

# THE JEW IN EUROPE: THE CHRISTIAN'S ANTAGONIST

by Charles C. Starbuck  
*Catholic World*, September, 1900

*Nowhere, for doctrinal and for historical reasons, in the memory of the deepest wrongs suffered and inflicted, does it seem possible that there should be such an immitigable hatred in the breast of any other human being towards the Redeemer as may be conceivably gathered in the breast of a Jew.*

IT is hard to say whether the anti-Semites or the pro-Semites are the more unreasonable, although unquestionably the latter are the more humane. The worst extremes of anti-Semitism, of course, as illustrated in the *Anti-Juif*, are indescribably vile, and remind us of nothing so much as of the worst ravings of the Orangemen, the American Protective Association, or the kindred parties among the English Nonconformists. They are outside the bounds of common decency and common humanity.

Even such anti-Semites as Mr. Gueroult, in the *Tablet*, who do not forget that they are

gentlemen, appear hardly less virulent in fact. I can make nothing else out of several of Gudroult's letters than that he reproaches the English Catholics, as with a crime, with their unwillingness to condemn Captain Dreyfus simply because he is a Jew. It is true he speaks of overwhelming proof against him, but we have to receive this on his word.

Certainly it has not been produced to the world. That which the world has seen seems mostly to tell the opposite tale. The sum of Gudroult's contention, and that of his fellows, appears to be simply this: A crime has been done; a Jew was accused of it. This is proof enough. Any Protestant who denies it in France is not a true Frenchman, and any Catholic who denies it in England is a dubious Catholic. It seems a good opportunity for the Holy See to repeat the admonition of Paul II, that a Jew does not lose the right to justice by being a Jew. Moral truisms, after all, seem to be the dicta which need repeating the oftenest.

It is curious what an exact counterpart to this appears in a Protestant paper published in Mexico. It said during the war: A powder

magazine has been blown up in California. Some think this was done by Spanish Jesuits. Indeed, there can be no doubt of this, for of what wickedness are not Jesuits capable? With the reverse application, here is the exact echo of Gueroult and such as he, allowing for the blatant impudence of a vulgar author.

### REASONABLE ANTI-SEMITISM

It does not follow, though, that because there is unreasonable and raving anti-Semitism, there is not such a thing as reasonable and just anti-Semitism. What is an anti-Semite? It is simply a man who believes the Jews to be in Christendom a disintegrating and dangerous force. Need a man, therefore, lose his head and rave like a lunatic, and treat every individual Jew as a mere wild beast, that is to be knocked on the head at sight?

St. Paul, in I Thessalonians, declares that the Jews of his time “please not God, and are contrary to all men.” Yet he did not cease to love his countrymen, to pray for them, to labor for them, and to foretell their ultimate conversion. He was at once an anti-Semite and a pro-Semite.

There is a true tolerance founded on justice and humanity. This is Divine. This has not much resemblance to that mawkish liberalism which is so common now, and which is nothing but a striving to be in the mode. Orthodoxy was once the mode, now it is unbounded amiability towards everything except orthodoxy. The one dangerous opinion now is to believe that any opinion is dangerous, and to speak and act accordingly. Those who do this, it is assumed, ought to have no quarter shown them.

One would think that this proposition: *The Jews are a disintegrating and dangerous force in Christendom*, was self-evident. How can it be otherwise? The two religions are so related to each other that neither can leave the other out of mind. Judaism differs from Christianity only in two points, but these are vital. One is: Jesus is not the Messiah. The other is: The law of Moses is permanently binding on all who claim to be Israelites.

Christianity differs from Judaism in the reverse order. First, Jesus is the Messiah. Second, The law of Moses has ceased to bind since the coming of Christ. Christianity,

therefore, in the eyes of every orthodox Jew, is a gigantic heresy, imposture, and usurpation. It is a heresy, for it denies the continuing obligation of a divine law, and sets in the place of Messianic honor One who has no right to it. It is an imposture, for it supports its claims by an account of miracles which were either pretended or diabolical, and by the affirmation of a Resurrection which never took place. It is a usurpation, for it affirms that its adherents, and they only, have an ascertained share in the new covenant foretold by Jeremiah. How, then, can a religion diffused throughout Christendom, and having such an apprehension of Christianity, be otherwise than a constantly corrosive force, a force of constant negation?

The great Jew James Dannesteter remarks that from the very beginning of Christianity Judaism has constantly supplied a force of negation and sarcasm, at work even in authors who are not themselves Jews, from Celsus down to Voltaire, and to the present.

#### SOME REASONS FOR ANTAGONISMS

The *New Englander* for 1881 has an article on the Jewish question which is worthy of close

attention. It is quite free from anti-Semite prejudices. It is simply an attempt to show why it is that anti-Semitism has gained such a force in Central and Eastern Europe, for at that time it was almost confined there. The facts adduced are certainly startling, especially the rapid increase in the number of Jewish land-holders; the increase in the number of Jewish university students; the relatively higher standing of Jewish students; the longer life of Jews. None of these things, it will be seen, imply any fault in the Jews.

They have been kept for ages out of holding land; what wonder, then, that they should be eager to possess it? The universities have been shut to them; what wonder that they should now throng to them? If their eagerness to rise, and the keen Semitic minds of a large proportion, and the wonderfully absorbent Slavonic minds of a larger, place them high in university standing, surely this is a merit, not a fault. If their manner of living, or the quality of race (we know how long-lived their kinsmen the Arabs are), insure them a longer life than Europeans generally, how are they to blame for this?

Yet a race which is feared is not likely to be loved the more by proving that its increase in numbers and wealth and power is natural and healthy, and therefore likely to be permanent. All this will make it more an object of dread, and therefore of hatred. Its merits in such a case are sure, by the most, to be turned into sins.

We know how largely the New England Protestants turn marriage into unfruitful unions. Their families, therefore, are small, although it is very far from being true that all their small families are to be so explained. The Catholics there, we know, are free of this crime, and their families are large. Yet, while there are some Protestant preachers, and zealous ones, who praise them loudly for this, one of the foremost, writing in a review, treats it as little short of an affront that they should presume to have large families when the Protestants choose to have small. Indeed, the bitter popular imputations upon them for daring to increase take no account of the question whether their increase is sound or unsound. Do the French hate the Germans

less because the population of France is waning and that of Germany is waxing?

### JUDAISM SETS UP ANTAGONISTIC IDEALS

However, it is unjust to European Christians to lay their dislike of the Jews simply to Jewish thriftiness and studiousness and sound living. There are other reasons for dislike and apprehension. After all, the foundation of society is and must be religious. Fundamental ideas and beliefs must of necessity control secondary. The contention in Protestant countries that Catholicism, and in Catholic countries that Protestantism impairs social unity, appears self-evidently true, however it may be pressed extravagantly and intolerantly. Yet here there is unity as to the supreme ideals and the supreme Exemplar. Judaism, on the contrary, has not the same supreme ideals and rejects the supreme Exemplar.

Distinctive Judaism, as fully developed after the rejection of Christ and the retributive overthrow of the Temple, and set forth in the Talmud, consists in the segregation of the Jews, so far as possible, from all other men, and their compact union into one body by

enclosure in a network of invincible tradition and use by means of the 613 precepts of the Law made out by the Rabbis. This, as a late Jewish writer of Germany remarks, has so completely enveloped every act of orthodox Jews in a scheme of rigorously defined Jewish ethics that Jewish life is pinned down entirely to it, as the supreme object.

Even the belief in immortality, he remarks, has not essentially modified it. That is a thing by the way. The orthodox Jew lives essentially for the earth. A Boston Rabbi has lately opposed the Christian ideal, as one of love and self-sacrifice, to the Jewish ideal, as one of “sane selfishness.” To be sure, he has just before called the Jewish ideal one of “truth and righteousness” (as if truth and righteousness were opposed to love and self-sacrifice), but it is truth and righteousness so far as these are instrumental to a “sane selfishness.”

### CHRISTIAN IDEAS OF SELF-SACRIFICE

We see, then, how essentially irreconcilable the Jewish and the Christian ideals are. To be sure, this Rabbi, like most non-Christians, blunders essentially in his interpretation of

Christian self-sacrifice. This is, indeed, opposed utterly to “selfishness,” and denies that there can ever be a “sane selfishness.” Yet it is as far as possible from being void of a just self-regard. Indeed, its self-regard looks to supreme achievement of good.

As Goldwin Smith has pointed out, the self-renunciation of the Gospel is the exact opposite of the self-renunciation of Buddhism. Buddhism demands absolute self-renunciation of the personal being. This is not the self-renunciation of love. Buddhism knows nothing of love, beyond a general sympathetic willingness to deliver all things, and to be delivered with them, from the misery of existence. As Buddhism knows nothing of God, or good, or a holy scheme of advancing excellence and blessedness, there is no possibility of real self renunciation. Nothing can be renounced except that which has a value.

Now, Buddhism acknowledges no value in anything or any one. All existence is finite, and each finite form is an endless round of wretched illusions. The only good is the purely negative good of fading into non-existence. All

attempts to make of Nirvana something positive are, as Max Muller shows, a deflection from the proper meaning of Nirvana, and from the true teaching of Buddha.

Self-renunciation, in any true meaning, is only possible in Buddhism in the following sense: Once in many ages a single man, become a Buddha, may be about to enter into non-existence, and may refrain from doing so during the course of one life, in order the better to instruct all mankind in the way of final extinction. This is certainly not a very heroic self-renunciation, but it appears to be the only one conceivable in Buddhism. Genuine Buddhism, it is true, has long been nearly extinct.

Christian self-renunciation is, of course, summed up in our Lord's words: "He that finds his life shall lose it, and he that loses his life for my sake shall find it unto life eternal." Here the right, and the duty, of eternal self-assertion of the individual being are emphatically affirmed. The very foundation of our Lord's teaching is the eternal worth of each individuality, of personal existence, as

being capable of entering into an ever-during covenant with God, and of becoming, when consummate and glorified, the indefectible expression and vehicle of God's infinite scheme of goodness and blessedness.

Self-renunciation of the personal being, therefore, and of essential good, is an impossibility in Christianity. The Christian, no more than the Jew, is called to renounce, or allowed to renounce, anything of his fundamental end of being. The difference lies in the relation to eternity. The Christian recognizes himself as the citizen of eternity, and this life as the germ of eternity.

Everything, therefore, which appertains only to this life is essentially indifferent. It is to be held loosely, and easily given up for any higher end, of ourselves or others.

This, then, is Christian self-renunciation. It is possible for a Christian to practice it, for existence has for him an infinite worth, and the present existence, as being subsidiary to it, has a finite value indeed, but a real and great value. What he gives up, therefore, is truly given up, whereas in Buddhism there is

nothing given up, for there is nothing to give up, except illusion and vanity.

### THE NOTION OF CHRISTIAN LOVE DIFFERENT FROM JEWISH

In like manner, Christian love is different from all other love, not in degree merely but in kind. The benefit and blessedness which a Christian (whether explicitly or implicitly such) wishes to every human being, is an infinite benefit and blessedness. Infinitude is not finitude augmented beyond capacity of thought. It is absolute completeness, eternal and immutable, as contrasted with mutable and transitory fragmentariness. Christian love, therefore, resting in eternity, is deeply kind, because it wishes to draw all men into the same blessedness as its own, and because it has no need to be aggressively watchful for its own mundane interests.

Talmudic Judaism, on the other hand, is concerned with this world. Its love is only a form of "sane selfishness," recognizing the instinctive affections of the family as necessary to the happiness of the man, and the instinctive interests of the tribe as necessary to guard the family. Here is

abundant room for a “sane” selfishness, but selfishness it remains, decently tempered but still frankly evident. The Boston Rabbi has undoubtedly struck the true ideal of true modern Judaism. The outermost boundary of real active regard is the tribe, the Jewish people. All beyond that are strangers, if not virtually enemies. Hostility towards them may be active or latent, but they are never included within any true community of interests. Emil Reich, in the *Nineteenth Century*, quotes, as expressive of genuine Jewish feeling, involved in the very nature of the Jewish religion, the remark of a fellow-Jew made to him, that, although an English subject, if the actuation of Jewish nationality involved the sacrifice of English nationality, he would not hesitate to sacrifice it.

This does not in the least imply that Jews in general are plotting against the country in which they live. Of this there seems not the slightest evidence. Attempts to prove such a thing in France have confessedly broken down utterly. The overwhelming majority of Jews, doubtless, as of all other men, are sufficiently engaged in earning their bread. The bulk of

Jews, no more than the bulk of Gentiles, are rich. And, as we know, among the rich by far the greatest number of the inordinately rich are Gentiles, not Jews.

The interests of most Jews, as of other men, are involved in the general organism of a nation. This is not true everywhere. It does not appear to be true in Poland and Russia. It is doubtful whether it is true in Posen, Galicia, Romania, and the adjacent regions. Elisee Reclus, a pronounced Positivist, but an exceedingly careful man in his statements, an even painful striver after fairness, speaks of the Jews of those regions as laying a web which entangles all Gentile business and prosperity in subordination to itself. I shall come back to this.

### ZIONISM AND ITS REASON

In the West, however, in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, France, England, and America, there seems no doubt that national life has laid strong hold on Jewish feeling. Doubtless, even in these countries all those Jews that are not gravitating towards a readiness to be shaken off into the bosom of Christianity (of whom

there are not a few) would let all these Gentile nations and nationalities go to destruction if it would assist Jewish nationalism. Yet as there is no way perceivable in which the destruction of any one of these nations, or of all of them, would do Judaism any good, there seems no reason why we should doubt that the mass of Jews in each country are swayed by the national feeling of that country, like other men. It is true, patriotic impulse in them is not as strong as in others, for several reasons. Their religion fuses religion and nationality inseparably.

Emil Reich defines Judaism as that which finds the mediation with God in the nation of Israel. This is why the Zionistic movement is gathering strength. A nationality that is scattered all over the world is only a nationality in aspiration. In order to be realized it must have at least a territorial nucleus. This explains Zionism. This is a perfectly legitimate movement. It agrees with the modern principle, that allegiance is alienable. Men are not guilty of disloyalty to their present nation because they meditate joining with others to found a new nation.

Every colonist, indeed, does that, and views ultimate detachment from the mother country as at least possible. Yet certainly when men own that their religion cannot be perfectly practiced, that its ideals cannot be perfectly realized, except in a distinct nation, they cannot well be regarded as citizens in the fullest sense.

A body of men may be loyal to a government which persecutes them, even to the death. The early Christians were so to Rome. Loyalty, indeed, with them, as with the Romans generally, was, as it were, a law of nature. The Empire had a self-subsisting power which nobody thought of contradicting. The cruelty of an emperor was felt as a scourge, but hardly awakened resentment, even in its victims. The Roman world was felt as the sphere of peace and of ordered society, and unfaithfulness to it was nearly impossible.

Yet the Jews abhorred it, after subjugation as before. They held themselves in no need of it. It was to them a nightmare. Were it gone, they might hope for the revival of their own nationality. As this could not be, however, they accommodated themselves to it as to

other disagreeable necessities of nature. So long as it was pagan they found some consolation, and gained some favor with authority, by helping to persecute the Christians. But when the cross was planted on the throne, their long time of woe began, and their malediction on themselves: ‘His blood be on us and on our children,’ first went into full effect.

So long as the Christian Empire endured there could be no talk of Jewish loyalty. Sullen submission was all that could be expected. To hate the murderers of Christ was easy, to practice the forgiveness of Christ was difficult, and few tried. Even in our day, and our country, we have known the child of a baptized Jew to be derided as a “Christ-killer“ by his schoolfellows, who probably had few marks of Christianity but this mockery of Christ’s Christian countryman.

### THE LOYALTY OF THE MEDIEVAL JEW

When the Empire broke up, and during the Middle Ages, there could be little talk of loyalty anyhow, except to individual lords. So far as the Jews were allowed to swear homage to a lord, there seems no evidence that they

were less faithful and zealous than other vassals. Generally, however, they were claimed as the immediate vassals, or rather property, of the king. He protected them as far as he could from other men's oppressions, and squeezed them as nearly dry himself as would consist with keeping them in his kingdom.

The kings who were not plunderers, a Saint Louis, an Edward I., were apt to banish them. A John robbed them and kept them. So long as they were lucrative to the king, they could afford to be haughty to the subjects. Green and other historians have remarked on the ludicrous dissimilarity of Scott's portraiture of Isaac of York to the facts of the Middle Ages. A shivering, aged craven, asking nothing, besides the return of his loans with promised interest, but that he may be suffered to practice his religion obscurely, and to slip through life unnoticed, is not the Jew of the Middle Ages, or of any age.

The Jews have small occasion to thank Scott for such a caricature of their position, and true temper. Protected as they were by royal power, and by papal excommunications fulminated against their murderers, they

could afford to carry their heads high, and they did carry them high, and do. Even Dreyfus brought the conspirators against himself by their anger at his overbearing demeanor. Whatever the Jews may be, they are not and never have been cravens and weaklings.

The individual Jew is said to be characteristically timid. He clings strongly to life. Yet deeper than this is the haughty consciousness of Divine favor, the invincible disdain of Christian heretics. This temper has been manifested in every age, and is but slightly dampened by modern amenities.

Whether it be the sneering contempt expressed towards Christ by Rabbi Schindler, of Boston, or the bold denial by Rabbi Philippson, of Cincinnati, in the *New World*, that Christ was any better than any common Jew of his time (which by plain inference, in view of his calmly asserted claims, implies that he was very much worse), the temper of modern Judaism is precisely the same temper of malignant and contemptuous hatred towards the Redeemer and his people which influenced those Jews of Smyrna who helped

the heathen to bring fagots for the funeral-pile of Saint Polycarp.

### THE JEWS IN SPAIN

Emil Reich's admission, that the ruin of a Christian nationality would easily be undertaken by Jews if it helped to advance the Jewish nationality, receives illustration in the history of Spain. It is fashionable now to expend great pity on the poor Jews of Spain as innocent and helpless victims of Spanish bigotry and greed. This compassion is unwarranted for the Jews banished by Ferdinand and Isabella. If there is any right fundamental to men unconvicted of crime, a right deeper even than that to personal freedom, it is the right of abiding on the soil of their birth. No divergence of belief or usage from their countrymen can deprive them of this.

The popes, though they did not proclaim this right, recognized it practically, for while they opened their states to banished Jews, they never banished Jews from their states. The Jewish subjects of Ferdinand and Isabella had been guilty of no conspiracy. The utter

overthrow of the Moorish power took from them all motive of confederacy with the Moors. We shall presently see, I think, that there is much palliation in the former history of Spain for this act of the sovereigns, but nothing can justify it. Besides, look at the barbarousness of the conditions: allowed only a few months to dispose of large landed possessions, and then forbidden to take with them the gold and silver which alone would be serviceable to them! Reduce the banished from the extravagant estimate of 800,000 to the true number, as ascertained by Prescott, 160,000, and this still remains one of the atrocious deeds of history.

Yet we have no right to forget that the Christian Spaniards had had to sustain a contest of seven centuries with the Mohammedans for their nationality and their religion, and that in this long contest the Jews had sided more often with the Moslem than with the Christian. Seldom, I believe, have Jews sided otherwise. How could they? Islam is Semitic, polygamous, legalistic, denying the fact of the crucifixion; abhorring the thought of a Son of God; calling Jesus, indeed, Word,

Messiah, Lord, and his mother Lady, and teaching the sinlessness of both, but putting Christ nearly out of sight behind the final revelation declared to have been given to the Arabian Apostle of God.

The high historical authority of Hefele informs us that the Spanish Jews had repeatedly conspired and intrigued, leaning on the Moslem power, for the establishment throughout the Peninsula of the Semitic religion, in its two forms, on the ruins of Christianity. Their attempts finally failed, but for centuries they seemed by no means chimerical. Hefele condemns the act of the two sovereigns, but he shows that it was not wanton, but had deep roots in the past.

### JEWES AND THE SLAVONIANS

The Polish and Russian Jews (Slavonic in race, like their Christian neighbors, as I am informed by the eminent Semitic scholar Professor G. F. Moore) hold it as the orthodox belief that all men but Jews perish at death. So we are informed by Jewish writers of that region. To them, therefore, Christians are not so much the objects of hate as of serene indifference, like other brute creatures. This

explains their cheerful exploitation of Christians, against which the Russian government has thought it necessary to intervene by measures so harsh—directed, however, against a very great danger.

Now, it is ridiculous to say that the two or three millions of unbaptized Slavonians, who regard the seventy or eighty millions of baptized Slavonians, Catholic or Orthodox, as simply like the beasts that perish, can have any real community of national feeling with them. We might as well talk about having a community of national feeling with our sheep and beeves. We have a kindly feeling for the poor creatures, but we plough with them, or shear them, or slaughter them, as we have occasion. The only right we acknowledge in them is the right to be treated kindly while they live. Therefore the refusal of the Russians to own the Jews for their countrymen is only the milder correlative of the refusal of the Jews to own the Russians for their human fellows. Nevertheless, it is more than doubtful whether Russian disfranchisement of the Jews can be justified.

As Simon de Montfort says: "What concerns all is the concern of all." The rights of men are antecedent to their creeds. They rest on their humanity. Whatever other men may think of our future, they have all manner of present concerns in common with us, which they are capable of discussing 'in a friendly fashion, in spite of any creed. Moreover, the more thoroughly they see we are like them in the present, the less likely they are to hold us as of a lower grade of being, incapable of immortality. Persecution might, indeed, have the effect of exasperating them into thinking that extinction is too good for us, that we must be meant to survive for torment; but such a change of creed would certainly not be desirable.

However it may be in France, it seems certain that in Germany most of the violent anti-Semitism is found in those that have little of Christianity left about them except hatred to the Jews, just as Reformed Jews may be denuded as those whose Judaism consists mainly in hatred to Christianity. Where this is not so, they seem to be dissolving into Christianity. It is astonishing how long

religious hatreds survive religious faith. Anti Semites in Germany sometimes deny outright that Christ was a Jew. Say they: "He was much too fine a specimen of a man for it." Could there be a more detestable mixture of intolerable patronage towards the Redeemer, evident unbelief, and the grossness of voluntary ignorance?

### JEWES AND THE CONTROL OF THE PRESS

Christians, dwelling in the atmosphere of the Bible, might judge certain measures of restraint necessary against Jewish oppositeness of interests, but they could not easily become violent, persecuting anti-Semites, It is true they have a good deal of temptation, especially in Germany. Jewish antipathy to the Gospel is more distinctly virulent there than anywhere else. Jewish capitalists gain large rights of church patronage, and use them to keep out active and earnest pastors. The press is largely controlled by Jews (Goldwin Smith says that it is falling more and more under Jewish control in our country), and it is used to pour scorn on Christian enterprises, especially on foreign missions.

This control of the press by Jews is most notorious at Berlin. The *Christliche Apologete* of Cincinnati, which is unfriendly to anti-Semitism, and decidedly hostile to Pastor Stoecker, nevertheless complains that the Jews of Berlin use the press not only to revile Christian faith, but Christian morals. Indeed, the energetic malignancy of Judaism is seen in England as well as in Germany, though not so constantly and intensely. Neither the Rothschilds nor the Montefiores appear to be in the least tinctured with it.

Indeed, the younger Montefiore, like our own Emma Lazarus, has virtually called our Lord divine. It is not that all Jews are malignant. How can we say that a majority are? What evidence have we of it? What right have we to say, or even to presume, of any particular Jew whom we meet, that he is a hater of Christ? He may be, and probably is, simply a worshipper of the God of Abraham according to the rites and doctrines of his fathers, without going much into questions concerning the Messiah. Very possibly he may hold, with certain great Rabbis, that Jesus, though not the Messiah, is "the way to the Messiah." A

modern Jew remarks that a majority of his people are a good deal more concerned to know the New Testament than the Talmud. We ourselves have known Jews to quote the New Testament as of canonical authority in contradiction to the Law, while plainly they had not a thought of quitting their people. It is not a strange thing for them to say that Jesus has a higher place than Moses in Paradise.

Therefore, when we say that Judaism survives in unabated malignancy towards the Gospel, what we mean is, that there is a large body of Jews (how large no one can tell) who have accepted the logical alternative between the reception of Jesus as the Christ and the rejection of him as an impostor and heretic. Even those Jews who do not venture to attack him personally in print, do not hesitate to attack his Apostles. Thus, we have seen quoted from a Jewish periodical of Cincinnati the remark that Jews ought not to transfer their Sabbath to the Sunday, if only because Christian scholars have shown that the observance of Sunday, as the Day of the Resurrection, rests on imposture. By

“Christian scholars,” of course, are meant such men as Strauss.

The degree of malignity which is involved in branding the Apostles as impostors is simply unfathomable. Yet it is not merely intense but active. Some time since a deputation of Jews, addressing the Bishop of Liverpool, haughtily demanded of his lordship the dissolution of “the disreputable Society for the Conversion of the Jews.” Here we see illustrated Emil Reich’s remark about the sacrifice of British nationality to Jewish. We might as well go back of Magna Carta at once as to ask that England or America should curb the right of men holding any opinions to convert others to them, so long, in Mr. Gladstone’s words, as they do not appeal to violence or “grossness.

We are not pleased to hear of Buddhist or Mohammedan missions in our country, but it never occurs to us to appeal to the law against them, or to treat the missionaries as if they were guilty of a personal affront against us. Indeed, how can I show my goodwill to another man better than by endeavoring to make him partaker of the supreme treasure of truth? That early Quaker who went to Rome

to convert the Pope was doubtless animated by the purest benevolence, and was so received. It is true, the Pope converted him; but this only shows that His Holiness too was inspired by benevolence, and had more reasons behind it. The Quaker matron who went to Constantinople to convert the Sultan was not successful, but was received with reverence and dismissed with honor.

Yet when Christians join with other Christians in the endeavor to persuade the disciples of the Old Economy that the Hope of Israel is already here, we see a deputation of Jews telling the president of the society that it is an immorality, and demanding its dissolution in a haughtiness of style that plainly conveys a threat. And, indeed, immorality is liable to suppression by law. If it is immoral for Christians to try to turn Jews into Christians, why should not Jews abate this nuisance in the exercise of that large discretion which the common law allows for the abatement of nuisances generally. Assuredly they will, as soon as they dare. With a mendacious insolence beyond description, these tell the bishop that,

whatever evil thing a Jew may do, it is simply impossible that he could do such a thing as to turn Christian. Here we have all possible crimes of a Jew treated as of less account than his turning Christian. Of course, then, they stand ready to proceed against such an abominable attempt. The infamous insinuation implied here against the early church is, of course, understood and intended. And yet we have known Christian divines, with indescribable fatuity, to set forth Jews as far more grandly tolerant than Christians!

We know that the Fathers were disposed to believe that as Christ was a Jew, so Antichrist will be a Jew. This expectation has strong probabilities for it. Nowhere, for doctrinal and for historical reasons, in the memory of the deepest wrongs suffered and inflicted, does it seem possible that there should be such an immitigable hatred in the breast of any other human being towards the Redeemer as may be conceivably gathered in the breast of a Jew. To be sure, a Jew,, even aided by half his race, could not do very much. Yet there are Gentiles enough ready to follow a brilliant lead.

Some years ago Moncure D. Conway, sharply censuring a Jewish lady of London, attacked her not because she maligned Christians, but because she asked other Jews not to malign them. Doubtless when the time comes there will be multitudes of these brilliant coadjutors of Antichrist starting up from among the baptized. At all events our business is, not to use the weapons of Antichrist in the service of Christ.