

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ANTI-SEMITISM IN VIENNA: A
TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF *DIE REICHSPOST*, 1894-1897

Adam Joshua Cohen, Master of Arts, 2013

Thesis directed by: Professor Marsha Rozenblit
Department of History

This Master's Thesis is a close textual analysis of the anti-Semitic argumentation of the *Reichspost*, a Catholic and anti-Semitic newspaper associated with the Christian Social Party and published in Vienna between 1894 and 1938. This micro study examines the newspaper from January 1894 through April 1897. During its early years, the *Reichspost* used economic, social, and political anti-Semitism, religiously motivated Jew-hatred, and historical misrepresentations against Jews and Judaism. In addition, the newspaper justified (but did not call for) anti-Semitic violence. The *Reichspost* moderated itself by rejecting racial anti-Semitism and leaving the possibility of baptism and conversion open to Jews. Moreover, the newspaper demonstrated state patriotism, dynastic loyalty, and some aspects of "positive" Christianity. The *Reichspost* molded these seemingly discordant views into consistent ideology with demands for the "re-Christianization" and "de-Jewification" of public life, and doing so differentiated it from racial and radical anti-Semites of its time and of later decades.

CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ANTI-SEMITISM IN VIENNA: A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF
DIE REICHSPOST, 1894-1897

by

Adam Joshua Cohen

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the

University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

2013

Advisory Committee:

Professor Marsha Rozenblit, Chair

Professor Jeffrey Herf

Professor John Lampe

©Copyright by

Adam Joshua Cohen

2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I:	Introduction.....	1
	Historiography of Viennese and Christian Social Anti-Semitism.....	3
	Origins of the <i>Reichspost</i>	8
Chapter II:	Use of Economic/Social Anti-Semitism, and Justifications of Expulsions/Riots Targeting Jews.....	11
	Use of Economic Anti-Semitism.....	11
	Use of Social Anti-Semitism.....	21
	Justifying Expulsions and Riots Targeting Jews.....	30
Chapter III:	Use of Political Anti-Semitism and History in Anti-Semitic Argumentation.....	35
	Use of Political Anti-Semitism.....	35
	Use of History in Anti-Semitic Argumentation.....	47
Chapter IV:	Use of Religiously Motivated Jew-Hatred and Rejection of Racial Anti- Semitism.....	54
Chapter V:	Conclusion.....	70
	Bibliography.....	72

Chapter I: Introduction

The *Reichspost*¹ was a Catholic and anti-Semitic newspaper published in Vienna from 1894 until 1938. The newspaper associated with the Christian Social Party until the party's dissolution in 1934. On May 17, 1895, the *Reichspost* explained its views and the goals of the Christian Social Party in its front-page feuilleton "Our Goals and Means to Those Goals." These goals included the "re-Christianization [*Wiederverchristlichung*] of society" and the return of public life to "the basis of positive Christianity."² Diminished in public life, Christian principles had to prevail again in government, politics, and the economy. With the support first of Pope Pius IX and then Pope Leo XIII, the *Reichspost* called on Christians to practice their faith not only in their private lives, but also in their public works. The "re-Christianization" of public life required the defeat of Liberals, Social Democrats, Freemasons, and Jews in order to end their un-Christian and un-Catholic influence in society. Rejecting racial anti-Semitism, the *Reichspost* declared its anti-Semitic mission: "What we fight, is not the Semite as a person, but the pernicious influence [*verderbliche Einfluß*] of the Jews, and above all also the 'Jew-Press'," a press that the paper claimed, "represented, maintained and promoted Jewish spirit in all of public life."³

This Master's Thesis is a close textual analysis of the anti-Semitic argumentation of the *Reichspost*, a newspaper not well studied by historians, from its first issue in

¹ All references to the *Reichspost* are to the main (morning) editions, unless otherwise indicated. All translations are the author's unless otherwise indicated. The Austrian National Library has digitized the *Reichspost* newspapers from 1894 to 1938, which are found at: <http://anno.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/anno?aid=rpt>.

² *Reichspost*, 17 May 1895, 1-2.

³ Ibid. According to Daniel Vyleta, anti-Semitic labels such as "Jew-Press" signified: "the anti-Semites' [...] dismissal of these papers as '*Judenzeitungen*,' [...] [it] presumes *a priori* that a journalist's Judaism would fully determine his language." Daniel Vyleta, *Crime, Jews and News: Vienna, 1895-1914* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 129.

January 1894 through April 1897. What is new and important about this micro-study is that it allows for a better understanding of the early development of *Reichspost* anti-Semitism. Moreover, it is worthwhile to study the newspaper from January 1894 through April 1897 because this was the period in which the Christian Social Party became politically dominant in Vienna. Karl Lueger, the party's anti-Semitic leader, became mayor of Vienna on April 8, 1897.⁴ The *Reichspost* actively campaigned for the Christian Social Party and Karl Lueger, and contributed to their electoral successes. This project helps us gain insight into the kinds of anti-Semitism that appealed to Viennese voters and the anti-Semitic views of the Christian Social Party. Moreover, *Reichspost* anti-Semitic argumentation is worthy of study in its own right because it surely influenced its readers' attitudes towards Jews in late nineteenth century Vienna.

Throughout the period under study, the *Reichspost* used economic, social, and political anti-Semitism, religiously motivated Jew-hatred, and historical misrepresentations against Jews and Judaism. In addition, the newspaper justified (but did not call for) anti-Semitic violence. On the other hand, the *Reichspost* moderated its views by rejecting racial anti-Semitism and leaving the possibility of baptism and conversion open to Jews. Furthermore, the newspaper demonstrated state patriotism, dynastic loyalty, and some aspects of "positive" Christianity, therefore distancing itself from radical German nationalism. The *Reichspost* molded these discordant views into a

⁴ In Vienna from the early to mid 1890s, the anti-Semitic parties scored successive victories against the Liberals. By 1895, they gained majority representation in the City Council [*Gemeinderat*]. Karl Lueger was nominated mayor of Vienna several times thereafter. However, Emperor Franz Joseph (r. 1848-1916), the Austrian government, bureaucracy, and hierarchy, resisted Lueger's appointment. Franz Joseph, who was unsympathetic to anti-Semitism, used the Imperial veto four times against Lueger. It was not until April 8, 1897 that Franz Joseph relented and permitted Lueger to become mayor of Vienna. Wolfgang Häusler, "Toleranz, Emanzipation und Antisemitismus. Das österreichische Judentum des bürgerlichen Zeitalters (1782-1918)," in *Das österreichische Judentum: Voraussetzungen und Geschichte*, ed. Nikolaus Vielmetti (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1974), 117-118; Robert S. Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 179.

consistent ideology by grounding them in demands for the “re-Christianization” and “de-Jewification” of public life. What we learn here is this Catholic form of anti-Semitism in late nineteenth century Vienna demonstrated versatility and adapted both traditional religious Jew hatred and modern forms of anti-Semitism.

Historiography of Viennese and Christian Social Anti-Semitism

Peter Pulzer, a British political historian born in Vienna in 1929, published in 1964 *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*. Pulzer explained the success of political anti-Semitism in Austria as a reaction to liberalism, capitalism, and Social Democracy. He contended that in late nineteenth century Austria, certain sectors of society, especially artisans, peasants, and landowners perceived that liberalism, capitalism, and Social Democracy harmed them. These sectors of society, due to the economic, political, and social position of Jews, identified Jews with liberalism, capitalism, and Social Democracy. Therefore, in late nineteenth century Austria, anti-Semitism was a reaction to these three ideologies. The Christian Social Party exploited this reaction and achieved political success. Moreover, pre-liberal and pre-capitalist religious hatred of Jews played a role in the rise of political anti-Semitism. Pan Germans such as Georg Ritter von Schönerer espoused racial anti-Semitism in reaction to liberal values of equality and human rights, but his radical German nationalism was not popular in Vienna.⁵ Speaking specifically to the anti-Semitism of Vienna and the Christian Social Party, Pulzer argued that “... in Vienna anti-Semitism drew its strength from neither racial nor religious springs, but from economic springs [...] Neither Lueger nor his party,

⁵ Peter Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*, 2nd ed., (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988).

nor the conservatives, nor the Church could afford to regard anti-Semitism as more than a means to an end. Racial anti-Semitism was out of the question.”⁶

In his 1981 book, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897*, John Boyer contended that Christian Social Party leader Karl Lueger and the majority of the Christian Socials used anti-Semitism as an opportunistic weapon of politics. They used anti-Semitism to attack economic and political liberalism, as well as liberal anti-clericalism. Moreover, they presented anti-Semitism as a solution to real and perceived economic threats to the bourgeois classes, to increase Christian Social voter participation and win elections. While some Christian Socials pursued more radical anti-Semitism, most radical anti-Semites were excluded from its top leadership over time. However, the Christian Social leadership continued to tolerate radical anti-Semitism among sub-elite journalists, priests, and ward politicians. Nevertheless, Boyer argued anti-Semitism was only one plank of the Christian Social platform and was not central to Christian Social ideology.⁷ Boyer explained the Christian Socials made both outlandish anti-Semitic promises to constituents as well as those with more “objective considerations such as better credit facilities, higher tax rates on big industry, the abolition of peddling, laws regulating competitive sales, and the like.”⁸ Note that these promises with “objective considerations” the Christian Socials made to constituents clearly intended to diminish the influence of Jews in commerce.

Steven Beller, in direct opposition to Boyer, argued that anti-Semitism was central to Christian Social ideology. In *Vienna and the Jews, 1867-1938: A Cultural*

⁶ Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism*, 200.

⁷ John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981).

⁸ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 51.

History (1989), Beller declared anti-Semitism had successfully unified democrats, independent liberals, artisans' leaders, clerics, and German nationals under the banner of Christian Socialism.⁹ In *A Concise History of Austria* (2006), Beller elaborated how Christian Socials did not have a national identity to rely upon. In addition, clericalism could not unite the Christian Socials, as many supporters were anti-clerical, especially in Vienna. For this reason, the Christian Social Party did not use the word "Catholic" in its name but rather "Christian," which meant in context "not Jewish." Beller remarked, "Antisemitism was at the core of Christian Social identity."¹⁰

Austrian scholarship has further elaborated on Viennese and Christian Social anti-Semitism. In 1965, Hellmut Andics published *The Eternal Jew: Causes and History of Anti-Semitism*. Andics related how Karl Lueger embraced clerical petty-bourgeois anti-Semitism, but not racial anti-Semitism. Lueger argued for a "quota [Latin: *numerus clausus*]" against Jews to scale back the influence of Jews to a level matching their small proportion of the population. With his anti-Jewish politics, Lueger evoked emotion and brought men to the polls to vote for the Christian Social Party.¹¹

In a 1974 article "Tolerance, Emancipation and Anti-Semitism," Wolfgang Häusler explained that Viennese anti-Semitism made impossible the complete integration into bourgeois society, emancipation, and assimilation of Jews. Häusler characterized Christian Social anti-Semitism as anti-liberal, anti-socialist, anti-capitalist, and motivated by religious Jew-hatred. Moreover, he portrayed Christian Social anti-Semitism as an

⁹ Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews, 1867-1938: a Cultural History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 193.

¹⁰ Steven Beller, *A Concise History of Austria* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 157.

¹¹ Hellmut Andics, *Der ewige Jude: Ursachen und Geschichte des Antisemitismus* (Vienna: Verlag Fritz Molden, 1965), 240-241.

integral part of Christian Social Party propaganda and press, and as a “political instrument” for electoral success.¹²

Historians’ characterizations of Christian Social anti-Semitism are only partially correct as characterizations of *Reichspost* anti-Semitism. An examination of the newspaper reveals that it identified Jews with liberalism, capitalism, and Social Democracy, and attacked Jews as identical with these three ideologies. Furthermore, it depicted Jews as a threat to artisans, peasants, and landowners. The *Reichspost* saw Jews as a threat to all of society and public life. The newspaper also utilized pre-liberal and pre-capitalist religious hatred of Jews. Pulzer argued that Viennese anti-Semitism drew its strength from “economic springs.” Indeed, the *Reichspost* made frequent use of economic anti-Semitism. However, the newspaper used just as much religiously motivated hatred of Jews, which Pulzer had downplayed. Yet Pulzer was right: “Racial anti-Semitism was out of the question,” for the *Reichspost*.

The *Reichspost* often used anti-Semitism in the same manner as the Christian Social Party, as a weapon of politics, especially during elections. The newspaper used anti-Semitism in attacks against liberals and Social Democrats, and to play off economic threats to the bourgeoisie. The *Reichspost* editorial staff consisted of Christian Social “sub-elite” of journalists and priests, to whom Boyer referred. Like the Christian Social Party, the *Reichspost* used anti-Semitism as a weapon against liberal and Social Democratic anti-clericalism. The newspaper viewed liberals, Social Democrats, and Jews as enemies of Christians, Christianity, and the Catholic Church. It specifically targeted Jews in calls for legal regulations of peddling and competitive sales, two

¹² Wolfgang Häusler, “Toleranz, Emanzipation und Antisemitismus. Das österreichische Judentum des bürgerlichen Zeitalters (1782-1918),” in *Das österreichische Judentum: Voraussetzungen und Geschichte*, ed. Nikolaus Vielmetti (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1974), 109, 115-118.

important Christian Social objectives. Same as the Christian Social Party, the *Reichspost* called for quotas against Jews in academic and professional positions. Note, however, that the *Reichspost* called for these quotas in the name of the “re-Christianization” and “de-Jewification” of public life, demonstrating religious motivations on par with economic ones.

As Beller and others argued, anti-Semitism constituted much of the core identity of the *Reichspost*. In contrast to Beller’s claims, however, Catholicism and “clericalism” also constituted the core identity of the *Reichspost*. The high frequency with which the newspaper portrayed Christians and Catholics, Christianity and Catholicism, and the Catholic clergy positively matched the high frequency with which it portrayed Jews, Judaism, and rabbis negatively.

Similarly, German nationalism was not important to the *Reichspost*. The newspaper professed state patriotism and identification with Austria-Hungary and the Habsburg monarchy. The name *Reichspost* means *Imperial Post*. From January 1, 1894 until September 27, 1894, the newspaper labeled itself an “independent daily paper for the Christian people of Austria.” In the rest of the period under investigation, the *Reichspost* changed “Austria” to “Austria-Hungary,” extending its state patriotism to the entire empire and reaching as wide a Christian and Catholic audience as possible. The *Reichspost* often declared loyalty to empire and dynasty. The newspaper was not German nationalist. It saw itself as Austrian, not German. Thus, the newspaper distanced itself from Georg Ritter von Schönerer and the Pan German movement.

The weight of the existing scholarship on the Christian Social Party emphasizes economic and political anti-Semitism and de-emphasizes social anti-Semitism and

religiously motivated Jew-hatred. On the contrary, this study of the *Reichspost* demonstrates that the newspaper emphasized all of these forms of anti-Semitism and Jew-hatred. Equally important, the newspaper often entwined them in its argumentation against Jews. At the same time, the *Reichspost* was not German nationalist, rejected racial anti-Semitism, allowed Jews to convert to Christianity, and professed state patriotism, dynastic loyalty, and “positive” Christianity. Moreover, the *Reichspost* selectively remembered historic events and figures in its argumentation against Jews. The newspaper also justified pogroms against Jews without “crossing the line” and inciting anti-Jewish violence.

Origins of the *Reichspost*

Christian Social politicians, Catholic clergy and Catholic laymen founded the *Reichspost*. At the Third Austrian Catholics Convention in Linz, summer 1892, the Christian Socials presented their views, emphasizing anti-Semitism and the social rather than religious content of their program. This irritated Catholic conservatives and consequently the *Katholikentag* ended in disunity. Nevertheless, during this meeting the Christian Socials founded the *Reichspost*, which became a Christian Social political organ more reliable than either Ernst Vergani’s *Volksblatt* or Karl Freiherr von Vogelsang’s *Das Vaterland*.¹³

Franz Martin Schindler (1847-1922), a Catholic cleric and professor of moral theology at the University of Vienna from 1888 to 1917, led a committee that organized and obtained funding for the creation of the *Reichspost*. Roman Himmelbauer (1858-

¹³ Richard S. Geehr, *Karl Lueger: Mayor of Fin de Siècle Vienna* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990), 85. Daniel Vyleta characterized the *Deutsches Volksblatt* as a “Radically and dedicatedly antisemitic paper,” both “German-nationalist and racist,” and the *Vaterland* as “The monarchy’s leading Catholic paper [...] Opposed extreme nationalism. Competed with the *Reichspost* for readers, though less populist in nature.” Vyleta *Crime, Jews, and News*, 75. Reinhold Knoll stated that the *Vaterland* forfeited its position as the representative Catholic newspaper to the *Reichspost*. Reinhold Knoll, *Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei: Ihre Früh- und Entwicklungsgeschichte bis zu den Reichsratswahlen 1907* (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1973), 178.

1929), an Augustinian cleric, political agitator, and editor of the Catholic *Correspondenzblatt*, was an influential *Reichspost* committee member. By early 1893, funding was obtained for the *Reichspost* in the same manner as for the *Correspondenzblatt*, by voluntary contributions from monks and clerics, as well as some investments by Catholic laymen such as Albert Gessmann. A Christian Social politician second in command to Karl Lueger, Albert Gessmann became *Reichspost* co-director.¹⁴ With Gessmann as co-director, the newspaper probably had stronger ties to the Christian Social Party than before him.

In a front-page article entitled “To the Christian reader,” on December 29, 1894 (more than two years after the *Katholikentag* in Linz), the *Reichspost* listed its owners. This included the aforementioned Albert Gessmann, Roman Himmelbauer, and Franz M. Schindler, as well as Adam Trabert, Ambros Opitz, Baron Vittinghoff-Schell, and Anton Weimar.¹⁵ Adam Trabert (1822-1914) was a Catholic writer active in the Christian Social movement in the early 1890s.¹⁶ Ambros Opitz (1846-1907) was chief editor for the *Reichspost* until 1903. A German cleric from northern Bohemia, Opitz had trained as a Jesuit and then became a priest in 1870. While *Reichspost* editor, he served as a member of the Bohemian Diet from 1895-1901. A prolific publicist, Opitz founded several other Catholic newspapers as well.¹⁷ Baron Vittinghoff-Schell was the organizer of the Austrian Catholics Convention, and a *Reichspost* co-publisher.¹⁸

¹⁴ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 70, 140, 339-340; John W. Boyer, *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna: Christian Socialism in Power, 1897-1918* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 37-39, 169, 304.

¹⁵ *Reichspost*, 29 December 1894, 1.

¹⁶ Boyer, *Culture and Political Crisis*, 318.

¹⁷ Ibid. 41; Wilhelm Kosch, “Opitz, Ambros,” in *Biographisches Staatshandbuch: Lexicon der Politik, Presse und Publizistik*, Fortgeführt von Eugen Kuri, Zweiter Band (Bern und Munich: A. Francke AG Verlag, 1963), 944; E. Lebensaft, “Opitz, Ambros (1846-1907), Journalist, Verleger und Politiker” in *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexicon 1815-1950* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der

During the period January 1894 through April 1897, the *Reichspost* listed its newspaper staff at the bottom of one of the last pages in each edition. Ambros Opitz, the newspaper's chief editor, was listed in every edition. Anton Weimar, also one of the newspaper owners, served alternately as publisher and/or responsible editor. Franz Winter and Hermann Hikisch, who were not listed as *Reichspost* owners, served as responsible editors. Friedrich Funder (1872-1959) became *Reichspost* feuilleton editor in 1896. A traditional Catholic layman, he studied three semesters of theology in Graz where he joined Catholic students in brawls against German nationalist fraternities. He studied law at the University of Vienna and received his *doctor juris* in 1898. In 1903, he succeeded Ambros Opitz as *Reichspost* chief editor.¹⁹

As Christian Social politicians, Catholic clergy and Catholic laymen, the owners, editors, and publishers of the *Reichspost* demonstrated it was a Christian Social and Catholic newspaper. Furthermore, the newspaper did not depend upon the church hierarchy for patronage. Of all the major Catholic newspapers in Austria-Hungary, the *Reichspost* was the only one with such independence.²⁰ In addition, the newspaper did not answer to Catholic conservatives, such as those irritated at the Third Austrian Catholics Convention by the Christian Social display of anti-Semitism. These factors enabled and encouraged the overt display of anti-Semitism in the *Reichspost*. The following three chapters examine how traditional religious Jew hatred and modern forms of anti-Semitism informed the newspaper's anti-Semitic arguments.

Wissenschaften 2003-2011), 233-234, accessed March 23, 2013, http://www.biographien.ac.at/oeb1/oeb1_O/Opitz_Ambros_1846_1907.xml?frames=yes.

¹⁸ Reinhold Knoll, *Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei*, 318.

¹⁹ Wilhelm Kosch, "Funder, Friedrich," in *Biographisches Staatshandbuch*, Erster Band, 367; Kurt Skalník, "Funder, Friedrich," in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 5 (Munich: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1961), 730, accessed March 23, 2013, <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118536869.html>.

²⁰ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 339-340.

Chapter II: Use of Economic/Social Anti-Semitism, and Justifications of Expulsions/Riots Targeting Jews

Use of Economic Anti-Semitism

“Buy only from Christians! [*Kaufet nur bei Christen!*]”²¹

The *Reichspost* used economic and social anti-Semitic argumentation to attack Jews and their role in the economy and society. In terms of economic anti-Semitism, the newspaper denigrated Jews as fraudulent and exploitative usurers, peddlers, stockbrokers, businessmen, bankers, industrialists, and millionaires. It represented Jews as the embodiment of capitalistic excess and a threat to a traditional economy, especially to artisans, farmers, and small businesses. This led to *Reichspost* calls for regulations on usury (lending money at excessive interest rates), peddling, and stockbroking. The newspaper blended religiously motivated Jew-hatred with its economic anti-Semitism; it condemned Jews for selling Christian religious objects, while exhorting Christians to “Buy only from Christians!” and called for the cessation of commerce on Sundays in observance of the Christian Sabbath.

In an article entitled “The harmful Jewish influence on working life,” the *Reichspost* declared that the “Jewish Question” was above all an economic policy question. The newspaper pledged itself to “fight as independent organ of the people against the exceedingly detrimental effect of Jewish business ethics on the entire economy, especially also on production.”²² In support of this position, the *Reichspost* discussed Dr. Leopold Caro’s 1892 essay “The Jewish Question, an Ethical Question.”²³ Dr. Caro, born a Jew and descended from a Spanish-Jewish rabbinical-family, was a

²¹ *Reichspost*, 17 April 1894, 1-2.

²² *Reichspost*, 4 March 1894, 4.

²³ Ibid.

Christian convert. The *Reichspost* assured its readers of Caro's credibility. He had converted earlier and never insulted or neglected his fellow Christians. The *Reichspost* explicitly rejected racial anti-Semitism, which allowed it to cite Caro, a convert, as an authority on the "Jewish Question." According to the newspaper, Caro's work proved Jews were "corrupt" usurers, stockbrokers, bankrupters, and journalists. In addition, the *Reichspost* cited Caro's statistics about usury. According to Caro, from 1880-1887 of 441 usurers prosecuted in Austria, 277 (62.9%) were Jewish, while 164 (37.1%) were Christian. In Galicia, of a total 192 usurers prosecuted, 168 (87.5%) were Jewish, 24 (12.5%) were Christian. The statistics Caro used, according to the *Reichspost*, came from the Imperial and Royal Statistical Central Commission for the Austrian Monarchy. The *Reichspost* then declared the criminal statistics proved Jews were criminals out of greed.²⁴ In many additional articles the newspaper derided Jews as usurers and/or stock exchange speculators, and called upon the government to regulate such economic activity.²⁵

In a similar vein, the *Reichspost* often declared Jewish peddlers negatively impacted the economy. In "Check Peddling!" the newspaper described the 1883 trade regulation on peddling as insufficient. This regulation required peddlers to obtain peddling permits. Despite the regulation, peddlers, most of them Jews, flourished. The *Reichspost* claimed this economic activity harmed legitimate artisans and salesmen. Competing with peddlers, they could no longer sell their wares directly. Peddlers undercut their prices. Furthermore, peddlers harmed consumers by selling wares of varying quality and by offering installment loans. Nevertheless, the newspaper alleged,

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ For additional examples of Jews seen as usurers and/or speculators, see *Reichspost*, 1 February 1894, 1; 1 May 1894, 3; 10 May 1894, 4; 26 July 1895, 5; 2 April 1897, 3.

Liberal deputies who depended on Jewish votes defended peddling because there were 20,000 officially registered peddlers (mostly Jews) throughout Austria. In spite of Liberal opposition, the *Reichspost* called for further regulation. This included a minimum age for peddlers of 35 years and a requirement that a peddler must be a candidate for one year before becoming registered. The newspaper also called for prohibiting peddling from being a family business and children from working as peddlers. The *Reichspost* requested enforcement of observance of Sunday as a day of rest. Furthermore, the newspaper called for excluding peddlers from selling herbs, meat and vinegar to prevent epidemics (implying Jews and their business practices were dirty), as well as perfumes, pocket watches, and securities. The *Reichspost* desired a ban on peddling in local communities with more than 10,000 inhabitants.²⁶

On many occasions, the *Reichspost* warned its readers that Jewish peddlers posed an economic and/or health threat.²⁷ In a report entitled “Jewish brutality,” the newspaper recounted a scene on Neubaugürtel (a street in Vienna) where a “bow-legged haggler” led one donkey and three horses, all “run down and miserable” animals, along with a rope. When the animals no longer had the strength to continue, the haggler hit them with a stick. This aroused general indignation among passersby: “To the allegations of some compassionate people; the benevolent Hebrew responded [in a Yiddish accent]: 'What do you want, I lead them only so far to the butcher!' [...] To slaughter such fagged animal stuff [*Theirzeug*] and offer it to the unsuspecting Viennese should then not be allowed.”²⁸

The *Reichspost* used easily recognizable anti-Semitic stereotypes of the “bow-legged”

²⁶ *Reichspost*, 25 February 1894, 9.

²⁷ For additional examples of Jews seen as peddlers, see *Reichspost*, 1 May 1894, 3; 22 July 1894, 1; 10 August 1894, 5; 6 March 1895, 4; 7 March 1895, 4; 8 March 1895, 6; 9 March 1895, 4; 12 March 1895, 5; 17 December, 1895, 5.

²⁸ *Reichspost*, 24 September 1896, 5.

Jew speaking German with a Yiddish accent. By recounting the Jew's cruel treatment of the tired animals, his desire to slaughter them and sell their meat to unsuspecting Viennese customers, the newspaper meant to elicit anger and disgust from readers in support of its efforts to curb Jewish peddling.

In an article entitled "Jews in the Food Trade," the *Reichspost* noted Jews had expanded into the industry of butchering and called for regulation of Jews there as well. Here the newspaper warned that Jewish butchers offered, "the cheaper price at the expense of quality and sanitary requirements. Those familiar with the process of ritual slaughter [*Schächtung*] and the rigor in the selection of meat for specific Jewish purposes will understand well that the Jews have a very lively interest to sustain a meat trade between Galicia and Vienna."²⁹ The *Reichspost* did not explain how the process of Jewish ritual slaughter and meat selection affected meat quality. Uninformed readers were expected to imagine the worst. Note as well, here the newspaper used a mix of economic and religious arguments against Jews in the food trade.

The *Reichspost* contended bad Jewish business practices existed in all branches of trade. In "He'd have to earn," a Jewish businessman and a Christian businessman came to an agreement. They helped each other sell goods at their respective shops to customers at the regular purchase price. The newspaper claimed that while the Christian sold the Jew's wares honestly, the Jew overcharged the Christian's customers slightly, and pocketed the difference. The *Reichspost* claimed that the character of Jews explained his action: "It is in the Jews' blood, he can't help it, to gain a little 'profit' [*Rebbach*]."³⁰

²⁹ *Reichspost*, 5 June 1894, 4.

³⁰ *Reichspost*, 6 January 1895, 6.

In a series of articles in March 1896, the *Reichspost* contended Jewish business owners exploited their workers to gain a competitive business advantage. Among cardboard producers, for example, Jewish industrialists employed 1500 female and 200 male workers. The women workers were mostly younger than 30 years old. Bad working conditions, hours, wages, malnutrition and living standards caused high mortality rates.³¹ The *Reichspost* described conditions in the feather adornment industry as well. Here Jewish industrialists were fewer in number, yet according to the newspaper they exerted a negative influence due to their bad business practices. Highly skilled women received better pay and could afford better living conditions. However, for the least experienced and lowest paid workers, “the main diet consists mainly of coffee and bread, in summer cherries and bread.”³² In this series of articles on women at work, the *Reichspost* had attacked capitalistic excess, which it attributed to Jews.

The *Reichspost* depicted wealthy Jews as crafty and/or miserly. In “Beneficence in installments” [“*Wohlthätigkeit auf Raten*”], the newspaper described the “beneficence” of the son of the deceased Jewish coal baron Wilhelm Guttman, who inherited millions of florins from his father. The *Reichspost* contended sarcastically that the son donated 20,000 florins to charities in installments to put himself in the best light: “Every second day 1,000 florins, then comes the name of this 'generous' donor 20 times in the newspapers, and the world will cry out in amazement: 'Must have been a charitable person, this Guttman!' [...] This 'beneficence in installments' is so genuinely Jewish.”³³

In two reports on the estate of Jay Gould (d. 1892), the American railway developer and speculator, the *Reichspost* negatively portrayed the deceased Gould and

³¹ *Reichspost*, (*Abendblatt*), 3 March 1896, 3.

³² *Reichspost*, (*Abendblatt*), 5 March 1896, 4.

³³ *Reichspost*, 18 July 1895, 3.

Jews who sought to profit from his estate. In truth, Jay Gould was a Protestant. However, in “The Crazy Gold” [“*Die meschuggenen Gold*”], the newspaper assumed Gould was a Jew from Hungary named Isaak Gold who migrated as a poor young man to America, where he changed his name to Jay Gould and made a fortune. The *Reichspost* declared, “All Jews who listen to the precious name 'Gold', are, as a Jewish newspaper reported, become suddenly ‘crazy’.”³⁴ Instead, it argued that many families in Austria-Hungary now carried the family name Gold and claimed familial relationship to the deceased. These claimants had formed a consortium and raised a twenty thousand gulden subscription to cover initial expenses: “Provided with this money, an established lawyer in Groß-Kanizsa has already traveled to New York to represent the claims of the heirs.”³⁵ By mislabeling Jay Gould a Jew, the *Reichspost* associated Jews with capitalism, and attacked both. Furthermore, the newspaper depicted Jewish claimants to his estate as both greedy and opportunistic.

The *Reichspost* engaged in a tirade against the Gould family. The newspaper declared derisively, “But the thing gets even better! The Gould's testament decreed that the son George would be paid from the estate 25 million dollars not as heir, but as a salary: the salary for twelve years working in the service of the company Gould! This salary rate - per year more than two million dollars!”³⁶ While the American public viewed such a salary as too high, Judge Dillon upheld the salary rate as justified. The Gould family dodged the inheritance tax. The *Reichspost* sneered, “As one sees, the Jew whether rich or poor, is dirty, and anxious to dig only to gain an advantage.”³⁷ The

³⁴ *Reichspost*, 30 October 1895, 6.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Reichspost*, 13 August 1896, 10.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

newspaper depicted Jews rich and poor as deceitful to gain an economic advantage. This article was another attack on the excess of capitalism, which the *Reichspost* associated with Jews.

The *Reichspost* further derided Jews for their economic roles in a series of articles covering a defamation lawsuit between two Jewish firms. In “For what purpose does a Jew use anti-Semitism,” the newspaper reported that Würtenberg and Co., a scythes mail order company [*Sensen-Versandhaus*] in the Rhineland, filed a defamation lawsuit against its competitor firm Münzer and Co. Würtenberg and Co. claimed Münzer and Co. had sent out 300,000 circulars warning clientele against buying Würtenberg’s scythes, as the company was “Polish-Jewish [*polnisch-jüdisch*].”³⁸ The *Reichspost* commented, “So in order to defeat a ‘Cohn-national’ competitor, even the Jewish scythe dealer used anti-Semitism.”³⁹

In “Jew versus Jew,” the *Reichspost* recounted the brothers David and Lazar Münzer had come from Galicia to Vienna to trade in scythes. The Münzer brothers distributed circulars in the countryside warning that its competitors, possibly Würtenberg and Co., did “farmer con tricks [*Bauern-fängerei*]” selling magnetic scythes to farmers. In addition, the Münzer brothers reportedly sent out 10,000 circulars warning clients against buying from their Jewish cousin Adolf Münzer’s scythe dealing house in Cologne. The Münzer brothers’ circulars warned “this Galician scoundrel” Adolf Münzer sent advertisements to farmers selling “honed scythes,” when he actually manufactured “miserable trash scythes” and defrauded his customers. The *Reichspost* commented, “Of course, Adolf felt violated in his business and in his ‘honor’ and sued his cousins for

³⁸ *Reichspost*, 12 Januar 1895, 5.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

‘defamation’.’⁴⁰ Note the newspaper, put “honor” and “defamation” in quotation marks. This demonstrated its belief that Adolf Münzer, as a Jew, lacked honor, made false claims of defamation, and had a fraudulent scythes business.

Moreover, Adolf Münzer had also sent out circulars against his cousins, the Münzer brothers in Vienna as well. The *Reichspost* noted that for this reason the Münzer brothers might be absolved. The newspaper expressed regret for the country people who had been enticed to buy from these scythe traders.⁴¹ Alleging the bad business practices of these Jews implied that all Jews cheated. By recounting Jews’ anti-Semitic accusations against Jews, the *Reichspost* meant to validate its economic anti-Semitism and portray Jews making petty attempts to gain economic advantages. The newspaper also made numerous accusations of Jewish fraud and swindling in all kinds of businesses and in banking.⁴²

In particular, the *Reichspost* was upset that Jews sold Christian religious objects. In a front-page article “The trade of Jewish businesses with Christian devotional or pilgrimage objects,” the *Reichspost* reported that Jews had manufactured and sold Christian prayer books, holy pictures, and other Christian devotional objects. The newspaper claimed four Viennese Jewish firms made a profitable business selling pilgrimage objects to pilgrims. It lamented that enough Christians bought these items from Jews to cause Christian producers to struggle financially, and that Christian firms with weak capital needed assistance. Combining religiously motivated Jew-hatred and economic anti-Semitism, the *Reichspost* cited Rabbi Joseph Caro’s sixteenth century

⁴⁰ *Reichspost*, 30 January 1895, 5-6.

⁴¹ Ibid; the *Reichspost* documented additional Münzer defamation lawsuits in two articles entitled “Jews among themselves” [“*Juden unter sich*”] on 10 June 1896 (page 7), and 11 June 1896 (page 9).

⁴² For additional examples of Jews depicted as frauds/swindlers in business and banking, see *Reichspost*, 26 January 1894, 6; 30 January 1894, 3; 10 February 1894, 6; 18 January 1895, 5; 6 May 1896, 3.

Schulchan Aruch [Code of Jewish Law]. The *Reichspost* claimed the *Schulchan Aruch* prohibited Jews from purchasing Jewish religious objects [*Cultusgegenstände*] from “*Akums (Christen)*.”⁴³ Here the *Reichspost* translated *Akum* as Christian for the sake of its anti-Semitic argumentation. *Akum* actually means “star worshipper.”⁴⁴

Nevertheless, the *Reichspost* claimed that Jews should strictly observe their own laws, not sell Christian religious objects, and stated that it would reprove Christians for selling Jewish religious objects as well. The *Reichspost* noted that Jews and their press joked and sneered [*witzeln und höhnen*] at Christian veneration of saints and pilgrimages, and ridiculed pious folk on pilgrimages. At the same time, Christians paid thousands of crowns to Jewish businessmen when they visited Mariazell, Styria, and pilgrimage sites of Lower Austria. The *Reichspost* exhorted readers: “Buy only from Christians! [*Kaufet nur bei Christen!*],”⁴⁵ which was also a leitmotif of the Christian Social Party. It is the epigraph at the beginning of this chapter as well.

In “Buy only from Christians. The confirmation business.” [*“Kauft nur bei Christen. Das Firmungsgeschäft.”*], the *Reichspost* claimed that Jewish merchants displaced Christian artisans in all branches of industry. Jewish merchants took their customers, reducing master artisans to journeymen, and worse to “wage slaves [*Lohnslaven*]” of the Jews. The *Reichspost* warned its readers not to buy from Jews who, according to its reading of the *Schulchan Aruch*, debased prices and considered Christians “domestic animals.”⁴⁶ The *Reichspost* then declared that when Christians withdraw trade from Christian businesses, “we commit a crime against Christian national

⁴³ *Reichspost*, 17 April 1894, 1-2.

⁴⁴ John W. Bowker, “Akum,” in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of World Religions*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), accessed March 22, 2013, <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1O101-Akum.html>.

⁴⁵ *Reichspost*, 17 April 1894, 1-2.

⁴⁶ *Reichspost*, 10 May 1894, 4.

character [*christlichen Volkstum*].”⁴⁷ The newspaper concluded with an emotional appeal, “And now again the request: buy from Christians! Remember, that for thousands of poor craftsmen's children there will be no festive joy, when your money enriches Jews.”⁴⁸ The *Reichspost* emphasized the Christian Social request “buy from Christians!” by appealing to the reader’s emotions with the image of Christian craftsmen’s children made joyless (allegedly) by calculating and cold Jews and their unfair business practices. The newspaper published a poem by J. Ant. Leib, entitled “Christmas!” which continued the theme in its second stanza: “Christmas! No feast of the Jews? / Yes, but! You fill their cash boxes [*Cassen*] / With the money of those – good / Christians, they let themselves be fooled.”⁴⁹

The *Reichspost* also implored its readers to buy Christian Social memorabilia from Christian rather than Jewish businesses. In “Anti-Semitic pieces of jewelry” [*“Antisemitische Schmuckgegenstände”*], the newspaper reported that in the seventeenth district of Vienna (Hernals) one of the Jewish shops sold anti-Semitic gold and silver jewelry, including Bismarck-, Schönerer-, and Lueger pins, pendants and so on. The *Reichspost* recommended to its readers in Hernals that they only order and buy their anti-Semitic jewelry from the skilled goldsmith Joseph Ungrad, a Christian Social sympathizer and German Christian, on Hernalser Hauptstraße No. 35.⁵⁰

The *Reichspost* supported legislation closing businesses on Sundays, the Christian Sabbath. In “On the Sunday rest” [*“Zur Sonntagsruhe”*], the newspaper described as

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid. For additional examples of the *Reichspost* and Christian Social motto “Buy only from Christians!” being used, see *Reichspost*, 22 March 1894, 5; 2 May 1894, 1. For an example of *Reichspost* calls for boycotts against the “Jew-Press” motivated by religious Jew-hatred and economic anti-Semitism, see *Reichspost*, 13 March 1897, 4.

⁴⁹ *Reichspost*, 23 December 1894, 12.

⁵⁰ *Reichspost*, 27 October 1895, 6.

“unconscionable and outrageous” that the “Jew-Press” had complained about recent regulations concerning Sunday rest and its effects on commerce. The *Reichspost* remarked that Christians were not permitted Sunday rest because the Jews would allow neither their profit nor their “domination [*Herrschaft*]” to be diminished.⁵¹ The *Reichspost* call for the closure of businesses on Sundays was a prime example of the coterminous “re-Christianization” and “de-Jewification” of public life. It would have allowed Christians to observe the Christian Sabbath without worry of economic competition from Jews keeping their businesses open. On the other hand, it would have damaged Jews economically, especially those who observed the Jewish Sabbath on Saturday by making commerce impossible for them over the weekend. Exhortations to buy Christian religious objects from Christians (not Jews), references to the *Schulchan Aruch*, and calls to end Sunday commerce, were a blend of economic anti-Semitism and religiously motivated Jew-hatred.

Use of Social Anti-Semitism

“Jewish swindler, you are malingering. [*Jüdischer Schwindler, Du simulirst.*]”⁵²

The *Reichspost* depicted Jews as unable to adhere to normal standards of behavior. They were deceitful, sexually depraved, and violent. The newspaper portrayed Jews misbehaving in Christian and Jewish houses of worship and in Jewish neighborhoods where they fought one another and peddled their wares. It depicted Jews in public life allegedly beating and sexually preying on Christian women and girls. Extreme examples of *Reichspost* social anti-Semitic argumentation included depictions of Jews as the sole perpetrators of “White Slavery” and as murderers for economic gain. The newspaper

⁵¹ *Reichspost*, 31 May 1894, 5.

⁵² *Reichspost*, 22 August 1895, 6.

generally characterized Jewish family life as driven by self-interest and deceit, not by love and mutual-respect.

The *Reichspost* presented hostile images of Jewish public behavior, including in Christian and Jewish houses of worship. The newspaper published a report submitted by Johann Stadler, a Christian Social collaborator, Leopold Neuhold, a master locksmith [*Schlossermeister*], and Johann Bischinger, a government official, entitled: “Rudeness in the Hofburg Chapel.” Sunday Masses in the Hofburg chapel drew large crowds because of the wonderful musical performances. Due to the large crowds, some people who came late had to be turned away. The report submitters claimed they had witnessed Jews in attendance acting sacrilegiously, resting their hats, sticks, books, on the altar, and leaning themselves against the altar to listen comfortably to the music. Jews stood in groups talking Yiddish [*mauscheln*],⁵³ criticizing the singing, and so on. This caused anger among the Christians and tested their patience. During consecration on Easter Monday, two giggling Jewish girls standing by the knees of Christians imitated them with mocking gestures. The report submitters lamented that Christians who came too late, and perhaps could not come earlier, were turned away, while Jews in attendance behaved so badly. They requested that a competent authority address the issue.⁵⁴ The *Reichspost* sought to demonstrate by publishing this submission that Jews disrespected Christianity and behaved badly, even in sacred spaces.

The *Reichspost* recounted Jews misbehaving in Jewish houses of worship too. In “Quarrel in the Jewish temple” [*Balgerei im Judentempel*], the author noted:

⁵³ *Mauschel* was the western Yiddish of Bohemia and Moravia imitated by anti-Semites. Vyleta, *Crime, Jews, and News*, 120.

⁵⁴ *Reichspost*, 31 March 1894, 10.

In the synagogue in Stryj [Galicia] it came yesterday to bloody brawls between gymnasium students who wanted to organize a memorial service for a deceased colleague and the fanatical orthodox party, who tried to prevent this devotion, as incompatible with the Orthodox traditions. As the local police could provide no assistance, the gendarmerie had to intervene in the synagogue.⁵⁵

The *Reichspost* portrayed Jews as violent and unruly, unable to adhere to norms of behavior in houses of worship. There was a tinge of religiously motivated Jew-hatred in the characterization of “the fanatical orthodox party” as well.

The *Reichspost* was hostile to Jewish neighborhoods, especially those in the Leopoldstadt, a district of Vienna situated on an island on the Danube River.⁵⁶ In “Picture of a Mood” [“*Stimmungsbild*”], the newspaper negatively represented “the Jew-island [Juden-insel]” of the Leopoldstadt, noting:

Peace exists today on the wide plaza in the Jew-island, peace in the enchantingly beautiful Jew-lane [*Judengasse*]! Anyone can now pass through this lane without risking his life. Quiet reigns in every house, no one will by the melodic 'trade [*Handleh*]' be shooed from his dreams. Even on the stock exchange the traffic is weak, so that one might think: 'Oh, if only it always remains!' And what is the cause - that peace so deep prevails? Tishrei 5655 - Jewish New Year.⁵⁷

The author insinuated that Jews were violent, that only by “risking one’s life” could one pass through the “Jew-island” of the Leopoldstadt. Furthermore, in remarking the “Jew-lane” was a noisy place marked by the sound of “melodic ‘trade’” and the noise of the stock exchange, the author implied Jews were neither polite nor genteel. Only during the Jewish New Year when most Jews were at synagogue could the author find peace and

⁵⁵ *Reichspost*, 20 December 1896, 12.

⁵⁶ Jews created their own neighborhoods in Vienna because they desired to live among coreligionists. This residential behavior increased social contact and opportunities to form personal relationships between Jews, limited contacts with non-Jews, and reinforced Jewish identity. Jews preferred residence among Jews more than among non-Jews even of their same class or from the same regions of Austria-Hungary. The district with the greatest proportion of Jewish residents was the Leopoldstadt; in 1890, 31% of residents were Jewish, and in 1900, 36.4%. Marsha L. Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914: Assimilation and Identity* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1983) 74-94.

⁵⁷ *Reichspost*, 2 October 1894, 6.

quiet in the Leopoldstadt. This passage was noteworthy for its combination of economic and social anti-Semitism and religiously motivated Jew-hatred.

In “From the ‘ghetto’ of Vienna” [*“Aus dem ‘Ghetto’ Wiens”*], the *Reichspost* claimed the dark alleys of the Glocken-, Blumauer-, and Novaragasse (streets) in the Leopoldstadt were places where “light-shy, Jewish riff-raff [*lichtscheuen, jüdischen Gesindels*]” roamed and depraved women resided. Here, a brawl or public scandal among the Jewish families broke out almost daily. The *Reichspost* reported: “Two Jewesses in the Glockengasse, Regina Löbl and Bertha Klimat, in accordance with the Jewish style [*jüdischer Art*] spat at each other, jabbed each other with umbrellas and pelted [each other] with plates and bowls, and then sued.”⁵⁸ Brought before the criminal judge of the Leopoldstadt, Dr. Schuster, the Jewesses denied everything and mutually retracted their defamation claims. While an action for assault remained against Mrs. Löbl, the defendant managed to prove that Mrs. Klimat’s injuries stemmed from an earlier incident. The *Reichspost* conjectured that the injuries likely came from a previous fight of this “heroine [*Heldin*],” and noted the negotiation ended in acquittal.⁵⁹ The newspaper depicted these Jewish women as shameless and violent.

The *Reichspost* described acts of violence by Jewish men more often than by Jewish women. In “The Jews have, as is well known, the intelligence,” the newspaper challenged the claim to Jewish intelligence in its account of a Jewish man beating a Christian woman and child. In a park in the third district of Vienna (Landstrasse) the Christian charwoman Marie Mandl and her daughter walked their small dog. They then witnessed Jewish children beat the dog without cause. When the charwoman made them

⁵⁸ *Reichspost*, 7 September 1895, 5.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

answer for their actions, they ran home to their father, the Jewish hemp dealer Max Kaufmann. The children complained to him that a Christian woman had rebuked them.

Mr. Kaufmann then:

[...] rushed immediately to the park and gave the daughter of the charwoman two slaps with such force that she immediately began to bleed. The intelligent gentleman [*intelligente Herr*] had then still the audacity, when a watchman came, to slap in the face the mother of the abused child while the watchman stood by. Mr. Max Kaufmann, this model of 'quick-witted' Jews, will have to stand trial soon because of this brutality.⁶⁰

The *Reichspost* depicted Jews as violent without cause against women, children, and animals. The newspaper also sought to demonstrate how Mr. Kaufmann, who it termed a "model of 'quick-witted' Jews," lacked well-known Jewish "intelligence."

The *Reichspost* also represented cases where Jewish men were not only violent, but also sexually perverse. To catch the reader's eye, the newspaper printed "A naughty Jew" [*Ein frecher Jude*] in larger than normal type. The article reported that at Berlin Alexanderplatz Alfonso Loewinsohn, a Jew, approached a young lady, Miss Selma Trost, "With the naughty words, 'Miss, I love you! Do you [love] me?'"⁶¹ Miss Trost, who was awaiting the arrival of a girlfriend, refused Loewinsohn. He then made a nastier remark to Miss Trost, openly doubted her "moral purity," and gave her the impression of a "half-finished man [*halbfertigen Menschen*]."⁶² Miss Trost then remarked that she considered him "a dumb boy who should prefer to go home and do his homework."⁶³ Loewinsohn acted offended and slapped her in the face. The young lady called a policeman who took statements and had Loewinsohn answer for his actions in court.

⁶⁰ *Reichspost*, 4 October 1895, 6.

⁶¹ *Reichspost*, 8 May 1896, 5.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Ibid.*

While the prosecutor sought 40 marks, the court ordered a 10 mark fine.⁶⁴ The *Reichspost* often cautioned Christian women to beware of Jewish men, depicting them as depraved and violent.

The *Reichspost* took its social anti-Semitic propaganda a step further in portrayals of Jewish men as sexual predators. In “What a good girl can experience in Jewish stores,” the newspaper reported that a Jewish goldsmith in the Leopoldstadt accosted a Christian girl in his store. The girl wanted to buy some jewelry but had no money. The child said she would come later with her mother, but the Jewish goldsmith offered the jewelry to her “for nothing” if she would follow him into his room. Outraged, the girl left the shop and told her parents what happened. The *Reichspost* represented this scene as a “warning to all Christian mothers before these ‘clean’ Jew's shops [*sauberen Judengeschäfte*].”⁶⁵

The *Reichspost* made similar warnings concerning Jews and the practice of “White Slavery [*Mädchenhandel*],” the sex trafficking of women and girls. “White Slavery” was a real problem. Christians and Jews trafficked Christian and Jewish women and girls as prostitutes. State governments as well as Christian and Jewish organizations fought against this crime.⁶⁶ However, the *Reichspost* reported almost exclusively on Jewish men and women as perpetrators and Christian women and girls as victims. The newspaper described “White Slavery” in a number of articles. Reportedly, Jewish men and women with the promise of a good marriage, employment, or vacation lured unsuspecting Christian women and girls from throughout Europe to travel with them to

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ *Reichspost*, 17 December 1895, 5.

⁶⁶ Studies demonstrated that the proportion of Jewish prostitutes in Buenos Aires brothels was as high as ninety percent. See Vyleta, *Crime Jews and News*, 57-58, 68. For more information on “White Slavery” and Jewish efforts to combat it, see Marion Kaplan, *The Jewish Feminist Movement in Germany: The Campaigns of the Jüdischer Frauenbund, 1904-1938* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979).

destinations in South America. If the innocent women and girls did not come voluntarily, the “white slavers” forced them against their will. Having arrived in South America, the innocent women and children were forced into prostitution. The *Reichspost* and the “white slavers” both referred to the “white slaves” as *Waare*, “merchandise.” The *Reichspost* could also refer to a “white slaver” as *Waarensensal*, “merchandise broker.”⁶⁷ The use of these terms signified how “white slavers” commodified the sex of innocent women and girls. The newspaper characterized Jews as exploitative and sexually depraved people from whom Christians needed to guard themselves, a combined economic and social anti-Semitic argument. That the *Reichspost* failed to depict any Christians as “white slavers” should not come as a surprise; the newspaper held no pretense about the absence of bias.

The *Reichspost* characterized Jews as deceptive and cowardly as well. In an article entitled “The Jew-Press” [*Die Judenpresse*], the *Reichspost* claimed “Jew-Press” bias and false reporting against the officer class. The “Jew-Press” of Erlau (Eger in Hungary), had reported that Löw, a “one year volunteer” reserve officer, had reported feeling unwell to the military doctor. Löw requested that he recover in his private residence rather than the garrison hospital. The “Jew-Press” claimed the military doctor made an anti-Semitic remark to Löw, which is also the epigraph of this chapter, “Jewish swindler, you are malingering [*Jüdischer Schwindler, Du simulirst*].”⁶⁸ At 5 PM, Löw went to his private residence to recover. The military doctor never visited him, and Löw died at 2 AM the next day. The *Reichspost* rejected these accusations against the military doctor, arguing he sought to maintain military discipline, which required soldiers to

⁶⁷ See also the *Reichspost* articles “White Slaver” [*Mädchenhändler*] on 28 June 1894 (page 6) and “White Slavery” [*Mädchenhandel*] 11 January 1896 (page 4).

⁶⁸ *Reichspost*, 22 August 1895, 6.

recover in the garrison hospital. Furthermore, the *Reichspost* claimed Löw was drunk, and should have had a Jewish doctor attend to him earlier, but did not. A Christian doctor came, but too late. The *Reichspost* scoffed:

Who knows, whether this one-year volunteer was not well known as a malingerer? No one will argue the fact that the Jews have a particular weakness for military service. Reasons to be pretty quiet, ‘offended’ Israel! The military doctor has only done his duty, since if this broke down, any Jewish mama’s boy [*Muttersöhnchen*], that happens to be a soldier, when he has toothache could go to the ‘Mothers’ home, and when an officer would forbid, he would be a ‘anti-Semite’ and a ‘disgrace [*Schandfleck*] of the century’!⁶⁹

The *Reichspost* prejudged Löw as a Jew to be a malingerer and “mama’s boy,” who breached military protocol to recover at home with his mother. In short, the *Reichspost* used this narrative to demonstrate Jewish cowardice and deceit.⁷⁰

The *Reichspost* frequently depicted baser Jewish family relations than that between the supposed malingerer Löw and his mother. In “A Jewish-patriarchal family life,” the newspaper depicted Jewish family life as neither exemplary nor “patriarchal,” but rather dominated by self-interest and greed. In the third district of Vienna (Landstrasse), lived a “Mr. K(ohn)” and his wife with their two unmarried daughters and one unmarried son. Two other daughters and one son were already married and resided outside the home. All family members got along well. When the mother died, the children mourned and everyone expected the family to continue its intimacy. However, shortly after the mother’s burial, the children sold the household goods and moved away from home. They abandoned the old father in the large residence, with only one bed as furniture. The *Reichspost* posed a rhetorical question to Josef Samuel Bloch, rabbi in Vienna, editor of a Jewish newspaper, deputy for Kolomea, and an outspoken critic of

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ For another example of an alleged deceitful Jewish officer in the military, see *Reichspost* 5 April 1895, 5.

anti-Semitism, “We ask now Reb Bloch: ‘Is this family life also exemplary [*musterhaft*] and patriarchal, how [you] mostly described the family life of the Jews to be kept up?’ What says Reb Bloch about it?”⁷¹ The reader could answer this for himself or herself; the *Reichspost* depicted Jewish family life as antithesis to the exemplary and patriarchal family ideal.

The *Reichspost* presented further negative portrayals of Jewish family life in the article “Jewish sibling love.” Wolf Glücklich, a nearly blind Jew, on the *Stefaniebrücke* (a bridge across the Danube Canal in Vienna) often requested charity from passersby. One “fine” (note the word is printed as “*faine*” in German to appear Yiddish phonetically) lady who walked across the bridge was angered by the beggar’s behavior and had a nearby watchman arrest him. The judge determined that the accuser (the *Reichspost* again used the word “*faine*” to describe her) wished to revenge herself against the blind beggar because he owed her 25 Gulden. Impoverished, he could not repay. In fact, the “Jewess is the blind beggar’s – loving sister.”⁷² The irony in describing her as a “loving sister” was apparent. The judge reproved the accused for breaking the law by accepting charity from a passer by. The accused claimed he did so because he only received 4 florins 50 krone each month from official charity. He then proved his incapacity with a medical certificate, and the judge acquitted him. This time, the *Reichspost* asked a Mr. Nothnagel, a Jewish docent at the University of Vienna, a rhetorical question: “Mr. von Nothnagel, are also the Jewesses without bad habits [*Unarten*]?”⁷³ To the reader the answer must have been clear; the newspaper portrayed

⁷¹ *Reichspost*, 18 August 1894, 5.

⁷² *Reichspost*, 21 September 1894, 6.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

Jews as the embodiment of bad habits. The *Reichspost* depicted Jews acting out of self-interest and greed, even to take advantage of family members.

The *Reichspost* also harshly described cases of familial murder among Jews. The newspaper reported one such case in “Jewish assassins sentenced to death.” The *Reichspost* took its information from a newspaper identified as “G. N.” In Przemyśl [Galicia], a Jew named Springstein and his sister had poisoned Springstein’s wife and six other close relatives for their life insurance. Springstein and his sister “were found guilty and sentenced to death by hanging.”⁷⁴ The *Reichspost* set out to demonstrate that Jewish family life was less than ideal. As in public life, the newspaper depicted Jews in their family life rejecting norms of behavior, exploiting, hurting, and even killing others for economic gain. In summation, the *Reichspost* depicted Jews as a dangerous and corrupting influence in the economy and society. The newspaper utilized such economic and social anti-Semitic argumentation to justify contemporary expulsions and riots that targeted Jews.

Justifying Expulsions and Riots Targeting Jews

The *Reichspost* justified contemporary expulsions of and riots against Jews throughout Eastern Europe as a reaction to, in its view, usurious, exploitative and corrupting Jews. These *Reichspost* economic and social anti-Semitic arguments mirrored those levied against the Jews of Austria. In July 1896 in “Russians and Jews,” the newspaper explained why Russia had expelled Jews from its villages:

As is known, about two years ago all the Jews were expelled from the villages of Russia, since the government was forced to recognize the harm of Jews in the villages, because the Jews led the residents astray to drink liquor [*Schnapstrinken*], get into debt and to (practice) an immoral way of life [*unmoralischen Lebensweise*]; they bought stolen goods, they advised

⁷⁴ *Reichspost*, 12 November 1895, 6.

the sons, daughters and servants of the grain farmer's etc. to steal, for which they then got from the Jews liquor, fake jewelry [*falsche Schmucksachen*] and so on. Only now was this sensible regulation carried out thoroughly, so that the Russians can certainly assert their villages exist cleansed of Jews [*judenrein*]. And in Austria?⁷⁵

This economic and social anti-Semitic propaganda concerning the position of Jews in Russian villages mirrored to a great extent *Reichspost* views towards Jews in Austria. Asking, “And in Austria?” suggested the newspaper would have approved of expelling Jews from Austria.

In “The Russian Jewish question” [*“Zur russischen Judenfrage”*], the *Reichspost* justified farmer’s riots against Jews as “self-help” against Jewish usury and exploitation:

On 3 March [1897], in the afternoon, the small town Spola in the governorate Kiev was raided by a large number of farmers who smashed and looted all shops and warehouses belonging solely to Jews. In just under four hours, more than a hundred houses and all the shops, even merchant's stores, were totally devastated. Home and business equipment [*Wirthschaftsgeräthe*], furniture and goods lie about smashed in the streets. – Such self-help is and remains unjust in all circumstances. However, without deeper reason, the farmers would not have been so bitter. It is expected because, as usual, usury and exploitation lie behind it.⁷⁶

The *Reichspost* contended the Jews got what they deserved for their “usury and exploitation.” The newspaper justified the Spola riot as an “outbreak of people’s indignation” at the “economic flood of Jews in the south and southwest of the Empire and rage against the Jews.”⁷⁷ In other articles, the *Reichspost* blamed riots on Jews without specifying why. In “Fighting between Christians and Jews,” the newspaper noted:

In the small town Diatlowka (Grodno Gouvernement) bloody clashes have broken out between Christian and Jewish residents. Only the intervention of the gendarmerie succeeded in putting an end to the incidents. Dozens of people were injured. Seventy people who disturbed the peace were

⁷⁵ *Reichspost*, 10 July 1896, 10.

⁷⁶ *Reichspost*, 14 March 1897, 4.

⁷⁷ *Reichspost*, 21 March 1897, 1-2.

arrested. In any case, the Jews will have caused the indignation of the population.⁷⁸

The *Reichspost* must have expected readers to take for granted, “the Jews will have caused the indignation of the population.” The newspaper had already given readers countless reasons to do so.

In “Against the Jews” [“*Gegen die Juden*”], the *Reichspost* reported how on a Russian Easter Monday in the city of Jekaterinoslaw an “angry riot” occurred against the Jews. At about 4 PM, workers began mishandling Jewish merchants in various streets, and rioting broke out in one locale. When gendarmes attempted to disperse the rioters, they became even more incensed and by evening the excesses had spread throughout the city. Rioters shattered the windows of Jewish homes, demolished Jewish inns and businesses, as well as smashed and set on fire a barrel of petroleum in a street inhabited by Jews. The efforts of police and gendarmes to quell the riots remained without success. The mob pelted them with stones, seriously wounding a police-inspector. When the military arrived and arrested a hundred rioters, the excesses ended. A rumor spread around the city that the next day the riots would be repeated and a thousand factory workers from Brjansk would appear in Jekaterinoslaw. Authorities planned accordingly and had the military surround the factory in Brjansk, permitting no workers to leave. The *Reichspost* commented, “So a formal encirclement to protect – the Jews [*Also eine förmliche Einschließung zum Schutze – der Juden*].”⁷⁹ The newspaper implied the workers needed to be protected from what it so often described as exploitative Jews. Again, the *Reichspost* had already given readers innumerable reasons to believe this was the case.

⁷⁸ *Reichspost*, 26 September 1896, 10.

⁷⁹ *Reichspost*, 22 May 1894, 5.

The two-part front-page feuilleton “The Jew of Rudnia” narrated graphic violence against the Jews, which the *Reichspost* justified as a reaction to Jewish guile. The story was told from the perspective of a postman travelling through Rudnia [a city in present day Poland] with his coachman. He witnessed the burning of a home of a Jewish ritual slaughterer while the non-Jews stood-by and watched with inner joy. With guilty pleasure, a Cossack declared the fire was not so bad. The Jew with the burning home despaired that his mother was still inside. The non-Jews laughed at him.⁸⁰ For the time being, the mother lived, as the flames did not take her. The Jewish son and his Jewish friend lacked courage to save her. The Jewish son offered a Cossack five silver rubles (the *Reichspost* noted not a kopek more) to save her. The Cossack said it was not enough to risk his life but he had no time to waste so he went to save her. After the Cossack saved the Jew’s mother, the Jewish son took from a purse under his caftan one ruble (he had promised five) and gave it to the Cossack who saved his mother’s life. This enraged the Cossack who then ripped the Jewish mother he just saved from her children and threw her into the flames, “As he stands now, enveloped in smoke and flames, he calls out to the terrified Jews: ‘A ruble, dog - you’ll get your mother now for free!’”⁸¹ The feuilleton portrayed the Jew as: a coward who would not risk his life to save his mother; a businessman who placed a monetary value on her life; and a cheap liar who promised five rubles to the Cossack to save her but only paid one. Just as the non-Jews who stood by witnessing the flames with inner joy, the *Reichspost* staff may have felt pleasure in publishing the feuilleton as well.

⁸⁰ *Reichspost*, 27 March 1897, 1-2.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

During the period under investigation (January 1894 to April 1897), the *Reichspost* did not publish articles concerning Christians attacking Jews in Vienna. Yet, minor incidents of anti-Semites beating up Jews and attacking Jewish property did occur.⁸² Nevertheless, these incidents did not rise to the level of pogroms,⁸³ such as in Eastern Europe. That the *Reichspost* reported often on Jews attacking Christians in Vienna and failed to report on Christians attacking Jews there was not a surprise; as noted previously, the newspaper held no pretense about the absence of bias.

⁸² Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 196-197.

⁸³ Robert S. Wistrich noted, "in spite of its vulgarity, Christian-Social anti-Semitism did not generate any pogroms in Vienna. It remained within the limits of a conciliatory, supranational Habsburg state with a political culture based on respect for the law and mutual accommodation between ethnic groups." Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph*, 236-237.

Chapter III: Use of Political Anti-Semitism and History in Anti-Semitic Argumentation

Use of Political Anti-Semitism

“We hate the Jews not on account of their religion, but rather we combat them, because we want to overthrow Jewish morality and Jewish exploiters.”⁸⁴

The *Reichspost* utilized political anti-Semitism in its attacks against Social Democrats, Liberals and Jews. This included charges that the Social Democratic and Liberal parties were controlled by Jews and served Jewish interests. The newspaper declared most of the leaders of these parties and their capitalist financiers were Jews. Moreover, it depicted Social Democrats, Liberals and Jews as waging a war against Christians, Christianity, law, order, and traditional values such as the family, especially through acts of voter fraud, intimidation, and violence. Thus, the *Reichspost* depicted itself and Christian Socials as waging a war of self-defense against Social Democrats, Liberals, and Jews. Moreover, the newspaper used political anti-Semitism to help Christian Social candidates win elections and to increase party membership. In politics, it used economic and social anti-Semitic attacks against Social Democrats, Liberals, and Jews, depicting them as exploiting and corrupting Christian Austrians.

Christian Social politician Leopold Kunschak⁸⁵ directed the words in the epigraph at the beginning of this chapter to the Social Democrats present at a political meeting of the “Christian Civic Association in Hernals” in Vienna. This pronouncement revealed how political, social and economic anti-Semitism intertwined among the Christian Socials. During the meeting, a Social Democrat named Krump spoke against Karl Lueger and the persecution of the Jews. Mr. Kunschak responded that, to avoid a scandal,

⁸⁴ *Reichspost*, 4 January 1894, 2.

⁸⁵ Leopold Kunschak (1871-1953), founder of the “Christian Workers Movement [christlichen Arbeiterbewegung],” see Reinhold Knoll, *Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei*, 311.

Christian Socials could not allow any more Social Democrats into the gathering.

Furthermore:

Would they behave themselves decently, they are always welcome (Loud applause.) ‘Religion is a private matter [*Religion ist Privatsache*],’ you say today, but otherwise you lead bitter combat against all Christians. We hate the Jews not on account of their religion, but rather we combat them, because we want to overthrow Jewish morality and Jewish exploiters.⁸⁶

Christian Socials associated Social Democrats and Jews. Kunschak’s allegation that Social Democrats could not “behave themselves decently” mirrored negative perceptions of Jewish behavior. Furthermore, Kunschak described as disingenuous the Social Democrats’ slogan “Religion is a private matter.” While claiming that Christian Socials “hate the Jews not on account of their religion,” he nevertheless described Social Democrats and Jews as waging “bitter combat against all Christians.” Kunschak cast political anti-Semitism as self-defense.

In an article entitled “Religion is a private matter,” the *Reichspost* provided its interpretation of the Social Democratic slogan of the same name. The newspaper claimed that in the cities “religion is only then a private matter when it concerns the Jewish [religion], the Christian religion is combated by all means at their disposal.”⁸⁷ Furthermore, it claimed workers were commanded to attend general meetings of the “freethinkers” in Vienna, led by Victor Adler and his comrades. According to the *Reichspost*, whatever was left of the workers’ faith [*Glauben*] would be torn out at these meetings, making them more receptive to Social Democratic ideas.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ *Reichspost*, 7 February 1894, 3.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

That Jews were highly visible in the leadership of the Social Democratic Party provided grist for the mill of *Reichspost* political anti-Semitic propaganda. In the article “Jewish leadership?” the newspaper commented ironically:

Say to me with whom you deal, and I will say to you who you are! Social Democracy will not be in Jewish hands, for in the party leadership are only 11 Jews and 9 non-Jews. Jews include: Dr. Adler, Dr. Chonert, Dr. Kalliane, Dr. Ellenbogen, Dr. Ingwer, Ehrentraut, Leutner, Brod, Kaff, Feigl and comrade Glas. Honest workers (!!), that ‘earn’ their daily bread by the sweat of their brow!⁸⁹

The *Reichspost* was making the case that in its view Social Democracy really was in “Jewish hands” because Jews made up the majority of the Social Democratic leadership. In reference to the eleven Jews in the Social Democratic leadership, the line “Honest workers (!!), that ‘earn’ their daily bread by the sweat of their brow!” referred to the economic anti-Semitic argument that Jews earned money not by “the sweat of their brow,” the efforts of their own labors as the Bible commanded,⁹⁰ but through economic exploitation of Christians. The line also made fun of the fact that the Social Democratic leaders were not workers.

The *Reichspost* depicted Jewish leaders of the Social Democrats as corrupting party members. The newspaper recounted the “Founding meetings of the Christian Socialist Workers' Educational Association ‘Unity’.” Schmidt, the meeting initiator, called for the association to be a one in which members could develop themselves into good Christian workers and have entertainment. Schmidt contrasted it with the “Social Democratic education associations” where, he claimed, Social Democrats denigrated the

⁸⁹ *Reichspost*, 13 February 1894, 3. Peter Pulzer noted, “The prominence of Jews in the Social Democratic leadership provided ammunition for both anti-Semitism and anti-Socialism,” and furthermore “Social Democratic ideology was determined to a considerable extent by Jewish influence.” Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism*, 252.

⁹⁰ “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” Gen. 3:19 King James Version.

Christian religion and Christian priests, trained to be rabbis, and studied Talmud.

Schmidt continued, the “chief rabbi [*Oberrabbiner*] of the Social Democrats” allowed this because “the leading figures of the Social Democrats are men, who are not workers, but rather Asiatics [*Asiaten*], who view the movement as a retirement fund.”⁹¹ Mr. Schmidt branded Social Democracy as entirely Jewish. Use of the term “Asiatics” denigrated Jews as outsiders and demonstrated profound disgust with them. Schmidt was making the claim that Jewish leaders of the Social Democrats did not look out for the best interests of party members, but in typical “Jewish fashion” used party finances for personal economic gain. It was an effective use of anti-Semitic demagoguery for a Christian Social and anti-Semitic audience.

The *Reichspost* and Christian Socials used equally venomous political anti-Semitism in attacks against Liberals. The newspaper recounted a January 11, 1894 meeting in “The Christian Social Club” in which Prince Alois Lichtenstein and Karl Lueger, Christian Social Party leaders, presented their views on liberalism. Both leaders utilized political anti-Semitic arguments characterizing the “Jewish-Liberals” and capitalism as mortal threats to modern civilization. Lichtenstein couched the contemporary relationship between “Jewish-Liberals” and capitalism in Biblical terms:

As on Sinai already the Jews performed a gold-dance until the admonition from above, written on stone tablets, ended the idolatry of the golden calf [...] Lord God, in the newly beginning year [1894], make the Jewish-Liberals gold-dance end for the salvation of modern civilization.⁹²

Lichtenstein used religiously motivated Jew-hatred in his Biblical references to the “idolatry of the golden calf,” and economic anti-Semitism in his representation of the “Jewish-Liberals gold dance.” He depicted Jews as greedy and always only concerned

⁹¹ *Reichspost*, 16 January 1894, 3.

⁹² *Reichspost*, 13 January 1894, 6. On the “Sin of the Calf,” see Exodus: 24.

with money. Lichtenstein prayed God would intervene, as God did on Mt. Sinai, to put an end to the idolatrous “Jewish-Liberals gold dance,” this time to save modern civilization. Lueger continued the theme, calling for: “the unity of all Christian parties against the common enemy, Liberalism. However, today's civilization stands on a precipice; it will be saved before the fall if people would remember that God created them free. Let us therefore be not slaves of desire [*Leidenschaft*] nor of capitalism.”⁹³

The *Reichspost* published several reports on the suicide and burial of Heinrich Jacques, a Jewish Liberal parliamentary deputy, which utilized political anti-Semitism and anti-Liberal ideology. In the front-page article, “The Death of Dr. Heinrich Jacques,” the newspaper insisted that Jacques committed suicide due to his loss of “belief in God and His love wielding Providence,” and its replacement with the “modern idols” of “Enlightenment,” “Education and Good Breeding,” and “Humanity.”⁹⁴ The Christian Socials and *Reichspost* viewed these three features and “godlessness” in Liberalism as damning. Indeed, the *Reichspost* stated that in Jacques’ case, suicide was the last but also the best resort. The newspaper had no complaints about Dr. Jacques death:

He was still one of the foremost representatives of the Liberal-Jewish-Capitalist movement, against which the Christian-Social movement increasingly agitated. It was also well known that Dr. Jacques wanted to bless our Christian Austrians immediately with the planned Hungarian civil marriage (emphasis in the original).⁹⁵

As a Catholic newspaper, the *Reichspost* opposed Jacques’ proposal of civil marriage in Austria.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ *Reichspost*, 27 January 1894, 1-2. Peter Pulzer summarized the “institutional aspects” of “nineteenth-century European Liberalism [...] as parliamentary government, the rule of law, the absence of legally established class privileges, a *laissez-faire* economy, and freedom of speech and association.” Moreover, Liberalism was “a set of moral qualities, those of rationalism, humanism, and—to give it its German context—*Aufklärung*.” The anti-Semites combated “the institutions of Liberalism, [...] its whole moral system, and its whole concept of human existence.” Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism*, 29-30.

⁹⁵ *Reichspost*, 27 January 1894, 1-2.

In “The Wolf in Sheepskin,” the *Reichspost* condemned the Liberals for selecting Constantine Noske (a non-Jew) to fill Jacques’ vacated position as parliamentary deputy for the Innere Stadt. The newspaper characterized Noske as a proud opponent of “the anti-Jewish aspirations of reactionaries [*judenfeindlichen Bestrebungen der Reactionären entgegenstellt*].”⁹⁶ The *Reichspost* screamed that the Liberals defended the human rights of the Jews alone, and that Christian Austrians needed protection from the selfishness and brutality of Jews: “The glory of Noske is an indictment of the Liberal Party and his courage testifies to their great dereliction of duty. Jews!”⁹⁷

In other articles, the *Reichspost* elaborated how Christian Socials and anti-Semites defended themselves against perceived abuses by Jews. In “Christian Socialism and Anti-Semitism 1895,” the newspaper lauded the growing support for Christian Socialism and anti-Semitism among the Christians in Vienna and the provinces, especially among the economically weak, politically oppressed, and those without rights. The *Reichspost* explained the benefits of the early successes of Christian Socialism and anti-Semitism:

The Christian spirit lives again in Christian Vienna and in the provinces, nationality hatred [*Nationalitätenhaß*] has lost its sharpness, and with one accord the people rise against those who until now exploited, incited, and criminalized them: Jewish capital, the Jewish liberal press [...] it [Christian Socialism and anti-Semitism] is led by real Austrian patriotism; it is above all the salvation of the emperor and the empire. They [Christian Socials and anti-Semites] wrote on their banners reconciliation of classes and peoples’ interests, these goals are pursued legally so they can be reassured as to their further development. The practice of the Christian Socialist and anti-Semitic ideas is already just a matter of time, for this conclusion justified their development just last year, in 1895!⁹⁸

Revival of “Christian spirit” in Austria fulfilled the Christian Social and *Reichspost* objective of the “re-Christianization” of public life. The newspaper declared “Jewish

⁹⁶ *Reichspost*, 28 March 1894, 2.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ *Reichspost*, 1 January 1896, 2-3.

capital [and] the Jewish liberal press” damaged the Austrian economy and society, and lauded Christians unified in opposition to them. The “reconciliation of classes and peoples’ interests” excluded Jews. Nevertheless, expressions of loyalty to “the emperor and the empire” demonstrated that the Christian Socials and the *Reichspost* rejected Pan-Germanism.

The *Reichspost* railed against Social Democrats, Liberals, and Jews in both political camps who, the newspaper claimed, participated in voter agitation, fraud, and violence. In “Do not be deterred!” the *Reichspost* advised its readers not to let Social Democrats’ threats deter them from voting:

Every Christian voter come on 9 March [1897] to do his voting duty in the Fifth Curia and not let himself by any chance be deterred by the crude threats of the Social Democrats. All precautionary measures are taken so that no one will harm a hair. The women, in particular, are requested to not hold back their men for fear of the Reds [*Rothen*]. On the contrary, they should admonish their family members eligible to vote to contribute to the victory of the Christian people over revolution and Jew-money [*Umsturz und Judengeld*]⁹⁹

The Fifth Curia (electoral constituency) comprised all voting age males. Fifth Curia voters elected a small number of delegates.¹⁰⁰ The *Reichspost* exhorted its male readers in the Fifth Curia to vote, promising Christian Social protection from Social Democratic violence. The assertion that Christian Social victory would be a “victory of the Christian people over [Social Democratic] revolution and Jew-money” connected Jews with Social Democratic revolution and capitalism. In a front-page article “A perfidious maneuver,” the *Reichspost* accused Social Democrats (including Jews) of calling for or abetting violence on an Election Day (March 9, 1897). As Fifth Curia voters went to the polls,

⁹⁹ *Reichspost*, 6 March 1897, 5.

¹⁰⁰ For more information on the Fifth Curia and the general elections of March 1897, see Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 406-407, 529.

members of Social Democratic clubs demonstrated with the slogan “Fight unto blood [Kampf bis auf's Blut].”¹⁰¹ The “Jew-Press” and “Red Party-Press [rothen Parteipresse]” did not speak of “benevolent neutrality” or oppose “appeals to violence.”¹⁰² The *Reichspost* reported on additional Social Democratic demonstrations against the anti-Liberals and their leader Karl Lueger, and called for the police and military to ensure security for free and fair voting.¹⁰³

Two days after the Fifth Curia elections of March 9, 1897, the *Reichspost* gleefully declared in its front page article “But still anti-Semitic” [“Doch antisemitisch”] and in several pages of election results that Christian Social candidates won all available mandates: five from the electoral districts of Vienna, and four from the vicinity of Vienna.¹⁰⁴ These Christian Social candidates, according to the *Reichspost*, prevailed over the Social Democrats and Liberals, as well as Jews in both political camps despite their “terrorism” and lies. The newspaper interpreted events thus:

The harder the struggle, the more brilliant the victory, the same applies here, and the almost unprecedented voter turnout [Wahlbetheiligung] teaches how brave and fearless the Christian conscript fulfills his duty, as the anti-Liberals are the only ones able to defend successfully state, family and religion against the ‘Jewified’ revolution-preacher [jüdelnden Umsturzprediger].¹⁰⁵

The *Reichspost* described combat against Social Democrats, Liberals, and Jews in both camps as a defensive war against “the ‘Jewified’ revolution-preacher” who sought to overthrow the empire as well as traditional family values and Christian religion.

¹⁰¹ *Reichspost*, 9 March 1897, 1.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ *Reichspost*, 11 March 1897, 1-3.

¹⁰⁵ *Reichspost*, 11 March 1897, 1.

In “The Second Ballot on 22. March in Vienna,” the *Reichspost* alleged the few Liberal candidates who won elections did so through massive voter fraud. Successful Liberal candidates included Constantin Noske, Carl Wrabetz, Ferdinand Kronawetter, and Josef Kopp in the Innere Stadt, and Kareis in the Leopoldstadt. According to the *Reichspost*, “The success of the united Jews was conditional on an unprecedented kind of voter agitation that worked with the extensive swindle-experiment.”¹⁰⁶ The newspaper accused Liberals of buying votes at 20 florins a vote. It claimed that 80 arrests were made because of such voting drives [*Wahlumtreiben*], and that all those arrested were Jews.¹⁰⁷ For the *Reichspost*, the anti-Liberals either won because they could overcome Liberal and Jewish treachery or lost because it was too great.

The *Reichspost* alleged encounters in which Jews used political violence, both verbal and physical, against Christian Socials. This involved social anti-Semitic representations of Jews acting outside expected norms of public life. The *Reichspost* recounted one such incidence in “What the Jews permit themselves!” [*Was sich die Juden erlauben!*]. According to the newspaper, two Jews at a café on the Praterstraße in the Leopoldstadt watched participants in the Christian Women’s Assembly marching home and cheering for Dr. Lueger. When one of the Jews asked the other what was wrong, he replied: “These are H.... [*Huren* (whores)] they allow to give cheers to Lueger.”¹⁰⁸ The *Reichspost* lamented how, “a greasy [*schmieriger*] Hebrew may insult the Christian civil women of Vienna in such a way.”¹⁰⁹ In “Jewish impudence” [*Jüdische Frechheit*], the newspaper stated one midnight a group of gentlemen

¹⁰⁶ *Reichspost*, 24 March 1897, 3-4.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ *Reichspost*, 4 December 1895, 6.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

travelled homeward from the Kaiser-Festival in the Wiener Prater, a large public park in the Leopoldstadt, carrying lanterns adorned with Lueger's image. Forty "viceless [*Unartenlosen* (note the sarcasm)]" Jews surrounded them, cried out "Today is not a Lueger-Festival! [*Hait is nix a Lueger-Fest!* (printed in German as if Jews spoke with a Yiddish accent)]," beat the lanterns out of their hands and behaved wildly. The *Reichspost* concluded, "Only the intervention of the security guard brought frenzied [*rasende*] Israel to its senses, and only after the impudent lantern heroes [*frechen Lampionshelden*] had been arrested, could Christian people continue on their path."¹¹⁰

The *Reichspost* reported several more instances of Jews reacting violently to Christian Social political activities. In "He wants to hear no Lueger marching song," the newspaper recounted such a scene occurred in a Prater restaurant Traxler. When chapel clergymen sang a Lueger march, Carl Toch (a Jew) flew into a rage. He threw mugs of beer at the bandmaster to make them stop singing and thus aroused Christian indignation. Chief mechanic Carl Kober brandished an unloaded revolver. Both Toch and Kober were brought before the Leopoldstadt District Court. Witnesses testified that Kober's revolver was not loaded, and he was acquitted. The prosecutor charged Toch with violating the bandmaster's expression, and Toch was transferred to the Regional Courts.¹¹¹

The *Reichspost* claimed a Jew made an "assassination attempt on a Christian voter" on the day of an election (March 22, 1897) in the "Jew-Island [*Judeninsel*]" of the Leopoldstadt. That evening, the event occurred at the entrance of a house on the Rotensterngasse. According to witnesses, the Jewish master shoemaker Gustav Raffel hit Joh. Nejedlik on the back, because Nejedlik had cheered for Lueger and Dittrich. Five

¹¹⁰ *Reichspost*, 30 August 1896, 6.

¹¹¹ *Reichspost*, 4 October 1896, 10.

days later, Nejedlik remained in a doctor's care and had initiated legal steps against Mr. Raffel.¹¹²

For the *Reichspost* the “re-Christianization” of Austrian public life necessitated its “de-Jewification.”¹¹³ The newspaper often decried what it viewed as the overrepresentation of Jews in the professions. In “The Jewification of the Viennese legal profession” [“*Die Verjudung die Wiener Advocatie*”], the *Reichspost* bemoaned the list of newly added Viennese lawyers in 1895, as it estimated based on the names that twenty percent were Christian and eighty percent were Jewish. The newspaper conjectured that within ten years the pace of the “Jewification” of the lawyers would make it so that a Christian lawyer would be as rare as a “white raven [*weißer Rabe*] or a Christian clothing manufacturer [*Confectionär*].”¹¹⁴ By implication, Jews had displaced Christians in that occupation.

The *Reichspost* detested Jews at the University of Vienna. In the front-page article “Nothnagel in Danger,” the newspaper described “Israel’s invasion [*Einmarsch Israels*]” into the University of Vienna. It declared that in the Law Faculty, of 46 professors and lecturers [*Dozenten*], 15 were Jews or 37.5% of the total. Among the Medicine Faculty of 127 professors and lecturers, 55 were Jews or 44% of the total. Among the Philosophy Faculty, of 121 professors and lecturers, 31 were Jews or 26.5% of the total.¹¹⁵ The *Reichspost* conflated professors and lecturers. However, such distinction was important. Jews were barred by anti-Semitic prejudice from rising into

¹¹² *Reichspost*, 27 March 1897, 4.

¹¹³ Peter Pulzer detailed how in Vienna Jews predominated in finance, medicine, journalism, law, academic professions, intelligentsia, cultural achievements and business. He stated, “There is no doubt that Jews were ‘over-represented’ (if one accepts such a concept) in the educated classes and the professions.” Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism*, 11.

¹¹⁴ *Reichspost*, 16 December 1895, 3.

¹¹⁵ *Reichspost*, 3 July 1894, 1-2.

the professorial ranks. The newspaper also noted high proportions of Jews among the student body at the University of Vienna. During the 1892 winter semester, Jews made up 38 percent and Christians 62 percent of the student body. During the 1892 summer semester, Jews made up 36 percent and Christians 64 percent of the student body. The *Reichspost* stated that in Austria the number of Jews amounted only to five percent of the number of Catholics. The newspaper then characterized as disproportional the number of Jews at the University of Vienna, especially in medicine where Jews made up 44 percent of the teachers and more than 50 percent of the students.¹¹⁶

Jews were not well represented in the civil service, and the *Reichspost* resolved to keep it that way. In a page one article “Too Few Jewish Civil Servants in Austria?!” the newspaper argued that the number of Jewish civil servants in Austria needed to be kept low. It wrote in response to Emil Byk, a Jewish Member of Parliament from Galicia, who claimed there were not enough Jews in the civil service, and Mr. Rappaport Ritter von Porada, Secretary of the National Bank, who found that Galician Jews faced difficulty acquiring civil service positions. The *Reichspost* sneered that Galician Jews who tried to acquire civil service positions were “usurers” and “tavern keepers [Branntweinschenker],” and declared the civil service an honorable profession that should not be corrupted by Jews. Furthermore, the newspaper declared that the Austrian Fundamental Law opened all positions to Jews. The *Reichspost* claimed only Jews cared that there were few Jewish civil servants. The newspaper was content that a “Jewish invasion” of the civil service had not occurred and deemed it necessary to keep it that way.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ *Reichspost*, 12 April 1894, 1.

Reichspost political anti-Semitism had a practical use: helping Christian Socials win elections and new party members. However, it did much more than that as well. *Reichspost* political anti-Semitism contributed to a negative image of the Jew, which the newspaper created. With its political anti-Semitism, the newspaper portrayed Jews as godless and treacherous Liberals and Social Democrats. In a modern age of mass politics, the *Reichspost* represented Jews not just as an economic, social, and religious threat to Christians and Christianity, but also a politically powerful one. With calls for restrictions on the number of lawyer, lecturer, student, and civil servant positions open to Jews, the *Reichspost* mirrored Karl Lueger and Christian Socials' calls for quotas against Jews.

Use of History in Anti-Semitic Argumentation

“I know of no greater danger to the Empire and its peoples, than the horrible properties of these [Jews], who by fraud, usury, and money transactions enriched themselves and destroyed the population.”

- *Reichspost* quotation of Empress Maria Theresa's Cabinet Order of June 19, 1777.¹¹⁸

The *Reichspost* utilized a combination of economic, social, and political anti-Semitism to interpret historic events and figures. The newspaper idolized Emperor Leopold I (r. 1658-1705), Empress Maria Theresa (r. 1740-1780), and Emperor Joseph II (r. 1780-1790), and specifically any of their anti-Jewish rhetoric and/or policies. It also looked kindly on historic expulsions of and/or bans on Jews in Vienna depicting Jews as anti-dynastic and anti-Austrian participants in the 1848 Revolution. *Reichspost* interpretations of history demeaned Jews while demonstrating the newspaper's own state patriotism and dynastic loyalty. The newspaper omitted historical facts that could have cast doubt on its interpretations. However, as noted previously, it held no pretense about the absence of bias, and such omissions should not have come as a surprise.

¹¹⁸ *Reichspost*, 23 April 1896, 3.

In an article entitled “Szepts is proud of his forefathers,” the *Reichspost* reported on a speech of Moritz Szepts, a Jewish journalist and publisher of the *Wiener Tagblatt*. Szepts delivered the speech at the unveiling ceremony of the monument celebrating the defeat of the Ottoman Empire at the Battle of Vienna (1683). Szepts reportedly said, “And raising this monument to the heroic deeds of our ancestors [*Heldenthaten unserer Ahnen*] may also have a [positive] effect for the future.”¹¹⁹ The *Reichspost* reminded Szepts and his editorial staff that in 1679 Emperor Leopold I “had asked [the Jews] to move away from our town,” tore down their synagogue, and built the parish church of St. Leopold in its place. Four years later, the Turks besieged Vienna. The *Reichspost* asked, “Should the Jews, dismissed out of Vienna with polite words, have come back as 'volunteers' for the army defending Vienna just during the siege? Possible - but it is not likely!”¹²⁰ In reality, Leopold I had not in 1679 “dismissed with polite words” the Jews from Vienna, as the *Reichspost* claimed. The newspaper downplayed the actions of Leopold I. In 1670, during the Catholic Counter-Reformation, Leopold I expelled all 3,000-4,000 Jews of Vienna who had refused baptism. Furthermore, he expelled the Jews at the behest of his Spanish wife, his court preacher Abraham a Sancta Clara, Bishop Kollonitsch of Wiener Neustadt, Christian merchants and the municipal government of Vienna. They viewed Jews as godless, the cause of great misfortunes, or as economic competition.¹²¹ The *Reichspost* had faulted Jews for not rushing to aid

¹¹⁹ *Reichspost*, 16 September 1894, 2.

¹²⁰ Ibid. Grand Vizier Kara Mustapha led the Ottoman army that besieged Vienna from July 4 to September 12, 1683. The people of Vienna defended the city until a rescue army of Duke Charles V of Lorraine, King Jan Sobieski of Poland, and Prince Eugene of Savoy defeated the Turks and lifted the siege. Peter Csendes, *Historical Dictionary of Vienna* (Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1999), 200, 209.

¹²¹ Bruce F. Pauley, *From Prejudice to Persecution: A History of Austrian Anti-Semitism* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 15-16.

Vienna against the Turks, when they had been forcibly expelled more than a decade previously.

The *Reichspost* described in “A historical memory” the Cabinet-Order of Empress Maria Theresa of June 19, 1777. In it, Empress Maria Theresa ordered and explained her expulsion of Jews from Vienna. Only Jews who had her written permission would be allowed to remain. The *Reichspost* quoted this Cabinets-Order:

My concern for the welfare of the Empire and its peoples is my most sacred duty - and inasmuch as I see leads me to [...] ban all Jews without my written permission to stay in Vienna, because ‘I know of no greater danger to the Empire and its peoples, than the horrible properties of these [Jews], who by fraud, usury, and money transactions enriched themselves and destroyed the population.’¹²²

This quote was chosen for this chapter’s epigraph as it clearly represented how the *Reichspost* viewed Jews as a negative force in the Empire, especially in the economic arena. Ironically, Maria Theresa’s policies pushed Jews to engage in commerce by limiting their employment to money changing, jewel trading, financial operations, and trade in domestic manufactured goods. Moreover, Maria Theresa never managed to expel the Jews of Vienna. However, Maria Theresa expelled the Jews of Prague in December 1744. Maria Theresa suspected the Jews of Prague had helped Frederick the Great conquer Silesia during the War of Austrian Succession, which began in 1740. The Jews were allowed to return in August 1748 because influential city and guild representatives intervened on their behalf and the “Toleration Tax” on Jews was raised. In addition, Maria Theresa mandated that Jews remove themselves from public view during Christian processions, on the morning of the Christian Sabbath (Sundays), and on

¹²² *Reichspost*, 23 April 1896, 3.

Christian holidays. Maria Theresa also refused to speak to Jews in person.¹²³ With her anti-Jewish sentiment and policies, Maria Theresa was an important role model for the *Reichspost*.

In “Characteristic” [“*Bezeichnend*”], the *Reichspost* cited Emperor Joseph II decree of August 3, 1786 concerning the conduct of the Jews. The *Reichspost* quoted:

His Majesty has deigned to instruct the extremely corrupt morality of the Jews [*Se. Majestät haben rücksichtlich der äußerst verdorbenen Moralität der Juden anzubefehlen geruht*] [...] so that the tolerated Jews [*tolerirte Judenschaft*] and especially the morality of their character will be elevated.¹²⁴

Clearly, the *Reichspost* felt that Jews did not know how to conduct themselves in public life. Yet, Joseph II did not provide a clear-cut model of anti-Jewish sentiment and policy, which the *Reichspost* made him appear to be.

In line with Enlightenment ideals, Joseph II had removed many anti-Jewish restrictions and given Jews many rights. On January 2, 1782, Joseph II issued the “Patent of Tolerance [*Toleranzpatent*]” in order to bring Jews out of cultural, occupational, and social isolation. It required Jewish children to attend German-language schools, allowed Jews to establish factories, employ Christians, engage in manual labor, discard their identifying Jewish dress and yellow emblem, and much more. The “Patent of Tolerance” was one of many reforms Joseph II directed at Jews to make them more economically and socially useful to the state. Nevertheless, Joseph II kept in place a number of restrictions on Jews. These included bans on Jews from the civil service, land ownership, and settlement in some parts of the empire. Communal taxes and a limit on the Jewish

¹²³ Arno Pařík, “Prague,” translated from Czech by Stephen Hattersley in *The YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe*, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, accessed May 9, 2013, <http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Prague>. Pauley, *From Prejudice to Persecution*, 16-17.

¹²⁴ *Reichspost*, 21 January 1896, 3.

population were maintained. In Vienna, where no Jewish communal organization was permitted, “tolerated Jews” had to pay their own dues.¹²⁵ Furthermore, in his August 3, 1786 decree, Joseph II revealed distaste for Jews by describing their morality as “extremely corrupt” and in need of instruction to be elevated. On balance, this proved sufficient for the *Reichspost* to cite Joseph II as an authority on (alleged) bad Jewish behavior.

The *Reichspost* in “A little comparison” [“*Ein kleiner Vergleich*”] demonstrated its negative attitudes towards the 1848-1849 Revolution and the role Jews had in it. The article cited “Austriacus” of the *Sonn- und Montagszeitung*, who wrote: “The same elements which propagate anti-Semitism also write anti-Austrianness on their banner.”¹²⁶ To refute this claim, the *Reichspost* asked Austriacus and readers of the *Reichspost* to compare the answers to several questions concerning the 1848-1849 Revolution:

[1.] Who incited the anti-dynastic orgies of 1848 and participated [in them] most eagerly? The anti-Semites or the Semites of Vienna? [2.] In the same year after the taking of Vienna, who cowardly had fled out from Vienna or furthermore swindled out [*feige*] (even in coffins [*sogar in Särgen*])? Was it anti-Semites or Semites? [3.] Who participated most zealously in the Kossuth-scandals and all anti-dynastic rallies in Hungary? The anti-Semitic or Semitic male youths? [4.] Who celebrated too lustily [*aus vollem Halse zu*] these anti-Austrian and anti-dynastic rallies? The anti-Semitic or the Semitic press?¹²⁷

The *Reichspost* expected its readers and Austriacus to answer that the “Semites” (Jews) and the “Semitic press” (“Jew-Press”) undermined both empire and dynasty in Austria and Hungary, and economically exploited Vienna during the 1848-1849 Revolution. In

¹²⁵ Jacob Katz, *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770-1870* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1998), 162-164; Pauley, *From Prejudice to Persecution*, 17-18.

¹²⁶ *Reichspost*, 14 August 1894, 2. Austriacus in his remark (as it is reported) and the *Reichspost* in its response failed to make an important distinction between the Pan-German and Christian Social anti-Semites. Pan-German anti-Semites would quite possibly “write anti-Austrianness on their banner,” while the Christian Social anti-Semites, state-patriots and loyal to the dynasty, would not.

¹²⁷ *Reichspost*, 14 August 1894, 2.

“comparison” (reference the article title), the anti-Semites, anti-Semitic Press, and anti-Semitic parties were portrayed as loyal and true to empire and dynasty. Concerning the claims of Austriacus, the *Reichspost* warned, “He who lives in a glass house shouldn't throw stones!”¹²⁸

The Jews did have a predominant role in the 1848-1849 Revolution. However, while portraying Jews as anti-dynastic and unpatriotic, the *Reichspost* refused to recognize that revolutionary Jews fought for a better world. In March 1848 in Vienna, liberal and radical Jews (academicians, doctors, medical students, journalists, and writers) fought alongside Christians to topple the authoritarian regime of State Chancellor Clemens von Metternich, who resigned and went into exile. Afterwards, revolutionary Jews and Christians killed in battle were buried together. Prominent in the revolutionary tribunals, student guard, and later the newly elected Parliament, Jews demanded for themselves and Christians greater civil and political rights, freedom of assembly, press, speech, and scientific research. Jews also circulated petitions for Jewish emancipation and published revolutionary newspapers. Catholics, conservatives and anti-Semites opposed to Jewish emancipation wrote anti-Jewish petitions, pamphlets, and newspapers. The *Reichspost* failed to mention that in March, April, and May of 1848, there were violent anti-Jewish riots in Preßburg [today Bratislava] and other Hungarian towns, as well as in Prague. Anti-Jewish mobs in Vienna limited attacks to Jewish property. In October 1848, an army under Prince Windischgrätz put down the revolution in Vienna. Again, Jewish and Christian revolutionaries died fighting side by side in battle. On March 4, 1849, a newly elected Reichstag passed a new constitution that emancipated Jews, enabled them to own property (mines excluded), enter any legal employment, and

¹²⁸ Ibid.

marry non-Jews. In Hungary, many Jews participated in the resistance against the Austrian army. This led the Hungarian revolutionary government on July 29, 1849, two weeks before its military collapse, to proclaim the full emancipation of Jews.¹²⁹ Perhaps Jewish emancipation in Austria and Hungary gave the *Reichspost* further cause to condemn Jewish participation in the 1848-1849 Revolution. Moreover, the *Reichspost* did not mention that Jews had fought for the betterment of all peoples; that fact failed to comport with the newspaper's negative depictions of Jews.

In summation, the *Reichspost* had a selective awareness of the past, and misused history to strengthen its arguments against Jews. The newspaper idealized and depicted itself as belonging to an old and "venerable" tradition of Jew-hatred, which Austrian Emperors and Empresses practiced going back more than two hundred years. Moreover, the *Reichspost* misrepresented the involvement of Jews in the 1848-1849 Revolution to further its economic, social, and political anti-Semitic arguments. We will keep in mind this selective awareness of the past in our consideration of *Reichspost* religiously motivated Jew-hatred.

¹²⁹ Häusler, "Toleranz, Emanzipation und Antisemitismus," 97-103; William O. McCagg Jr., *A History of Habsburg Jews, 1670-1918* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1989), 83-101; Pauley, *From Prejudice to Persecution*, 20-21.

Chapter IV: Use of Religiously Motivated Jew-hatred and Rejection of Racial Anti-Semitism

“The Jews are the sworn enemies of Christianity, [and] of Christians.”¹³⁰

The *Reichspost* used the Bible, teachings of the Church Fathers, and sermons of Christian theologians past and present in support of its religiously motivated Jew-hatred and anti-Jewish arguments. *Reichspost* staff members, many of whom were Catholic priests and theologians, saw themselves as belonging to the tradition of the Church Fathers. They took it upon themselves to assume what they described as a traditional role for the Catholic Church and clergy: defenders against the enemies of Christians and Christianity, enemies including (they claimed) the Jews. The *Reichspost* regularly labeled the Jews as “Christ killers” and “Witness People” (living testaments to the truth of Christ). Furthermore, the newspaper attacked on religious grounds Judaism and Jewish religious texts, including the Old Testament, Talmud, and *Schulchan Aruch*, characterizing them as outmoded and/or morally corrupting. Equally significant, the *Reichspost* blended traditional religious Jew-hatred with modern economic, social, and political anti-Semitism in its arguments against Jews. In addition, the newspaper distorted the history of religion and Christian-Jewish relations during the Middle Ages to make a case for revoking Jewish emancipation. The *Reichspost* idealized the medieval ghettoization of Jews. Moreover, the newspaper downplayed the real extent of anti-Jewish violence during the Middle Ages; it claimed only a few Jews were burned to death and failed to recount countless Jews killed in pogroms, often due to religiously motivated violence. Yet, the *Reichspost* moderated its Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism by rejecting

¹³⁰ *Reichspost*, 10 March 1894, 1-2.

racial anti-Semitism and, in traditional fashion, leaving open to Jews the possibility of conversion.

Over the course of two days in March 1894, the *Reichspost* invoked the medieval German Franciscan monk Berthold von Regensburg (aka Berthold Lech, d. 1272). Berthold made missionary trips to Switzerland, Swabia, Thuringia, Bavaria, Bohemia, Moravia, Austria and Hungary. The newspaper claimed that his sermons were well received, and that up to 200,000 people could have listened to them. The *Reichspost* looked to Berthold for guidance on the current “burning Jewish Question.”¹³¹ To do so, it used Göbel’s edition of Berthold’s sermons.¹³²

The *Reichspost* quoted Berthold, a thirteenth century Franciscan monk, on the “Jewish Question” because, the newspaper claimed, Jews were neither better nor worse in its time than in Berthold’s time; Jews had always been “great sinners [*große Sünder*].”¹³³ Berthold observed Jews as misers, usurers, businessmen, and tax collectors. He portrayed Jewish tax collectors as intermediaries between the state treasury [*Fiscus*] and its Christian victims, consequently driving Christians to Jewish usurers, which further victimized them. Berthold had stated the cycle led on occasion to “bloody Jew-baiting [*Judenhetzen*],” and Christians to “always want to have war with the Jews.”¹³⁴

The *Reichspost* demonstrated its view that Jewish women were immoral both in Berthold’s time and contemporaneously. The newspaper claimed that in the late nineteenth century, there were comparatively more Jewish than Christian prostitutes. To

¹³¹ *Reichspost*, 9 March 1894, 1-2.

¹³² The *Reichspost* cited Göbel, “Franciscan missionary sermons of Berthold von Regensburg. Foreword by A. Stolz, third enlarged and revised edition. Regensburg 1873 [*Missionspredigten des Franciskaner Berthold von Regensburg, mit einem Vorwort von A. Stolz, dritte vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. Regensburg 1873*].”

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

prove its point, it quoted the *Archives Israélites de France*, a French Jewish periodical from 1857. The *Reichspost* then quoted Berthold to show it was the same in the thirteenth century, when Jewish prostitutes wore in their hair recognizable “yellow ribbons [*gelbes Gebände*]” and plied their trade on the lane around the castle.¹³⁵

As an expression of its economic, social, political anti-Semitism, and religiously motivated Jew-hatred, the *Reichspost* declared, “The Jews are the sworn enemies of Christianity, [and] of Christians,” and then asked why Christians should tolerate them in a Christian state.¹³⁶ The newspaper quoted Berthold’s two answers to this question:

The first because they are witnesses, that our Lord was oppressed by them. And when a Christian man sees a Jew, he should be moved to prayer: 'Oh' he should think, 'You are the one from which our Lord Jesus Christ was martyred, and suffered for our sins!' and the Christian people should thank God for their martyr when they see a Jew; they should never forget their martyr, then He never forgets us also, and [Christians] should be warned of the Jews. The second is: what of [the Jews] survives the Antichrist, they become before Judgment Day all to Christian people.¹³⁷

The *Reichspost* commented, “So the Jews are tolerated, protected as they are taken in ‘peace’.”¹³⁸ As adherents to Catholic dogma, Berthold and the *Reichspost* believed Jews were “Christ-killers,” hence the line “You are the one from which our Lord Jesus Christ was martyred, and suffered for our sins.” Even so, Christians tolerated Jews as a reminder to Christians of this evil act as well as a reminder to thank God for the martyred Lord Jesus Christ. Furthermore, Berthold and the *Reichspost* believed: “what of [the Jews] survives the Antichrist, they become before Judgment Day all to Christian people.” This was a variation of the idea of Jews as the “Witness People.”

¹³⁵ *Reichspost*, 10 March 1894, 1-2.

¹³⁶ Ibid. Note that the *Reichspost* considered Austria a Christian state.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

Beginning with Bishop Augustine of Hippo (354-430) in North Africa, Christian theologians developed the doctrine of “witness.” The doctrine was meant to explain the continued survival and existence of the Jewish people centuries after the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE. Christian theologians saw continuities between Old Israel and New Israel. They argued that because Jews continued to preserve the Old Testament they bore witness to the truth of the New. Therefore, the doctrine of “witness” was meant to legitimize Christianity; it provided a counterpoint to pagans who claimed Christianity was an invented religion. The doctrine of “witness” held that upon witnessing the Second Coming of Christ, the Jews would recognize the truth of Christ and convert to Christianity, providing the ultimate testament to the truth of Christ as messiah.¹³⁹

Berthold argued that Jews and Christians should live together in peace, and that secular powers had a mandate to protect Jews and Christians from harming one another. He contended Christian education was necessary for Christians to recognize the enemies of Christianity and defend themselves against them. He made the case that “because popes cannot be in every land there are the patriarchs, cardinals, archbishops, other bishops, high-priests, abbots, and provosts [Pröpsten], deans [Dechanten], pastors, and under-pastors [*Unterpfarrern*] given and awarded the power to protect the Christian people.”¹⁴⁰ This important passage represented the view of the *Reichspost* that Catholic clergy, such as many on the *Reichspost* staff, needed to actively participate in the defense of Christians against enemies such as (allegedly) the Jews.

¹³⁹ Mark R. Cohen, *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 20-21, 139.

¹⁴⁰ *Reichspost*, 10 March 1894, 1-2.

For Berthold there were limits to toleration. He warned that when, “There are so many Jews that they want to gain from us the upper hand, then one must fight them as heathens [*Heiden*].”¹⁴¹ On treating Jews as “heathens,” the *Reichspost* quoted Franz Dingelstedt (d. 1881), a German poet, dramatist, and theater manager, who said about the Jews “Go, lock them again in the old streets [the Jewish ghetto], before they lock you in a Christian Quarter [*Christenviertel*].”¹⁴² In addition, the *Reichspost* quoted from German Protestant anti-Semite Julius Langbehn’s 1892 work *The Rembrandt-German. From a Friend of Truth*:

At the present time, in which hundreds of thousands of German workers are slowly tortured to death and tens of thousands of German women and girls quickly handed misery as well as shame - this time has the least reason to weep for a few Jews burned in the Middle Ages [...] this same Middle Ages was the most consistently healthy, brave and pious - though here and there still raw and violent.¹⁴³

The *Reichspost* glorified ghettoization and burning of Jews during the Middle Ages as defensive acts by Christians against a (perceived) Jewish threat. Such rhetoric demonstrated the newspaper was nostalgic for the Pre-Modern Era, wanted to undo Jewish emancipation, and rejected the liberal values of equality and human rights. Moreover, the *Reichspost* proved selective in its use of history by citing Langbehn. Claiming only “a few Jews burned in the Middle Ages,” Langbehn understated medieval violence against Jews. He disingenuously claimed the Middle Ages was a wonderful period, only “here and there still raw and violent.”

A short catalogue of violence against Jews in Western and Central Europe from the eleventh to the fifteenth century discredits Langbehn’s claims. During the First

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

Crusade in the late eleventh century, a number of crusaders on their way through to the Rhine forcibly converted and killed Jews. While some bishops and other Christians sheltered Jews, the crusaders massacred Jews in the cities of Cologne, Mainz, Metz, Speyer, and Worms. From the twelfth century onward, “blood libel” accusations that Jews murdered Christians for their blood to bake matzos for Passover led to massacres of Jews in England, France, Germany, and Spain. In 1298, the Jews of Roettingen, Franconia were accused of desecrating the consecrated host, the communion bread used in Mass believed to have become the body of Jesus Christ. Claiming divine inspiration, a minor nobleman named Rindfleisch assembled and led an army against the Jews of Roettingen, Rothenburg, Nuremburg, and elsewhere in Bavaria, Franconia, and neighboring Austria. The Rindfleisch massacres killed as many as 20,000 Jews. From 1336-1339, the Armleder, a band of peasants claiming divine inspiration, attacked about 120 Jewish communities in Alsace, Bavaria, and Swabia. Despite Christians who defended the Jews, the Armleder murdered thousands. From 1348-1350, throughout central and western Europe, mobs attacked and killed thousands of Jews accused of being “Christ-killers,” poisoning wells, causing the Black Death, “blood libels,” and usury. In one such instance, in 1349 with the approval of Emperor Charles IV (r. 1346-1378), the city magistrate and government of Nuremburg organized a mob that massacred thousands of Jews in the city. There were expulsions of Jews from England (1290), France (1394), and Spain (1492). In Vienna in 1421, charges of Host desecration led to more than two hundred Jewish men and women being burned to death. Their children were spared, converted, and then sent to convents and monasteries to be raised. Any remaining Jews in Vienna were banned.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ Leonard B. Glick, *Abraham's Heirs: Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe* (New York: Syracuse

Ironically, in “Jews and persecution of Christians” [“*Juden- und Christenverfolgung*”], the *Reichspost* portrayed Jews as historic persecutors of Christians rather than the other way around. The newspaper described Georg Rösel’s *Jews and the Persecution of Christians to the First Centuries of the Middle Ages* (1893) thus:

In the current brochure, he seeks to show that the Jews were always the first and most zealous when it came to Christian persecution. Thus have the Church Fathers already complained. When the Jews had power, they themselves killed [Christians]; when they had no power, they sought to make themselves executioners subservient to the heathen world [*suchten sie sich dem Henkerarm der Heidenwelt dienstbar zu machen*].¹⁴⁵

In its recommendation of Rösel’s work, the *Reichspost* demonstrated its conviction that Jews had been historic enemies of Christians and Christianity. The newspaper omitted that between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries, Christians in Western and Central Europe had slaughtered tens of thousands of Jews in anti-Jewish riots. The *Reichspost* misused medieval religious history to strengthen its religious arguments against Jews. The newspaper idealized the violent Jew-hatred of the past, without admitting its true destructiveness. In addition, it misrepresented Jews as historically “the first and most zealous when it came to Christian persecution.”

The *Reichspost* justified and encouraged the participation of priests in Christian Social and anti-Semitic movements. In an article about a political meeting in the seventh district (Neubau), the newspaper approvingly quoted speaker G. R. Latschka: “that we [Christian Socials] stand in opposition against Liberalism on the same ground as the popes and bishops. And as we always meet the Jews in this struggle, anti-Semitism is justified and the priest forced to stand in the Christian Social movement on the side of the

University Press, 1999), 258-259, 268, 273; Lynn Hunt et al., *The Making of the West: Peoples and Cultures, A Concise History* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2003), 358-360, 450-452.

¹⁴⁵ *Reichspost*, 13 December 1894, 3.

people.”¹⁴⁶ Simply put, the *Reichspost* exhorted priests to become involved in the Christian Social movement in order to help defend “the people” from the (perceived) excesses of Jews. Berthold had also argued church leaders had the power and authority to protect Christian people.

The *Reichspost* printed a series of sermons and articles about the Passion, Crucifixion, and Resurrection of Christ during Lent, Good Friday and Easter, which demonstrated its religious and/or economic arguments against Jews. The newspaper reprinted a sermon Father Heinrich Josef Maria Abel¹⁴⁷ delivered at St. Augustine's Church in Vienna on March 16, 1894, two days before Palm Sunday. His sermon was on Jesus's entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday and how people welcomed him, which enraged the Pharisees, members of an ancient Jewish sect. Jesus turned out the bankers, moneychangers, and traders from the temple, and incensed the Pharisee high priest. The Jews advocating for the bankers asked Jesus “Where from have you the power, [to] drive them out of the temple?” and Father Abel commented “In those days, as today, these Jews made business with the bankers.”¹⁴⁸ This scene of Jews defending bankers was one of many Father Abel used to demonstrate the eternally negative characteristics of Jews.

Father Abel continued. On the next day, Monday, Jesus taught people in the temple to guard themselves against the scribes and the Pharisees. When Jesus did so, the Jewish High Priest Caiaphas, according to Father Abel, thought it would be:

better that Jesus die, than the political nation of the Jews perish by the Romans. However, the Lord God had also endorsed his words, in another sense: It is better that Jesus Christ alone perishes than the poor people, than the workers [...] better he than that we all perish, whether Catholic,

¹⁴⁶ *Reichspost*, 21 April 1894, 5.

¹⁴⁷ Father Abel was the founder of the Marian Congregation in Vienna and the organizer of the pilgrimages to Mariazell. See Reinhold Knoll, *Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei*, 305.

¹⁴⁸ *Reichspost*, 17 March 1894, 4-5.

or Protestant, or Jewish – because also Jews are safe here – whether believing Catholics and Protestants, or unbelieving, whether Orthodox or Reform-Jew. So had God understood the word of Caiaphas.¹⁴⁹

For his contemporary audience, Father Abel conflated past and present. He made biblical references to a “political nation” of Jews, as well as Reform Jews and Protestants, none of which existed at the time. Father Abel then described the hiring of “the traitor Judas” on Tuesday, and the imprisonment of Jesus on Thursday. Father Abel pronounced the “terrorism of the Jews against the people began at this time.”¹⁵⁰ By implication, it continued to the present. With Jesus before Pilate, Father Abel proclaimed, the scribes and Pharisees ran about the crowd calling for the crucifixion of Jesus, for the people to vote for the freedom of the murderer Barabbas instead. Then Father Abel made a number of connections between Jewish “terrorism” past and present. Concerning what he termed the “terrorism of the phrase,” which included labels such as “clerical” and “ultramontane” against Catholics, Father Abel declared, “We are not subject to the terrorism of the slogans of the phrase!”¹⁵¹ Regarding what he termed the “terrorism of the press,” Father Abel declared the “Divine Savior Jesus Christ” had said “the apostate Catholic, the apostate Christian is twofold worse than the Jew. Therefore, Christian men, again [we] request: Support the Christian Press!”¹⁵² Father Abel here equated Christians abandoning the “Christian Press” and turning to the “Jew-Press” with apostasy. With regard to “terrorism of the majority” (in Father Abel’s time the Liberals), Father Abel stated that “Not the majority makes truth; when only few are for it this can also be something true,” and he narrated how:

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid.

[...] only Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea in the Sanhedrin took the [good] word for him [for Jesus], Christ was done in with the whole Sanhedrin, with the majority of the Jewish people, who wander [*irrt*] around now the world over as living witness [*lebender Zeuge*], that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God.¹⁵³

Father Abel following in the tradition of the Church Fathers, believed the Jews to be both “Christ killers” and “Witness People.”

In “Easter,” a front-page article, the *Reichspost* explicitly connected the Jews’ (alleged) crucifixion of Christ and the actions of present day Jews.

They [the Jews] have crucified him. He was laid in a grave and a heavy stone sealed the tomb. And watchmen watched over the grave. So did the Jews more than 1800 years ago, and the enemies of Christ and of Christianity, the enemies of the Christian people have through 1800 years followed this example. The Christian people’s spirit was scourged with scorn and ridicule even in last century, and every revolution was at the same time a new crucifixion of Christ and his people.¹⁵⁴

The *Reichspost* compared Christ’s corpse to Christian consciousness [*christliche Bewußtsein*] and the watchmen to Jewish newspapers and magazines. Christ was resurrected after three days, the stone rolled away, and the watchmen fell down blinded by the light. The *Reichspost* commented, “now in the nineteenth century the Christian people have awakened and thrown off their death sleep and now stand mighty before the blinded watchmen.”¹⁵⁵ The newspaper warned its readers that the Jews still brandished their weapons against the “life force” of the people, Christianity. From present day Judases and Pharisees, “again drool scorn and ridicule, again roll the silver coins, and again [they] will betray and sell Christ and his people, but the effort shall be vain,

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ *Reichspost*, 25 March 1894, 1.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

because Christianity shall overcome all.”¹⁵⁶ The article called for Christian Social reform, “re-Christianization” of public life, and “awakening of Christian spirit” in the people.¹⁵⁷

On April 13, 1897, the *Reichspost* reprinted another sermon by Father Abel at St. Augustine's Church in Vienna on the Passion, Crucifixion, and Resurrection of Christ. At its conclusion, Father Abel exhorted his audience to “return to practical Christianity.”¹⁵⁸ The recommendations for the observance of “practical Christianity” were specific and concrete, and reflected the desire for a “re-Christianization” of public life and reawakening of Christian spirit. Father Abel recommended observance of the Easter holiday and rest on Sundays, “avoidance of non-Christians,” supporting the Christian-Press, and joining Catholic clubs. He exhorted civil servants to attend the St. Vincenz-Conference, as they were not permitted to join political clubs. He urged Catholic youths to join Catholic worker’s clubs and attend Catholic schools. He also recommended that Catholics avoid non-Christians, that is, Jews.¹⁵⁹

In its *Sunday Supplement*, the *Reichspost* published Aug. Schiffmacher’s poem “Easter Solace” [“*Ostertrost*”]. The three-stanza poem encapsulated *Reichspost* views of Jews both as “Christ killers” and eternal enemies of Christianity and Christians:

They [Jews] have killed the Saviour	<i>Sie haben den Heiland getödtet</i>
In their blind fury,	<i>In ihrer blinden Wuth</i>
Because he is risen victorious	<i>Da ist er siegend erstanden</i>
In the golden glow of morning.	<i>In gold'ner Morgengluth</i>
Now they want to	<i>Nun möchten sie seine Lehre</i>
Destroy and desecrate his teaching,	<i>Vernichten und entweih'n,</i>
And scatter to all the winds	<i>Und seine treue Heerde</i>
His faithful flock.	<i>In alle Winde zerstreu'n.</i>

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ *Reichspost*, 13 April 1897, 6.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

But just let them rant and rage, They will vanish like mist, And time and time again Christ will be resurrected.	<i>Doch laßt sie nur toben und wüthen, Sie werden wie Dunst vergeh'n, Und immer und immer wieder Wird Christus aufersteh'n.</i> ¹⁶⁰
---	---

The title of the poem “Easter Solace” signified that the poet wished to comfort Christians saddened by Jews’ (alleged) Crucifixion of Christ and put them at ease. Even though Jews (purportedly) continued to attack Christ and Christianity, they did so in vain: “They [Jews] will vanish like mist, / And time and time again / Christ will be resurrected.”

The *Reichspost* directed its hatred not only at the Jews, but also at Judaism itself. In “Rabbinical Wisdom,” the *Reichspost* responded to claims by the *Jüdische Chronik* [*Jewish Chronicle*], which the *Reichspost* claimed Bohemian rabbis published. The *Jüdische Chronik* described Jews as the people of God with a “world-historical calling” to develop Judaism into a “world religion.”¹⁶¹ The *Reichspost* labeled such claims “arrogance” and responded that:

Judaism has lost for 1800 years temple, altar and sacrifice, these most important features of its confession, as today's Judaism split completely with Talmudism and modern Reform Judaism actually stands on the positions of atheism and materialism. Why now did the Jew-Press busy itself with such rabbinical wisdom?¹⁶²

The *Reichspost* rejected claims by the *Jüdische Chronik* that Judaism was meant to be a “world religion.” Instead, the *Reichspost* asserted Judaism had lost credibility after the Romans destroyed the Second Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE. The *Reichspost* also took a swipe at Reform Judaism, declaring how its split from “Talmudism” reflected its “atheism and materialism.” These ideologies were anathema to the “re-Christianization” of public life.

¹⁶⁰ *Sonntags-Beilage. Illustriertes Unterhaltungsblatt der „Reichspost“*. 18 April 1897, 121.

¹⁶¹ *Reichspost*, 29 July 1896, 7.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*

The *Reichspost* attacked Jewish religious texts as well. Berthold von Regensburg, the thirteenth century German Franciscan monk had insisted: “The Old Testament is the night, the New Testament is the day.”¹⁶³ Berthold also inveighed against the Talmud and declared it a heretical text.¹⁶⁴

The *Reichspost* attacked Joseph Caro’s sixteenth century *Schulchan Aruch* [Code of Jewish Law] more than any other Jewish text. Indeed, it saw the *Schulchan Aruch* as the text Jews used to justify (alleged) economic exploitation of Christians.¹⁶⁵ The *Reichspost* had received reports of “Talmud Torah Schools,” Jewish supplementary schools that provided basic Hebrew and Bible instruction, educating pupils with the *Schulchan Aruch*. In response, the *Reichspost* (falsely) claimed the Grand Duchy of Baden had banned the *Schulchan Aruch* for promoting Jews’ immoral acts against *Akum* (as previously noted, the *Reichspost* translated *Akum* as Christian for the sake of its anti-Semitic argumentation, but *Akum* actually means “star worshipper”). The *Reichspost* noted that there was hardly a school in Vienna where the *Schulchan Aruch* was in use, except perhaps the Talmud Torah School in the Leopoldstadt. The *Reichspost* then requested that the appropriate authorities conduct an inquiry concerning the use of the *Schulchan Aruch* at this school as well as the “hundreds of Talmud Torah Schools” in Galicia and Bukovina. The *Reichspost* claimed the *Schulchan Aruch* compared *Akum* to dogs. The newspaper challenged defenders of the *Schulchan Aruch* who claimed that *Akum* meant only “star worshippers [*Sternanbeter*].” While this translation could perhaps

¹⁶³ *Reichspost*, 10 March 1894, 1-2.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ See also references to the *Schulchan Aruch* in the MA Thesis section on the “Use of Economic Anti-Semitism.”

apply to the Talmud to a certain extent, surely it did not to the sixteenth century

Schulchan Aruch. The *Reichspost* declared:

About the meaning of the word 'Akum' in the Talmud [one] can argue; in the *Schulchan Aruch* 'Akum' means Christians and only Christians, because at that time heathens [*Heiden*] (except the Moslems), were no longer anywhere in Europe. We therefore want the high Imperial and Royal Ministry of Education [...] to act the way Karlsruhe behaved. Ban from the schools a book with dubious morality, and [which] excused or justified most vicious actions if committed against Christians! When a catechism or any other textbook remotely contained an anti-Semitic passage, immediately the relevant textbook would be suppressed! Why should the *Schulchan-Aruch* enjoy such exceptional preferences?¹⁶⁶

In “Again, the *Schulchan Aruch*,” the *Reichspost* reported the *Schulchan Aruch* was found in not one, but two schools in Baden, despite the (falsely alleged) ban. The newspaper assumed there would be more elsewhere, considering there were 27,000 Jews in Baden and more than 1.5 million Christians, and in Austria 1.25 million Jews and 24 million [sic] Christians. The *Reichspost* demanded to know where else in Austria this “immoral” book was being used.¹⁶⁷ It is probable the newspaper hated the *Schulchan Aruch* so much because it fit its view that Jews were excessively legalistic.

The *Reichspost* used specious arguments about the *Schulchan Aruch* to condemn the Jews. Its arguments hinged entirely on a false definition of *Akum*. In addition, the newspaper failed to consider that by the late 19th century most Jews did not abide by the *Schulchan Aruch*. Moreover, the *Reichspost* neglected a significant modernized *Schulchan Aruch* that further simplified “Torah knowledge” and made it applicable to everyday life. In 1864, in Uzhorod, Hungary, Rabbi Schlomo Ganzfried published his *Kitzur Schulchan Aruch*, an abridgement and update of Joseph Caro’s sixteenth century *Schulchan Aruch*. It disproved *Reichspost* claims that the *Schulchan Aruch* encouraged

¹⁶⁶ *Reichspost*, 21 July 1894, 1.

¹⁶⁷ *Reichspost*, 24 July 1894, 2-3.

immoral business practices. In “Chapter 62: Commerce and Trade,” the *Kitzur Schulchan Aruch* directed Jewish businessmen to deal honestly with both Jews and Gentiles. A Jew who cheated or deceived a Jew or Gentile when purchasing or selling goods, hiring or contracting labor, or exchanging currency violated Torah prohibitions. The *Kitzur Schulchan Aruch* recommended punishments for such violations ranging from beatings and fines, to being cursed in court.¹⁶⁸

Despite its intense hostility to Jews, the *Reichspost* nevertheless rejected racial anti-Semitism because it compromised the efficacy of baptism, which as good Catholics, the newspaper’s editors upheld. A baptism could allow a person of any faith or nationality to wash away his or her sins (even the “sin” of being Jewish) and become Christian. Racial anti-Semites such as Georg Ritter von Schönerer believed in the primacy of biological origins. For them, Jews could not become Christians through baptism and a baptized Jew was still a Jew. On the other hand, the *Reichspost* acknowledged that Jews could become Christians through baptism.

On numerous occasions the *Reichspost* explicitly rejected racial anti-Semitism. In “Very true!” [“*Sehr Wahr!*”], the newspaper declared: “Certainly in love and unity may we already live with the Jews – but what is anti-Semitism other than a defensive war? Christian anti-Semitism is not founded on religion- and race-hatred.”¹⁶⁹ In the front-page article “Anti-Semitic and Christian Social,” the *Reichspost* declared, “Racial-anti-Semitism is un-Christian and unacceptable.”¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ Shlomo Ganzfried, *Kitzur Schulchan Oruch: The Classic Guide to the Everyday Observance of Jewish Law*, trans. Eliyahu Touger (New York: Moznaim Publishing Corporation, 1991), xvii-xix, 265-270.

¹⁶⁹ *Reichspost*, 2 July 1894, 2.

¹⁷⁰ *Reichspost*, 25 July 1896, 1-2.

To emphasize the efficacy of baptism, in “Anti-Semitic and Christian Social” the *Reichspost* proclaimed: “Only Christian anti-Semitism [...] has a reasonable content, moral efficacy and duration.”¹⁷¹ The newspaper justified this because, “Christian anti-Semitism [...] does not forget that the Jews are human beings [...] does not deny them equality after genuine acceptance of baptism and of the Christian faith [...] only fights in the Orientals [Jews] the degeneracy of one to us foreign Semitic culture and against their attacks seeks to effectively protect the Christian state and social order.”¹⁷²

The *Reichspost* criticized Martin Luther (1483-1546), the Protestant Reformer, for warning against attempts to baptize Jews (while Luther believed in the efficacy of baptism, he made this warning because of the difficulty he had trying to convert Jews). The newspaper quoted Luther’s work *On the Jews and Their Lies*, in which Luther warned German Christians “not to convert the Jews, which is as impossible as to teach the devil.”¹⁷³ The *Reichspost* declared, “Everyone has a right to it [baptism], if they desire it honestly, and so too the Jew.”¹⁷⁴

Along with state patriotism, dynastic loyalty, aspects of “positive” Christianity, and refraining from calls to physically attack Jews, the importance of the *Reichspost*’s rejection of racial anti-Semitism and allowing Jews to convert cannot be overstated. These features of Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism differentiated the *Reichspost* from racial and radical anti-Semites of its time and of later decades.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ This distinction, though important, is not a justification of the vulgar hydra-headed anti-Semitism and Jew-hatred of the *Reichspost*.

Chapter V: Conclusion

In its early years, January 1894 to April 1897, the *Reichspost* used economic, social, and political anti-Semitism, religiously motivated Jew-hatred, and distorted history to call for the “re-Christianization” and “de-Jewification” of public life. As demonstrated by close textual analysis, the newspaper utilized a wide range of positive depictions of Christians, Christianity, and Christian clergy juxtaposed against negative depictions of Jews and Judaism. Moreover, the *Reichspost* proposed and/or supported anti-Jewish legislation. Nevertheless, the newspaper moderated its views by keeping open to Jews the possibility of conversion to Christianity, rejecting racial anti-Semitism, professing state-patriotism and dynastic loyalty, and the rule of law. The *Reichspost* justified expulsion and violence against Jews past and present, and demonstrated bias in its reporting of contemporary Christian and Jewish violence in Vienna. However, the newspaper recognized when to draw the line and did not exhort its readers to pursue such “self-help” against the Jews.

So what do we learn about anti-Semitism in Vienna? Anti-Semitism in Vienna of the *Reichspost* variety, Catholic and Christian Social, was multifaceted. Moreover, traditional religious Jew-hatred and modern anti-Semitism co-existed side by side. More than four decades after writing *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism*, in 2005 Peter Pulzer published an article entitled “Third Thoughts on German and Austrian Antisemitism.” In this article, Pulzer detailed the historiography of German and Austrian anti-Semitism and noted that historians have long debated “the ever-recurring question of continuity between the ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’ forms of Jew-hatred.”¹⁷⁶ The *Reichspost* was founded and run by traditional Catholic clergy and Catholic laymen associated with the

¹⁷⁶ Peter Pulzer, “Third Thoughts on German and Austrian Antisemitism,” *Modern Jewish Studies*, 4, no. 2, (July 2005): 140.

Christian Socials in modern Vienna on the cusp of the twentieth century. For the *Reichspost*, traditional religiously motivated Jew-hatred and modern anti-Semitism went hand in hand. The newspaper did not hide this fact. In “The Wolf in Sheepskin” [“*Der Wolf im Schafspelz*”], the *Reichspost* declared “It was not dead, the old Jew hatred, it had changed names and is now called: anti-Semitism and has become modern.”¹⁷⁷ For economic, social, political, and religious ends, the *Reichspost* recognized and demonstrated the continuity between traditional Jew hatred and modern anti-Semitism in Vienna at the turn of the twentieth century.

¹⁷⁷ *Reichspost*, 28 March 1894, 2.

Bibliography

1. Newspapers

Reichspost, Vienna, 1894-1897.

Sonntags-Beilage. Illustriertes Unterhaltungsblatt der „Reichspost“, Vienna, 1897.

2. Secondary Sources

Andics, Hellmut. *Der ewige Jude: Ursachen und Geschichte des Antisemitismus*. Vienna: Verlag Fritz Molden, 1965.

Beller, Steven. *A Concise History of Austria*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

———. *Vienna and the Jews, 1867-1938: a Cultural History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Boyer, John W. *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna: Christian Socialism in Power, 1897-1918*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

———. *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Cohen, Mark R. *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Csendes, Peter. *Historical Dictionary of Vienna*. Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1999.

Ganzfried, Shlomo. *Kitzur Schulchan Oruch: The Classic Guide to the Everyday Observance of Jewish Law*. Translated by Eliyahu Touger. New York: Moznaim Publishing Corporation, 1991.

Geehr, Richard S. *Karl Lueger: Mayor of Fin de Siècle Vienna*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990.

Glick, Leonard B. *Abraham's Heirs: Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1999.

Häusler, Wolfgang. "Toleranz, Emanzipation und Antisemitismus. Das österreichische Judentum des bürgerlichen Zeitalters (1782-1918)." In *Das österreichische Judentum: Voraussetzungen und Geschichte*, edited by Nikolaus Vielmetti, 83-140. Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1974.

- Hunt, Lynn, Thomas R. Martin, Barbara H. Rosenwein, R. Po-Chia Hsia, and Bonnie G. Smith. *The Making of the West: Peoples and Cultures, A Concise History*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003.
- Katz, Jacob. *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770-1870*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1998.
- Knoll, Reinhold. *Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei: Ihre Früh- und Entwicklungsgeschichte bis zu den Reichsratswahlen 1907*. Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1973.
- McCagg Jr., William O. *A History of Habsburg Jews, 1670-1918*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Pauley, Bruce F. *From Prejudice to Persecution: A History of Austrian Anti-Semitism*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Pulzer, Peter. *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- "Third Thoughts on German and Austrian Antisemitism." *Modern Jewish Studies*. 4. no. 2 (July 2005): 137-178.
- Rozenblit, Marsha L. *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914: Assimilation and Identity*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1983.
- Vyleta, Daniel. *Crime, Jews and News: Vienna, 1895-1914*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2007.
- Wistrich, Robert S. *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.