism an incomplete form of Catholicism rather than an act of rebellion or revolution. According to Hugh Angress, a Jewish convert to Catholicism and the Chairman of the Catholic Guild of Israel, the Jewish Catholic had not ceased to be a Jew because Catholicism was not a replacement to Judaism, but rather a complete and fulfilled Judaism.⁵⁷ Day accepted this view. He observed that 'Judaism did not break off from Catholicism, it only stopped short – a terribly sad failure ... but not a rebellion or revolution'.⁵⁸ However, he also believed that Judaism was a problem, because it acted as 'a mighty bond of union' that made it difficult to convince Jews to embrace Christianity.⁵⁹ Day considered the Jew a great

⁵⁵ Sternberger, *Princes Without a Home*, 393-398.

⁵⁶ Jewish Catholic [pseud.], 'The Jew: A Reply to Prior Bede Jarrett, O.P.', *Universe*, 13 July 1917, 6.

⁵⁷ See Hugh Israelowicz Angress, *I am a Catholic because I am a Jew* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1921) and Report of lecture by Hugh Angress to the Catholic Truth Society, Manchester Branch, in 'Solving the Jewish Problem', *Catholic Federationist*, November 1923, 2.

⁵⁸ Arthur Day, 'Jews and Catholics', *Month* 143 (January 1924): 8.

⁵⁹ Report of paper delivered by Arthur Day at the National Catholic Congress, in 'The Conversion of the Jews', *Catholic Times*, 18 August 1923, 4.

challenge, a ‘hard nut to crack’, but he believed that within the hard shell there lay a ‘sweet’ kernel. He wanted to bring that sweet kernel into the Church, and he believed the best way to overcome Jewish resistance was to support Zionism.

Whilst Day and Jarrett reached opposing viewpoints on the matter of Zionism, they were essentially a part of the same discourse. Whilst on the surface Hans Herzl adopted the anti-Zionism of Jarrett, he was in essence a part of a completely different discourse. Day and Jarrett were part of a Catholic discourse about Jews and Zionism that was influenced by their views of Judaism and Jewish power. Conversely, Hans Herzl was part of an Anglo-Jewish discourse about the merits and demerits of Zionism, which in his case was influenced by his view of Catholicism.⁶⁰ Whilst on occasion Hans referred to Zionism as a form of imperialism, his concern was not primarily a matter of Jewish power but rather the best form of Jewish nationalism. Even before he embraced Catholicism, Hans was ambivalent about Zionism.⁶¹ He believed in Jewish nationalism, the bringing together of Jews in a great bond of love and unity, but he viewed Zionism as too territorial and political. Unlike Jarrett, Hans recognised that Jews had been persecuted in Russia, but he believed that the time was right for the Jews to turn their energy to rebuilding Russia rather than the Middle East. Even after he formally left the Church, he was still influenced by Catholicism. As he informed Lucien Wolf in 1926, i.e. after he had left the Church, he was ‘opposed to the continuance of the British Mandate over Palestine’. ‘Instead of the Mandate’, he stated, ‘I advocate ... the custody of the Holy Places exercised by the Holy See’. As he later informed Marcel Sternberger, he believed that the Jewish nation should ideally be a ‘Christian Theocracy of Jewish faith’, a Jewish diaspora nation, with the Pope as sovereign and protector.⁶²

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angress, Hugh Israelowicz. *I am a Catholic because I am a Jew*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1921.
- Belloc, Hilaire. ‘The Jewish Question’. *Eye Witness*, 7 September – 26 October 1911.
- . *The Jews*. London: Constable, 1922).
- Cecil Roth and Arthur Day, Correspondence. ‘Edgardo Mortara and Others’. *Jewish Guardian*, 28 December 1928.
- . Correspondence. ‘Further correspondence on the Mortara Case’. *Jewish Guardian*, 4 January 1929.
- Community, A Member Of The [pseud.]. *Memoir of Mother Mary Judith: Congregation of Our Lady of Zion, 1847-1932*. London: Longmans, Green, 1936.
- Day, Arthur. ‘Hans Herzl’. *Our Lady of Zion* 34 (1932): 4-8.

⁶⁰ Many Anglo-Jews were against Zionism (such as Claude Montefiore and Lucien Wolf). Disagreements between prominent Zionists – such as Leopold Greenberg, Moses Gaster, Chaim Weizmann and Israel Zangwill – about the form that Zionism should take were also heated.

⁶¹ When he was young, there were those, especially among his guardians, who saw it as his duty to follow in his father’s footsteps and become a Zionist leader. He tried to explain to them that he had little interest in getting involved with Zionism, but they usually dismissed this as the folly of youth or a fear of failure. Despite his ambivalence towards Zionism, he was occasionally involved with it (for example, by contributing to Zionist periodicals). See Sternberger, *Princes Without a Home*, 106, 159-161, 167, 173-175, 198, 303-305, 341.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 375, 396.

- . ‘A Jewish Jesuit’. *Month* 156 (July 1930): 14-23.
- . ‘Jews and Blasphemy: Anti-Christian Attitude Causes Anti-Semitism’. *Universe*, 13 February 1925.
- . ‘Jews and Catholics’. *Month* 143 (January 1924): 1-10.
- . *Jews and Catholics*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1926.
- . ‘The Mortara Case’. *Month* 153 (June 1929): 500-509.
- . *Our Friends the Jews; or, The Confessions of a Proselytizer*. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1943.
- . ‘The Re-Birth of Hebrew’. *Month* 158 (November 1931): 408-415.
- . *Twin Heroes of the Vatican Council*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1938.
- Ehret, Ulrike. ‘Catholics and Antisemitism in Germany and England, 1918-1939’. PhD thesis, University of London, 2006.
- Herzl, Hans. ‘How I Became a Catholic’. *Tablet*, 8 November 1924.
- . ‘How I Became a Catholic’. *Universe*, 7 November 1924.
- . ‘National Home for the Jews’. *Universe*, 20 March 1925.
- Jarrett, Bede. ‘The Attitude of the Church Towards the Jews’. *Tablet*, 27 August 1927.
- . ‘The Catholic Guild of Israel’. *Harvest*, November 1921.
- . ‘The Catholic Guild of Israel’. *Month* 138 (September 1921): 193-198.
- . ‘The Jew, part I’. *Universe*, 29 June 1917.
- . ‘The Jew, part II’. *Universe*, 6 July 1917.
- [Judith, Reverend Mother Mary?]. ‘Ideas for Addresses to Children on the Conversion of the Jews’. pamphlet, undated.
- Mayers, Simon. ‘From the Christ-Killer to the Luciferian: The Mythologized Jew and Freemason in Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century English Catholic Discourse’. *Melilah* 8 (2011): 30-68.
- . ‘From “the Pharisee” to “the Zionist Menace”: Myths, Stereotypes and Constructions of the Jew in English Catholic Discourse (1896-1929)’. PhD thesis, University of Manchester, 2012.
- Sternberger, Ilse. *Princes Without a Home: Modern Zionism and the Strange Fate of Theodor Herzl's Children 1900-1945*. San Francisco: International Scholars, 1994.
- ‘Catholic Guild of Israel’. *Tablet*, 8 December 1923.
- ‘The Church and the Jew’. *Catholic Times*, 18 February 1927.
- ‘The Conversion of Israel’. *Universe*, 4 January 1918.
- ‘The Conversion of the Jews’. *Catholic Times*, 18 August 1923.
- ‘Priest's Defence of Zionism: Fr. Arthur Day, S.J., Advises Catholics to Support it’. *Universe*, 9 December 1927.
- ‘Solving the Jewish Problem’. *Catholic Federationist*, November 1923.

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Catholic Guild of Israel Archives, Sion Centre for Dialogue and Encounter, London.